

Montana Statewide Elk Management Plan

Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Wildlife Division

1420 East Sixth Avenue, Helena, MT 59620



Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	ix
PREFACE	1
Major Changes From 2005 Elk Management Plan	1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	2
Authority	2
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Park’s Mission, Vision, and Core Values	3
Common Interests of Stakeholders in Elk Management	3
Elk Management Plan Development Process	3
Plan Timeline and Updating Process	5
TOPICS RELEVANT TO ELK MANAGEMENT IN MONTANA	5
History	5
Elk Hunting	6
Elk Hunter Numbers and Days	6
Access	11
Economics of Elk	13
Hunting Revenue	13
License Revenue	13
Elk Population Monitoring	15
Aerial Surveys	15
Hunter Harvest Surveys	17
Check Stations	17
Radio-Collaring Efforts	17
Elk Integrated Population Model	17
Elk Population Dynamics	17
Bull Age Structure	18
Habitat	19
Carrying Capacity	22
Habitat Selection	22
Forage and Nutrition	23
Elk Security Habitat	24
Elk and Mule Deer Competition	24
Types of Habitat Management	25
Habitat Recommendations	26
Predation	26
Direct Effects	27
Indirect Effects	27
Carnivore Management	27

Integrated Carnivore-Ungulate Harvest Management	28
Carnivore Monitoring Programs.....	28
Elk Distribution	31
Changes in Land Use	32
Refuge Areas.....	33
Other Causes of Problematic Distributions.....	34
Management Strategies.....	36
Migration.....	37
Disease	38
Chronic Wasting Disease.....	38
Brucellosis	38
Bovine Tuberculosis	39
Harvest Strategies	40
Antlerless Hunting Regulation Types	40
Bull Hunting Regulation Types.....	41
ANTLERLESS HARVEST MATRIX.....	42
ANTLERED HARVEST MATRIX	48
Bull Management in HDs chronically and significantly above population goal range	48
STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT DIRECTION	52
HUNTING DISTRICT INFORMATION AND MANAGEMENT DIRECTION	62
Special Management Districts for Bull Elk.....	64
Hunting District 100	66
Hunting District 101.....	69
Hunting District 103.....	72
Hunting District 104	76
Hunting District 110	79
Hunting District 120.....	82
Hunting District 121	85
Hunting District 122.....	89
Hunting District 123.....	92
Hunting District 124.....	96
Hunting District 130.....	99
Hunting District 140	102
Hunting District 141	105
Hunting District 150.....	107
Hunting District 170.....	110
Hunting District 200	112
Hunting District 201.....	116
Hunting District 202	120

Hunting Districts 204, 261, 262	124
Hunting Districts 210, 211, 212, 216	130
Hunting District 213	136
Hunting District 214	140
Hunting District 215	143
Hunting District 217	147
Hunting District 240	151
Hunting District 250	155
Hunting District 260	159
Hunting District 270	162
Hunting District 280	166
Hunting District 281	168
Hunting Districts 282, 285	172
Hunting Districts 284, 293	178
Hunting Districts 290, 298	183
Hunting District 291	188
Hunting District 292	196
Hunting Districts 301, 309	199
Hunting District 302	204
Hunting District 303	209
Hunting District 304	212
Hunting District 310	216
Hunting District 311	219
Hunting District 312	222
Hunting District 313	227
Hunting District 314	231
Hunting District 315	235
Hunting District 316	237
Hunting District 317	242
Hunting District 318	245
Hunting District 319	249
Hunting District 320	253
Hunting District 321	256
Hunting District 322	261
Hunting District 329	266
Hunting District 331	271
Hunting District 335	275
Hunting Districts 339, 343	279
Hunting District 340	282

Hunting District 350	285
Hunting District 360	290
Hunting District 361.....	292
Hunting District 370	295
Hunting District 380	298
Hunting District 388	300
Hunting District 390	303
Hunting District 391.....	306
Hunting District 392	309
Hunting District 393	313
Hunting Districts 400, 403, 404, 405, 406, 419, 444, 471	315
Hunting District 401	318
Hunting District 410	322
Hunting District 411	326
Hunting District 412.....	330
Hunting District 413.....	334
Hunting District 415.....	337
Hunting District 416.....	341
Hunting District 417.....	345
Hunting District 418.....	348
Hunting Districts 420, 448.....	352
Hunting District 421.....	356
Hunting District 422	360
Hunting Districts 424, 425, 442	364
Hunting District 426	368
Hunting District 441.....	372
Hunting Districts 445, 455.....	376
Hunting District 446	380
Hunting District 447	384
Hunting District 450	388
Hunting District 451.....	391
Hunting District 452	394
Hunting District 502	397
Hunting District 515.....	400
Hunting District 525	404
Hunting District 535	408
Hunting District 540	412
Hunting District 555	416
Hunting District 565	420

Hunting District 575	423
Hunting District 580	423
Hunting District 590	427
Hunting Districts 600, 640, 650, 652, 670	431
Hunting Districts 620, 621, 622	433
Hunting District 630	437
Hunting District 690	441
Hunting District 700	445
Hunting Districts 701, 703	448
Hunting Districts 702, 704, 705	450
LITERATURE CITED	453
Appendix A. Elk Management Plan Initial Guidance Citizens Group Information	466
Appendix B. Elk Management Citizen Advisory Group Information	471

List of Figures

Figure 1. Estimated number of elk license holders who actively hunted for elk during each license year, 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).	7
Figure 2. Estimated number of days spent elk hunting during each license year, 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).	7
Figure 3. Estimated number of elk harvested during each license year, 1963 to 2021.	8
Figure 4. Total archery stamp sales in Montana from 1958 to 2021 as well as residency of archery stamp holders from 2002 to 2021. Prior to 2002, residency information of archery stamp holders is not available.	9
Figure 5. Estimated number of elk harvested with archery equipment, 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).	10
Figure 6. Proportion of total elk harvested that were harvested with archery equipment 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).	10
Figure 7. Proportion of survey respondents reporting hunting for elk on each access type in the 2013 and 2018 hunting seasons. Hunter could report hunting more than one type (Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019).	11
Figure 8. Reported elk harvest success for the 2013 and 2018 hunting seasons on various access types (Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019).	11
Figure 9. Total private acres enrolled in FWP’s Block Management Program, 1996 to 2022.	12
Figure 10. Elk licenses sold 2005 to 2022. Total licenses include General Elk Licenses as well as B Licenses. Both resident and nonresident licenses are represented in the figure.	14
Figure 11. Total estimated revenue generated from elk licenses sold in Montana.	14
Figure 12. Elk distribution in Montana as of 2022. Note: Distributions are not mapped within Indian reservations or national parks.	19
Figure 13. Montana estimated elk distribution 1940 to 2022. Note: Elk distribution is not mapped in Indian reservations or national parks.	32
Figure 14. Registrations of Motorcycles or Quadricycles in Montana for off-road use (includes off-highway, and street/off-highway). Data obtained from the Montana Department of Justice (https://dojmt.gov/driving/mvd-by-the-numbers)	35
Figure 15. Bull hunting opportunity types in Montana 1950 to 2020.	41
Figure 16. This figure includes 2023 EMUs. FWP recognizes elk interchange, overlap, and similarity in elk management circumstances at the EMU scale.	52
Figure 17. Special Management Districts for Bull Elk defined as such in this plan.	55

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of average elk harvest by region including average archery harvest.....	9
Table 2. Antlerless harvest opportunities during early antlerless season (early shoulder season).	43
Table 3. Antlerless harvest opportunities during archery-only season.....	44
Table 4. Antlerless harvest opportunities during general rifle season.	45
Table 5. Antlerless harvest opportunities during muzzleloader-only season.	46
Table 6. Antlerless harvest opportunities during late antlerless season (late shoulder season).....	47
Table 7. Antlered harvest opportunities during archery-only season.	49
Table 8. Antlered harvest opportunities during general rifle season.	50
Table 9. Antlered harvest opportunity during muzzleloader-only season.....	51

Acronyms and Abbreviations

- **ATV - All-Terrain Vehicle**
- **BLM - Bureau of Land Management**
- **BMA - Block Management Areas**
- **bTB - Bovine Tuberculosis**
- **CE - Conservation Easement**
- **CWD - Chronic Wasting Disease**
- **DNRC - Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation**
- **DSA - Designated Surveillance Area**
- **EMU - Elk Management Unit**
- **FWP - Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks**
- **HD - Hunting District**
- **IPM - Integrated Population Model**
- **iPOM - Integrated Patch Occupancy Modeling**
- **LEPOC - Lion Ecoregional Population Objective Committee**
- **NDVI - Normalized Difference Vegetation Index**
- **MCA - Montana Codes Annotated**
- **OHV - Off-Highway Vehicle**
- **USFS - U.S. Forest Service**
- **USFWS - U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service**
- **WMA - Wildlife Management Area**



Elk (*Cervus canadensis*) are one of the largest terrestrial mammals in North America and are an icon of big game hunting and conservation. Elk are managed for the benefit of all Montanans. Managing Montana's elk populations at levels compatible with other land uses and meeting the current and future demand for hunting and other recreation has become increasingly complex and has demanded comprehensive planning. Montana has operated under some form of elk plan since 1978.

This Elk Management Plan has multiple uses. It is intended to (1) inform the decisions regarding elk management and conservation in Montana, (2) assist Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP) personnel when considering elk management recommendations, (3) define FWP's commitment to the public to responsibly manage elk populations, and (4) guide FWP to meet statutory requirements in sustainably managing elk populations.

Major Changes From 2005 Elk Management Plan

The previous Elk Management Plan used by FWP was adopted in 2005. Since its adoption, many changes on the Montana landscape suggested the development of an updated plan for the overall management of elk, statewide, was appropriate. There are several functional differences between the 2005 and 2023 Elk Management Plan. The 2023 Elk Management Plan includes an option to update the Plan approximately every five years (offset from biennial season-setting years), with an expected lifespan of at least 15 years, at which time FWP will assess the possibility of an update, a major revision, or development of a new plan. This is different from the 2005 Elk Management Plan, which included the option to propose changes to population objectives and regulation packages annually; however, that process was used sparingly over the lifespan of the Plan. Additionally, there was no end date associated with the 2005 Elk Management Plan. By allowing for periodic updates, the new Elk Management Plan can more readily be adjusted to incorporate new information and management tools as needed while providing more regular opportunity for public input.

Another difference is the structure by which harvest regulations are prescribed for each hunting district (HD). The 2005 Elk Management Plan included a set of hunting regulation packages (Standard, Liberal, and Restrictive) with population measurement criteria (i.e., triggers) for moving from one regulatory package to another, and it directly tied hunting regulation packages to results of monitoring data. However, as elk management tools have changed over the past 18 years, the prescription of a specific season type resulted in prescribed season packages that were no longer available (e.g., A7 licenses), or conversely, new tools that are now available not being prescribed by the Plan because they didn't exist at the time of development (e.g., shoulder seasons, three elk bag-limit per hunter). The 2023 Elk Management Plan offers more flexibility by providing harvest matrices for antlerless and antlered elk that describe season types currently available in Montana ranging from liberal to restrictive. Each HD can move through the harvest matrices as needed to meet multiple objectives and the matrices can be updated during the review period as necessary.

Also, the 2023 plan uses HDs to define the area that the listed objectives and goals apply. HDs are the scale at which elk are surveyed; however, multiple HDs are occasionally included in the same survey when elk from multiple HDs mix or congregate during the survey period. This is the scale at which elk counts have been established and published since 2008. The 2005 plan's local scale was the Elk Management Unit (EMU). The 2005 plan set population objectives at the EMU scale and the HD scale (when they differed from one another). An EMU population objective was the sum of individual HD objectives. FWP and the public tend to focus on the smaller (HD) scale. Additionally, regulations are set at the HD scale and the public is more familiar with HDs than they are with EMUs. Therefore, FWP still recognizes the elk interchange and overlap in elk populations at the



EMU scale, but now focuses on the HD scale when determining objectives and goals.

Further differences between the two plans include the number and type of objectives used to determine success. The 2023 Plan has more objectives for each HD than the 2005 Elk Management Plan had. The 2023 Plan also includes statewide objectives that are programmatic and are intended to address issues that apply broadly within the state. At the local scale, the 2005 Elk Management Plan focused on a population size objective, including a bull objective for most EMUs. The 2023 Elk Management Plan still includes population demographic goals (population size and bull metrics), but it also includes elk distribution objectives and recreation-based objectives. Additionally, the 2023 Plan includes metrics to determine success in meeting elk management goals and objectives. These metrics will allow the department to report status and progress on meeting goals and objectives. Using a larger suite of objectives at both the statewide and HD scales better reflects the ecological and social complexity of elk management, allows the department to consider multiple objectives simultaneously, and is more transparent when there are competing objectives and trade-offs.

Former “population objectives” from the 2005 Elk Management Plan are now called “population goals”, and some have changed with the adoption of the 2023 plan. More specifically, the upper limit of the goal range has increased in 76 HDs and decreased in 6 HDs. There are also 17 HDs with similar population goals between plans, 30 HDs that do not have population goals (due to high amount of canopy cover, no wintering elk, or low elk density), and 7 HDs with population goals that cannot be compared across years (due to boundary changes in 2022 or newly established population goals). In the 2005 elk management plan, the statewide sustainable number of elk was determined to be 86,355 with a range between 72,413 to 101,525. In this plan, the statewide sustainable number of elk is determined to be between 96,015 and 151,425. This range is derived from a sum of all HD population goals. In some HDs, population goals have increased commensurate with landowner tolerance, as measured through the public process described in this Plan. Increased goals in these areas are set to not exceed current biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacities. In HDs where the population goal has decreased since 2005, either landowner tolerance has decreased, or biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacity has decreased.

Lastly, the 2005 Elk Management Plan defined bull objectives for most EMUs but did not specify those that would have special management to achieve a higher bull:cow ratio or older age bull structure. The 2023 Elk Management Plan explicitly recommends which HDs should be considered “Special Management Districts.” If an HD is not a “Special Management District for Bull Elk,” then it is considered a “Bull Opportunity District.”


INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND



Authority

FWP and the Fish and Wildlife Commission (Commission) are responsible for supervising and managing Montana’s wildlife (see §§ 87-1-201; 87-1-301, MCA). As to elk, the Department is responsible for (1) managing elk populations based on habitat acreages, (2) determining the sustainable number of elk in Montana after incorporating private landowner concerns and (3) managing elk populations with the objective they remain at or below sustainable population numbers (§§ 87-1-201; 87-1-323, MCA). Meanwhile, the Commission shall consider available elk habitat when adopting commensurate policies and crafting regulations (see § 87-1-301(1)(h-j), MCA). The Commission is also charged with ensuring elk management does not adversely impact Montana’s land and must establish a sustainable elk population based on available habitat and landowner tolerance (see §§ 87-1-321; 87-1-322, 87-1-323, MCA).

The Department uses this plan to satisfy its statutory mandate to define and determine Montana’s sustainable elk population, based on habitat acreage, landowner concerns, and the public’s interest in having a healthy and robust elk population.





Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks Mission, Vision, and Core Values

Mission – “Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, through its employees and citizen commission and board, provides for the stewardship of the fish, wildlife, parks and recreational resources of Montana, while contributing to the quality of life for present and future generations.”

Core Values – “Serve the public, embrace the public trust, honor tradition and heritage, work with landowners, use science, provide leadership, provide stewardship, value our workforce.”

Vision – “Montana is a place where people have abundant opportunities to connect with the world-renowned fish, wildlife, and state parks resources that define our state, and where a responsive and relevant FWP has the resiliency and public support it needs to lead the way in making sure these resources remain an essential part of Montana’s culture, economy, and high quality of life.”

Common Interests of Stakeholders in Elk Management

There are diverse stakeholders invested in elk management in Montana. Although there can be conflict among stakeholder groups, there are also commonalities, some of which are:

- The value of elk somewhere on the landscape
- The need to work across landownerships (federal, state, tribal, and private)
- The recognition that elk are a natural resource managed for the public
- The need to update the management plan regularly to adapt to changing conditions on the landscape
- The emotions elk can incite
- The concerns about disease, including chronic wasting disease (CWD), bovine tuberculosis (bTB), and brucellosis

These commonalities can provide a strong foundation for elk management.

Elk Management Plan Development Process

In April 2020, the Commission endorsed FWP beginning the process to develop a new Elk Management Plan. In the first step, FWP assembled the Elk Management Plan Initial Guidance Citizens Group. The group was diverse, independent, and represented multiple stakeholder perspectives. The group met three times during winter 2020 and developed 19 Guiding Principles using a facilitated, structured process (see Appendix A for more information).

Real-time public comment opportunities were offered during two of the group’s meetings. FWP received three public comments during these opportunities. The Guiding Principles were presented to the Commission in April 2021, and a 30-day public comment period was opened. FWP received 33 public comments during this time. The Commission endorsed these Guiding Principles and included an additional one. These were incorporated into the plan’s statewide management direction objectives and goals. See **Statewide Management Direction** section.

In the summer of 2022, another Elk Management Citizen Advisory Group was developed to forge new relationships among stakeholders and collaboratively develop new and creative ideas and recommendations for issues surrounding elk management in Montana to balance hunter and landowner interests. The group met 10 times and developed 15 recommendations (see Appendix B for more information). The recommendations were released for public comment, and FWP received 1,397 comments. Several of the recommendations, or portions of recommendations, had public support, were within the scope of the plan, and were within FWP's authority. These recommendations are included within the "strategies" portion of the statewide direction, as well as some of the HD strategies where applicable. Recommendations included in the plan are:

- Recommendation #3: Collaboration with other local, state, and federal land management agencies
- Recommendation #6: Establish localized elk working groups
- Recommendation #8: Promote focused game damage hunts (included portions of this recommendation)
- Recommendation #9: Improve accessibility to the FWP videos and programs that promote the desired behaviors between landowners and hunters
- Recommendation #11: We have to manage elk where they are not (included portions of this recommendation in Region 1 HD management direction sections)
- Recommendation #12: Understand and mitigate the disease of brucellosis in elk
- Recommendation #13: Use of shoulder seasons (included portions of this recommendation)



Public scoping efforts were initiated in summer 2022. The scoping period was open from June 20 to October 15, 2022. Fifty meetings were held across the state to gather feedback on elk population sizes, other elk management challenges, and goals for each HD. There were seven standard question prompts to gather feedback for individual HDs (note, "###" and "XXX" represent numbers and words, respectively, that were unique to each HD):

- Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?
- Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?
- The current population objective for HD XXX is ### (range ###-###). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

- In HD ###, there is a bull objective of XXX. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?
- Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?
- What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

In total, FWP received 824 comments that were used in determining goals and measures for each HD.

Work completed by the citizens groups and public comment received during those processes helped guide statewide objectives, goals, and strategies included in this Plan. Area biologists developed proposed goals and measures for local elk population demographic objectives, distribution objectives, and elk recreation objectives after considering public scoping comments and elk biology while maintaining relative consistency across HDs and regions. Public comment was solicited for 35 days on the 2023 Draft Elk Management Plan, which included proposed statewide and HD objectives, goals, strategies and measures. FWP received 590 comments during this process. The population goals and other metrics were subsequently finalized after consideration of these inputs.

In Montana, hunting regulations are evaluated biennially and can be changed with Commission approval. This Plan is intended to guide FWP proposals to meet the objectives set forth. Thus, the process of setting objectives is important and must come before determining hunting regulations. Hunting regulations must be determined only after the desired biological and sociological goals have been clearly identified ^{Lipscomb 1974}. Evaluating hunting regulations biennially provides wildlife managers the opportunity to assess the efficacy of a regulation in meeting objectives, and to adapt harvest strategies regularly.

Plan Timeline and Updating Process

This Plan includes an option to update approximately every five years (offset from biennial season-setting years), with an expected lifespan of at least 15 years (2023 to 2038), at which time FWP will evaluate the necessity of an update, a major revision, or development of a new plan. By allowing for periodic updates, the new Elk Management Plan can more readily be adjusted to incorporate advanced monitoring or management approaches as needed while providing more regular opportunity for public input. At each five-year update assessment, measures associated with both statewide goals and HD goals will be evaluated and reported publicly. Following evaluation, the department will bring forth any proposed changes.

TOPICS RELEVANT TO ELK MANAGEMENT IN MONTANA



History

Elk were widely distributed across North America prior to the arrival of the first Europeans ^{Bryant and Maser 1982} and in Montana, were distributed throughout the lengths of the Missouri and Yellowstone river valleys and overlapped with numerous tribal territories. At the time of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in 1805 and 1806, observations extended little beyond the vicinity of the major river valleys. By the early 1800s, unregulated subsistence, market, and hide hunting had almost eliminated elk east of the Mississippi River. Unregulated hunting continued to reduce elk in the western United States, and elk were gone from eastern Montana by the mid-1880s and were also heavily reduced in western Montana.

Elk numbers probably reached a low point in North America during 1900 to 1910. In 1910, it was estimated that fewer than 50,000 elk existed in North America ^{Thomas and Lyon 1987}. About half were associated with Yellowstone National Park (YNP), Jackson



Courtesy Robert Conney photo collection (Picton and Lonner 2008)

Hole, and the surrounding areas. The establishment of YNP in 1872 and its remoteness was a major factor in preserving elk in North America.

During the late 1910s and 1920s, local and national interest in protecting and expanding existing elk herds increased. Many local sportsman's clubs were formed with a primary purpose of preserving elk. In 1910, the first transplant of elk from YNP was made to Fleecer Mountain, near Butte, Montana ^{Picton and Lonner 2008}. During the period from 1910 to 1940, 1,753 elk from YNP, Jackson Hole, and the National Bison Range were transplanted to 31 sites in the national forests of Montana ^{West 1941}. In 1913, the Sun River Game Preserve was established, and hunting season closures were established elsewhere.

In 1922, about 13,000 elk were estimated to occur in the national forests of Montana and northern Idaho ^{West 1941}. Probably about 7,500 to 8,000 of these elk were in Montana. In 1928, an estimated 10,900 elk were in Montana ^{Raymer 1930}. By 1940, the national forests of Montana were estimated to contain 22,000 elk ^{West 1941}. Although the precision of these estimates is subject to question, the general trend provides a relative sense of elk population growth in Montana during the early 20th century.

The era of management on the basis of biology began in 1940 ^{Picton 1991}. At that time there were seven major native elk herds in Montana and small elk herds at scattered transplant locations ^{West 1941}. In 1940, the first State Game Manager position was created, biologists were hired, and the first portion of the Judith River Game Range was acquired by the state for elk winter range.

Reintroduction of elk through transplants continued, and from 1941 to 1970 an additional 4,140 elk were released into Montana, mostly from YNP. As a result of these and earlier transplants and natural increases in distribution of existing elk, elk began to fill in much of their former habitat, including some areas of eastern Montana. Today, all timbered mountainous areas of central and western Montana contain elk, as well as some of the open habitat types. Additionally, huntable elk herds exist in areas of eastern Montana. While post-hunt elk populations were estimated at about 8,000 in 1922, biologists counted over 143,000 elk in the state during aerial surveys in 2023. Elk are much more abundant and well distributed today than they were a century ago in Montana.

Elk Hunting

Hunting has cultural value and is important to many Montanans ^{Eliason 2008, Teel and Manfredo 2010}. For Montana residents, General Elk Licenses are unlimited (one per hunter) and available over the counter, whereas nonresident elk hunters must obtain an Elk License via drawing. The number of Big Game Combination Licenses allocated to nonresidents has been set by the legislature at 17,000 since 1979 (§ 87-2-505, MCA). However, there are additional elk license options for nonresidents available over the counter or via draw, such as B Licenses, Nonresident Youth Big Game Combination Licenses, Nonresident College Student Combination Licenses, and others. In HDs where numbers of B Licenses or special permits are limited, nonresidents are limited to, but not guaranteed, 10 percent of license or permit quotas by law (§ 87-2-506, MCA).

Elk Hunter Numbers and Days

FWP annually surveys a random sample of elk license holders via telephone. From these surveys, the number of license holders who actively hunted for elk, the number of days spent afield hunting for elk, and the number of elk harvested can be estimated with a predetermined level of confidence. These data highlight the importance of hunter survey data along with licensing information to estimate the number of hunters who *actively* hunted for elk in a given year.



Between 2004 and 2021, the estimated number of hunters who actively hunted for elk in Montana fluctuated between 102,860 in 2012 to 113,976 in 2017 (Figure 1). During 2004 to 2021, the estimated number of days hunters spent pursuing elk varied between 811,831 days in 2006 to 1,066,716 days in 2016 (Figure 2). Number of days spent hunting per hunter varied between 7.8 days per hunter (2006) to 9.4 days per hunter (2016 and 2021). During the same timeframe, nonresident elk hunters comprised 13 to 18 percent of total active elk hunters in Montana. In comparison, a 2016 nationwide survey estimated 9.2 million big game hunters in the United States and 712,000 of those hunters hunted for elk a total of 6 million days ^{USFWS 2016}. If the nationwide and state hunter effort datasets are compared, Montana hunters comprise approximately 14 to 18 percent of the nation’s elk hunters and elk hunter days.




Figure 1. Estimated number of elk license holders who actively hunted for elk during each license year, 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).




Figure 2. Estimated number of days spent elk hunting during each license year, 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).

Harvest Statistics

Elk harvest is estimated for each HD annually using a telephone survey of a random stratified sample of elk license holders. Elk hunting effort data is also collected during these surveys. This method has been shown to be cost-effective and reliable, whereas other methods such as self-reporting can have unacceptable levels of bias if follow-up surveys are not conducted ^{Lukacs et al. 2011}. Statewide, elk harvest peaked in 1994 with a total estimated harvest of 32,433 (Figure 3). Beginning in 2004, Montana allowed for the take of two elk, only one of which could be antlered. In 2020, Montana allowed for the take of three elk, only one of which could be antlered. These additional opportunities were allocated using B Licenses.




Figure 3. Estimated number of elk harvested during each license year, 1963 to 2021.

Archery Hunting

Currently, the archery season is six weeks long, beginning the first Saturday in September and extending into mid-October. Historically, archery hunting was offered to provide hunter recreation rather than population management ^{FWP 1989, FWP 2005}. Although the level of elk harvest with archery equipment is notable, in many HDs, archery opportunity is still offered primarily to provide recreation more so than for population management.

The number of hunters purchasing an archery stamp in Montana has steadily and substantially increased over time (73 percent increase 2004 to 2021, Figure 4) which has resulted in increased archery harvest. For example, total archery harvest increased 56 percent from 2004 to 2021 (Figure 5). Archery harvest varies by FWP administrative region and is still a small but increasing proportion of the overall harvest (Figure 6). Region 3 has the highest average number of elk harvested with archery equipment, whereas eastern Montana, specifically Regions 6 and 7, has the highest percentages of harvest attributed to archery (Table 1).

The contribution of archery harvest to overall harvest becomes more prominent when examining bull harvest; antlerless harvest by archers appears to be minimal (less than 6 percent of total antlerless harvest). Approximately 21 to 28 percent of nonresident bull harvest was during archery season (2015 to 2021), whereas 16 to 23 percent of resident bull harvest was from archers during the same time. Nonresidents made a larger contribution to total archery harvest (29 percent) than they did to total rifle harvest (17 percent).

Region	2004 to 2021 Average Elk Harvested	2004 to 2021 Average Elk Harvested with Archery Equipment	2004 to 2021 Average Percent Elk Harvested by Archery Equipment
Statewide	25,205	3,010	12%
Region 1	1,301	202	16%
Region 2	4,128	447	11%
Region 3	11,238	1,043	9%
Region 4	4,739	667	14%
Region 5	2,027	236	12%
Region 6	808	207	26%
Region 7	933	205	22%

Table 1. Summary of average elk harvest by region including average archery harvest.

Impacts of archery harvest and hunting pressure on elk distributions are complicated and context dependent. Studies from the late 1980s indicated no consistent changes in elk distributions in response to archery hunting. More recently, effects on elk distributions have been found in response to archery hunting Conner et al. 2001, Vieira et al. 2003, Proffitt et al. 2013 & 2016a. Additionally, there are roads that are open during archery season and closed during rifle season. These motorized routes and the increased use of them during archery season affect elk security during archery season. FWP recognizes that under specific circumstances, archery hunting can influence elk distribution if hunter densities are high enough.

Archery Stamp Sales in Montana




Figure 4. Total archery stamp sales in Montana from 1958 to 2021 as well as residency of archery stamp holders from 2002 to 2021. Prior to 2002, residency information of archery stamp holders is not available.

Montana Archery Elk Harvest Estimate




Figure 5. Estimated number of elk harvested with archery equipment, 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).

Proportion of Statewide Elk Harvest Taken by Archery Equipment




Figure 6. Proportion of total elk harvested that were harvested with archery equipment 2004 to 2021 (FWP hunter harvest survey data).

Access

Hunter Success Across Different Access Types – Hunters were surveyed by FWP following the 2013 and 2018 hunting seasons to determine what type(s) of land they hunted (hunters could hunt more than one type, Figure 7) and the elk harvest success rate on each of the access types (Figure 8) ^{Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019}. Hunters most commonly pursued elk on public land (Figure 7) and were most successful on private land that charged access fees (Figure 8) ^{Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019}. Although the elk harvest success rate was highest on private land that charged an access fee, because such a small percentage of hunters reported using that access type the total harvest on that access type may be less than the total harvest on other access types. Thirty-three percent of elk hunters who responded to the survey were satisfied or very satisfied with hunting access and 35 percent were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with hunting access ^{Lewis et al. 2014}.




Figure 7. Proportion of survey respondents reporting hunting for elk on each access type in the 2013 and 2018 hunting seasons. Hunter could report hunting more than one type (Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019).




Figure 8. Reported elk harvest success for the 2013 and 2018 hunting seasons on various access types (Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019).

Concurrent with the elk hunter effort/success by access type survey, a survey of rural private landowners was conducted asking them to specify what type of elk hunting access they allowed on their private land. Generally, only about 25 percent of private land is available for free public hunting access^{Lewis et al. 2015, Lewis 2019}. Land is not considered open for free public hunting access when hunting is restricted for use by particular groups or individuals, requires hunters to pay fees, requires that individuals have a direct connection with landowner (family or friend), or does not allow hunting^{Lewis et al. 2014}.

FWP Hunting Access Enhancement Programs

Block Management Program – This program was created in 1985 and expanded in 1996. The program is a voluntary, cooperative agreement between FWP and landowners. The program provides hunter management assistance, an impact payment, a weed management bonus, and a complimentary license benefit to offset the impacts from allowing free public hunting access on private lands. By enrolling private land acres in block management, additional public land may become accessible by access to the enrolled lands. The program is funded by license fees paid by hunters in Montana, primarily (about 80 percent) by nonresident big game license revenue. As of 2022, 6.8 million acres are enrolled in the program; this equates to 7 percent of the land area of Montana (Figure 9). Of the enrolled acres, 5.7 million are privately owned whereas the other 1.1 million acres are public lands, some of which would not be accessible if the surrounding private lands were not enrolled. Acres enrolled in block management peaked at 8.8 million in 2002. Since then, the program has lost approximately 2 million acres or over 3,000 square miles of enrolled land. In 2020, landowners in the block management program were surveyed along with elk license holders. Ninety percent of enrolled landowners indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with the program, and 67 percent of elk license holders responded that they are supportive of the program^{Lewis and Kool 2021}.




Figure 9. Total private acres enrolled in FWP’s Block Management Program, 1996 to 2022.

Elk Hunting Access Agreements – This program provides landowners with an elk license, permit, or combination thereof in exchange for allowing free public elk hunting access as described in a signed agreement approved by the Commission. The permit and license are only valid on the landowner’s property. As of 2021, participating landowners receive one elk license or permit in exchange for allowing three public license or permit holders access to hunt their property.

Public Access Land Agreement Program – This program seeks to open or improve free public access to isolated parcels of state or federal land for hunting or fishing. These isolated public lands are surrounded by private land without a dedicated easement that provides access. The program is a way for landowners to facilitate public access to public lands for hunting and/or fishing in exchange for a payment and other negotiated improvements.

Access Public Lands – This program is intended to improve access to public lands and reduce conflict between sportsmen and landowners. To accomplish this, the program provides or enhances access corridors to public

lands in exchange for incentives such as fencing, cattle guards, water crossings, signs, and increased patrolling if necessary. Projects may include providing signage to clarify designation of access route and property boundaries or may include obtaining right-of-way easements for a limited term length or in perpetuity.

Unlocking Public Lands – The objective of the Unlocking Public Lands Program is to allow the public to cross parcels of enrolled private land to gain access to otherwise inaccessible parcels of state or federal (Bureau of Land Management, BLM; or United States Forest Service, USFS) land for the purpose of outdoor recreation compatible with the use of public lands, which includes hunting, trapping, and fishing. The program allows private landowners to enter into contractual agreements with FWP and receive an annual tax credit.

Management Access Projects Program – This program seeks to work with private landowners whose needs fall outside the criteria of the Block Management Program to achieve a species-specific level of harvest. Often no formal agreements are used, but rather assistance is provided on an as-needed basis. The landowner in collaboration with FWP determines when, where, and how the public may access private land and may restrict access during specific times in accordance with program guidelines. Landowner incentives may include an FWP hunt coordinator and/or compensation through FWP payment for free public hunting access.

Habitat Montana Program – This program was established by legislation (HB 526) in 1987, when portions of license dollars were earmarked for protection of wildlife habitat. The aim of the program is to conserve and protect habitat and contribute to providing recreational activities including hunting and fishing opportunities. Conservation of high-quality habitat is typically accomplished by fee title acquisition, conservation easements (CEs), or habitat leases funded by the Habitat Montana Program, along with other partners. Although the Habitat Montana Program is not an access program, hunting access is obtained when CEs, habitat leases, and most fee title acquisitions are completed (access limitations may apply and vary among projects).


Economics of Elk

Hunting Revenue

In 2016, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) conducted a survey of hunting, fishing, and other wildlife related recreation across the United States. They estimated that \$14.9 billion was spent on big game hunting trips and equipment nationwide ^{USFWS 2016}. Similarly, FWP estimated that in 2020, elk hunters in Montana spent about \$187.1 million annually on trip related expenditures (transportation, food, beverages, lodging, and access or guide fees) ^{Lewis 2021} with residents spending about \$87.8 million and nonresidents spending about \$99.3 million ^{Lewis 2021}.

License Revenue

Total number of elk licenses sold in Montana increased from 142,498 in 2004 to 186,917 in 2021 (Figure 10). Noticeable increases in license sales occurred in 2010 and 2015. During these years, many antlerless permits were converted to B Licenses, allowing hunters to purchase more than one elk license (2010), and the concept of shoulder seasons was adopted by the Commission, with a trial in several districts (2015).



Total Elk Licenses Sold




Figure 10. Elk licenses sold 2005 to 2022. Total licenses include General Elk Licenses as well as B Licenses. Both resident and nonresident licenses are represented in the figure.

Revenue to FWP from elk license sales was nearly \$9 million in 2005 and increased to over \$17 million in 2021 (Figure 11). Total revenue described does not include elk permit drawing fees, archery license fees, or conservation license fees. It also does not include the share of federal Pittman-Robertson funds that could be attributed to elk hunting/hunters. Thus, elk hunting is an important source of funding to FWP and the economic benefits generated from elk and elk hunting provide for and benefit the conservation and management of numerous other species.

Revenue Generated from Elk License Dollars




Figure 11. Total estimated revenue generated from elk licenses sold in Montana.

Outfitting

In the outfitting industry, elk hunting is a significant source of revenue. Clients are primarily nonresidents with only about 1 to 1.5 percent of resident elk hunters using the services of outfitters ^{King and Brooks 2001, Lewis et al. 2014, Lewis 2019}. The website of Montana Outfitter and Guides Association (MOGA) was surveyed for listings of elk hunting services. Fifty-nine businesses utilizing the MOGA website provided price information on guided elk hunting trips on their individual websites. The average for reported price options ($n = 175$) for a bull elk hunt in 2022 was \$6,511 (where available, 2:1 hunter to guide pricing is reported). This is an 87 percent increase over the \$3,472 price noted in the 2005 Elk Management Plan.

Elk Population Monitoring

Aerial Surveys

In the 2005 Elk Management Plan, where numerical population objectives were included, they were based on counts from aerial surveys. Likewise, population demographic objectives in this plan are also based on observed number of elk during aerial surveys where they can occur. Aerial elk surveys are typically flown using a fixed-wing aircraft or helicopter with the pilot and one biologist. During aerial elk surveys, biologists count all visible elk in the survey area, known as a complete coverage survey. These surveys do not yield an overall abundance or population estimate, rather a minimum count and index of the population trend which can provide useful information over time (increasing, decreasing, or stable).

Given elk behavior, landscape variables, and seasonal weather patterns within a specific HD, biologists design and conduct surveys to yield optimal results. Most surveys (76 percent) are conducted between January and April ^{FWP 2013}.

Good winter surveying conditions include cold, clear/sunny days and complete snow cover. Fresh snow can also be helpful for biologists and pilots to track elk. Some aerial surveys are flown at other times of the year during spring green-up (March through May) or during the summer (July). Spring green-up surveys are predominantly used in heavily forested habitats (i.e., the northwest part of the state) because this is when and where elk are most visible. A thorough review of Montana elk surveys can be found in the Survey and Inventory Protocols for Big Game in Montana: Elk ^{FWP 2013}.

Observing all elk in an HD during a survey is highly unlikely. Rather, it is expected that some will be missed. Factors such as habitat type, time of day, group size, snow cover, elk activity, time of year, weather, aircraft, pilot, and observer can affect the number of animals observed. To mitigate factors associated with survey variability, biologists consider multiple years of data. A long-term trend count can be used to gauge relative changes in the population ^{Mills 2012}.

In general, elk are classified during aerial surveys, but in some areas, classification is done from ground observations separate from aerial surveys. Classifying consists of counting cows, calves, and bulls (sometimes bulls are further classified into age classes based on antler size). After elk have been counted and classified, biologists calculate standardized calf to cow ratios (calves:100 cows), and bull to cow ratios (bulls:100 cows). Age and sex ratios provide a standardized metric to compare across years and sites. Interpreting age and sex ratios can be challenging because they distill multiple processes into a single metric. For example, calf:cow ratios represent harvest, pregnancy, juvenile survival, and cow survival in a single variable ^{Caughley 1974, Bender 2006}.



Courtesy of Joe Rahn

Harris et al. 2008, Lukacs et al. 2018. Similarly, bull:cow ratios are influenced by recruitment and mortality which may differ between sexes. Antlerless harvest may have a substantial influence on measured calf:cow ratios^{Lukacs et al. 2018} and bull:cow ratios^{Bender 2006}. For example, when harvest of adult females is occurring, an increase in calf:cow ratios may be observed. This is because if adult females are removed via harvest, the denominator of the ratio is decreased and the numerator remains constant, resulting in an increase in the ratio. An increased calf:cow ratio in this situation should not be interpreted to reflect an increase in recruitment of calves when compared with years when no adult females are harvested. Incorporating count and classification data from surveys into an Integrated Population Model (IPM) that also uses additional data may improve inference^{Paterson et al. 2019}. For more information see **Elk Population Monitoring: Elk Integrated Population Model** section.

Calf:cow ratios are used by biologists as an index of recruitment into the population. Obtaining calf:cow ratios from aerial or ground-based surveys is less expensive and less time-consuming than other direct measures of recruitment (such as radio-collaring calves), and calf:cow ratios have been shown to be a reliable index to recruitment^{Harris et al. 2008}. Typically in Montana, biologists use calf:cow ratios collected during late winter or early spring as an estimate of recruitment. However, because potentially significant calf mortality might occur in late winter, calf:cow ratios may need to be corrected for assumed mortality from the date of survey to June 1 (when calves are assumed “recruited” to the population). Comparing recruitment indices like calf:cow ratios among areas can be challenging because not all data are collected during the same time period or in the same manner. Surveys that occurred substantially earlier in the year may result in greater calf:cow ratios simply because calf mortality continues throughout the fall and winter.

Estimating bull:cow ratios through classifying elk during aerial surveys provides an index of the proportion of bulls in the population. Overall bull sightability is often less than cows and calves as bulls are known to separate from other age and sex classes in winter more so than during other seasons^{Unsworth et al. 1998}. Finding smaller bachelor groups of bulls can be more challenging. Proportionally, smaller bachelor groups are more often missed during aerial surveys than larger groups. Additionally, bulls may be misclassified as cows during spring green-up surveys if they have already dropped their antlers. Therefore, bull:cow ratios recorded during surveys can be biased low, and the true ratio is generally higher than reported. Flying surveys with fresh snow cover can aid in locating single or small groups of bulls.



Courtesy of Joe Rahn

Observed bull:cow ratios are often compared to management objectives or biological requirements. Some state wildlife agencies set bull:cow ratio goals for immediately post-hunting season whereas other states have pre-hunting season bull:cow ratio goals. Bull:cow ratios collected postseason (mid to late winter) may be biased lower because the sexes are separated during this time^{Unsworth et al. 1998} and bachelor bull groups have lower detectability. If surveyed during the rut, adult elk are mixed in distribution and unbiased sex ratios can be obtained^{Bender and Spencer 1999, Bender 2006}; however, these do not account for bulls removed during the hunting harvest to follow. Montana has set postseason bull:cow ratio goals for most HDs where postseason or spring green-up aerial survey data are available. For more information see **HD OBJECTIVES** section. The bull:cow ratios measured in mid to late winter or early spring should be considered minimum ratios because of the timing of the surveys.

Though ideal in much of the state, aerial surveys are impractical in some areas such as northwest Montana that are thickly timbered or northeast Montana where elk densities are very low. In northwest Montana, FWP is evaluating other techniques for estimating elk numbers, such as using trail cameras to estimate abundance.

Hunter Harvest Surveys

Elk harvest is estimated annually by FWP using a telephone survey of a random stratified sample of elk license holders. This method allows harvest and hunting effort to be estimated for each HD with a defined level of confidence. For more information see **Elk Hunting: Harvest Statistics** section.

Check Stations

Check stations are conducted in all seven FWP administrative regions in Montana. Check station data can include information on animals harvested as well as some information on hunter effort. Data collected on harvested elk passing through the check station include sex and age of the animal, number of antler points, and location of harvest (region or HD). Age is determined by tooth wear or via cementum analysis of an extracted tooth. At some check stations, additional antler measurements are collected. Data from check stations are limited in that they do not provide an unbiased or precise estimate of harvest or effort. The data can provide an index to harvest timing, age structure of the harvested animals, and hunter demographics as well as providing valuable personal interactions between hunters and FWP staff.

Hunter data usually includes number of successful and unsuccessful hunters in a party. At certain stations, data collected also includes information such as origin of hunting party; whether an off-road vehicle or horse trailer was with the hunting party; whether the party included youth, nonresident, or resident hunters; and various other metrics. Check station data can be used to suggest changes in elk age structure, antler size, local hunter demographics, and other local information of interest.

Radio-Collaring Efforts

FWP routinely deploys radio collars on elk as part of ongoing research. Each research project is focused on answering specific questions such as evaluating the effects of hunter access, evaluating habitat alterations on elk resource selection, or evaluating the effects of predation on elk populations. Though radio collars may be deployed to provide data focused on a specific research question, additional information is gathered as well. Biologists use this information during routine operations such as survey planning or commenting on project proposals.

Elk Integrated Population Model

Recently in Montana, an IPM was developed for elk using inputs from aerial counts, harvest, and herd composition data along with vital rates to estimate the elk population in a HD ^{Paterson et al. 2019}. This method accounts for biases within each data type, can account for multiple sources of error, and can produce population estimates, even when data are missing. Biologists can apply the IPM when evaluating the abilities of a harvest rate to achieve goals within a given time frame, and to determine the desired harvest needed to reach population goal range.

Elk Population Dynamics

Ungulate populations are driven by adult female survival and juvenile recruitment ^{Gaillard et al. 2000}. For elk, adult female survival has the greatest potential to influence the population growth rate ^{Raithel et al. 2007, Eacker et al. 2017}. Adult survival ^{Eacker et al. 2017} and calf survival ^{Raithel et al. 2007} have been shown to drive population growth in different systems, indicating that populations can operate differently from one another. Factors that affect adult elk survival include predator numbers or density, precipitation, age of individual, and habitat quality ^{Brodie et al. 2013, Horne et al. 2019, Middleton et al. 2013, Proffitt et al 2009, Creel and Winnie 2005, Eacker et al. 2016}. Factors affecting calf survival include forage productivity, weather, snow depth, number of different predator species in the system, predator abundance, calf size, and nutritional state of pregnant cow while calf is in utero ^{Proffitt et al. 2014, Eacker et al. 2016, Lukacs et al. 2018, Horne et al. 2019, Paterson et al. 2019}.



Fecundity is the ability to produce offspring over time and is important to elk population dynamics. Fecundity for elk is a product of the probability of conception and the probability of a fetus surviving in utero until birth. For species that have multiple offspring at once, litter size is important; elk typically only have a single calf (twin pregnancies less than 0.5 percent; triplet pregnancies less than 0.01 percent ^{Cunningham et al. 2009}). Because there is little information regarding fetal survival, most estimates of fecundity rely on pregnancy rates.

Nutritional condition is an important factor influencing pregnancy rate ^{Cook et al. 2013, Proffitt et al. 2014, Proffitt et al. 2016b}. Elk with access to better nutrition had pregnancy rates of 89 percent, whereas those with lower quality diets averaged 72 percent ^{Proffitt et al. 2016b}. Pregnancy rate also varies with age of the female, increasing from yearlings to a plateau for middle aged females (2 to 16), then declining with older age classes (17+) ^{Paterson et al. 2022a}.

Fecundity and calf survival together yield recruitment. At one year old, a calf is considered “recruited” into the population. Recruitment is a product of conception, in utero survival to birth, and calf survival for the first year of life ^{Paterson et al. 2019}.

Bull Age Structure

Public concerns have been raised about too few bulls or too few mature bulls in the herd resulting in delayed or prolonged breeding cycle. Breeding timing has been shown to be earlier and more synchronous when breeding is done by older bulls ^{Noyes et al. 1996 and 2004; Cook et al. 2004}. A more synchronous breeding period should result in a more synchronous birthing period which can have a predator swamping effect and potentially increase the survival of calves during their first weeks after birth. Cook et al. (2004) argue that impacts from breeding timing on calf overwinter survival are unlikely due to the role of summer nutrition. Later-born calves are larger at birth and grow faster than earlier-born calves under favorable conditions, indicating that later-born calves are not always disadvantaged ^{Cook et al. 2004}. Ultimately, there is little evidence that low bull ratios relate to delayed breeding results and lower calf survival, especially with adequate nutrition. There have been no realized population level effects from delayed or prolonged breeding cycles.



Similarly, little evidence exists in support of public concerns regarding low pregnancy rates as a result of low bull numbers, low mature bull numbers ^{Noyes et al. 2002}, or low bull:cow ratios ^{Hamlin and Ross 2002}. Pregnancy rates have been related to female kidney fat index ^{Noyes et al. 2002}, female body fat in fall ^{Cook et al. 2013}, female age, and summer precipitation ^{Proffitt et al. 2014}. In one study, bull elk older than yearlings were responsible for 70 percent of copulations while only comprising 25 percent of the bull population ^{Squibb 1985}, indicating that relatively few older bulls can still accomplish a majority of the breeding. Regulation changes in Montana that have increased numbers and ages of bulls have not resulted in an increase in recruitment ^{FWP 1990, Vore and DeSimone 1991, Hamlin and Ross 2002}, indicating factors other than number of bulls or number of adult bulls in the population are more important to pregnancy and calf survival ^{Hamlin and Ross 2002}. Increasing bull:cow ratios or changing bull harvest structure is unlikely to have much effect on herd productivity ^{Bender and Miller 1999, White et al. 2001, Bender et al. 2002}.

Because there is little evidence that bull:cow ratios observed in Montana are contributing to negative population consequences, we consider a total bull:cow ratio of 10:100 to be adequate in meeting the biological requirements of accomplishing breeding within a herd. This minimum ratio of 10:100 accounts for all bulls, including yearling bulls or “spikes.” Yearling bulls counted at the time of survey will be 2.5 years old and be brow-tined bulls by the following breeding/hunting season. A bull:cow ratio goal of greater than or equal to 10:100 does not indicate the herd will be managed down to 10:100, but rather management actions will be triggered if lower than 10:100. Most HDs in Montana meet or exceed this minimum ratio. Any bull:cow ratio goals set higher than 10:100, or ratios that include a brow-tined bull:cow ratio are done so to meet social desires of more bulls, older age classes of bulls, or larger antler size of bulls.

Habitat

Elk are habitat generalists and can thrive across a broad range of Montana habitat types and conditions. However, elk only occupy portions of the state as shown in the 2022 elk distribution consisting of 59 percent public land and 41 percent private land (Figure 12). Note the 2022 elk distribution is not mapped within American Indian reservations or national parks as FWP does not have management authority in the areas. In Montana, public land management of elk habitat is the primary responsibility of the USFS (44 percent), BLM (7 percent), Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC, 5 percent), USFWS (2 percent) and FWP (0.9 percent). The missions of these agencies recognize the importance of quality wildlife habitat, yet many include a multiple-use mandate. Multiple use of landscapes can make providing quality elk habitat a challenge. Management of elk habitat on private lands is the prerogative of the landowner. FWP directly manages elk habitat only on FWP-administered wildlife management areas (WMAs), on private and public lands enrolled in FWP habitat conservation programs, and partially on lands under FWP conservation easement agreements. However, FWP actively works with land management agencies to inform land management decisions. Also, FWP collaborates on projects with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to conserve or improve elk habitat. The collaboration does not end at the state border, because some elk herds range into other states, Canadian provinces, or Indian reservations.




Figure 12. Elk distribution in Montana as of 2022. Note: Distributions are not mapped within Indian reservations or national parks.

FWP's Habitat Program

In 1940, 1,004 acres of big game wintering habitat were purchased by the Montana Fish & Game Department in what is now known as the Judith River WMA (now approximately 9,658 acres), the state's oldest WMA. As of 2022, FWP has 41 WMAs within the current elk distribution in Montana. The area of WMAs currently estimated to be used by elk exceeds 366,000 acres.

Similarly, the Habitat Montana Program allows FWP to purchase conservation easements (CEs). CEs allow landowners to be compensated for voluntarily keeping their property undeveloped for future generations. The lands included under CEs remain privately owned and can remain working lands (timberlands, farmlands, grazing lands) which can be beneficial to wildlife populations. As of 2022, there are 64 CEs entirely or partially within the current elk distribution covering almost 441,000 acres of perpetually conserved habitat.

Both WMAs and CEs contribute to providing winter range for big game populations. Within the defined elk winter range in Montana, about 4 percent is either under conservation easement or are part of a WMA, about 6 percent is owned by the State of Montana (not including FWP lands), and about 45 percent is federally owned.

FWP biologists and managers provide technical assistance to land managers regarding elk habitat. Additionally, FWP has conducted and funded substantial research exploring relationships between elk and their habitat. FWP administers voluntary habitat programs on private lands, which often leverage FWP programs with other federal or NGO programs to create large-scale habitat improvements on private lands. FWP biologist involvement in habitat management is a critical piece of identifying habitat-limiting factors for elk, finding solutions to elk habitat issues, and partnering with landowners, agencies, and conservation groups.



Habitat Programs Administered by FWP That Benefit Elk

Habitat Montana Program— The Habitat Montana Program uses license dollars to fund high-value habitat projects through conservation easements, fee title acquisitions, and habitat conservation leases. The goal of the program is to conserve and restore habitat for fish and wildlife. Benefits of the program include:

- WMAs purchased through the Habitat Montana Program provide critical wildlife habitat, including winter range for big game herds.
- Access to outdoor recreation has been secured and enhanced.
- Soil and water are conserved.
- Landscape-scale ecological functions are sustained.
- Watershed quality has been maintained and improved for communities, fisheries, and other downstream users.
- Accomplishments have supported the removal of species from federal Endangered Species Act listing or have contributed to avoidance of listing.
- Conservation easement projects have helped support keeping ranchers on the land and maintaining rural and agriculture-based lifestyles.
- Conservation easements have averted urban sprawl in fire-prone forest settings and addressed related fire management issues.
- Rural business and agricultural economies have been supported and enhanced.
- The wood products industry has benefited by retention and support of sustainable working forests.
- Scenic open-space values have been preserved.
- Other less tangible quality-of-life benefits have been maintained or enhanced.

Forest Legacy Program— The Forest Legacy Program provides funding for conserving high value working forests. The program is administered by the USFS and managed in Montana by FWP. This voluntary, incentive-based program operates through nationally competitive grants. Montana forest values conserved by the program include wildlife habitat, sawmill timber and other forest products, public access for recreation, watersheds for municipalities and irrigation, cultural and aesthetic values, and other social and ecological benefits.

The program began operating in Montana in 2000 and has since supported nearly 261,000 acres of permanent conservation, including 243,000 acres of conservation easements and 18,000 acres of fee title acquisitions, the latter managed by FWP as WMAs. The Forest Legacy Program is funded from offshore oil and gas lease earnings through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Additional information about the national program can be found on the USFS website.

Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program Grants— The Montana Wildlife Habitat Improvement Act was passed into law by the 2017 Legislature. The purpose of the act is to make federal funding available to restore priority wildlife habitats by managing noxious weeds. The legislation makes available up to \$2 million annually in federal Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration funds, which requires a dollar of nonfederal matching funds (cash) for every three dollars of federal grant funding.

Projects are intended to be focused on ecologically important wildlife habitats with landscape-scale benefits. Grants, which are paid in the form of reimbursed expenses, may be issued for up to five year's duration. Priorities for funding include:

- Landscape-scale projects lands that are open to public hunting and involve priority wildlife habitats
- Noxious weed infestations that directly impact habitat functions
- Broad partnerships involving multiple landowners
- Proposals with leveraging beyond the minimum match funding requirement
- Projects that retain or restore native plant communities

Carrying Capacity

There are multiple definitions of carrying capacity for wildlife populations. Common definitions (as they pertain to elk) include:

- Biological carrying capacity, which is the maximum number of elk that the habitat can support long-term
- Nutritional carrying capacity, which is the maximum stable population of elk that can be supported by the nutrition available
- Ecological carrying capacity, which is the population level at which elk are not negatively influencing native plants and other animals
- Social carrying capacity, which is the social tolerance for animals on the landscape

Overall, the biological concept of carrying capacity indicates that there are limits to the number of animals a landscape can support without degradation or without severe mortality during extreme weather events.

Beyond the scope of biological definitions of carrying capacity, social tolerances define social carrying capacity. Social carrying capacity more routinely dictates maximum number of elk for a given area and can be translated into population size goals. Often, social carrying capacity is below that of any biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacity. This is the case with elk, given their inherent capacity to thrive throughout a variety of Montana's habitat types and conditions. Depending on which values and which social group is considered, the social carrying capacity may differ. Social carrying capacity can also vary spatially and temporally (across seasons and across years) and may be affected by the economy, weather and land use. For example, agricultural producers may request elk numbers lower than biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacity because of the impact on their property, whereas sportspersons or tourism interests may advocate much higher elk numbers to enhance their experience.

Although wildlife managers have long considered the concept of biological carrying capacity as one of the potential factors influencing elk populations, it is not a concept that can easily be translated to a defined population number for multiple reasons. First, it varies seasonally, annually, and among years. Carrying capacity can be affected by weather conditions such as drought and winter severity. It can be affected by habitat changes such as forest succession or forest fires. Because multiple species use the same landscape, other ungulates often compete for the same forage resources as elk. Some elk move seasonally and sometimes change their distribution seasonally or among years, which changes the availability of forage resources. Finally, because forage grows and cures over time, and forage resources change throughout the year, measuring production may be difficult and expensive, and remotely sensed data may not adequately quantify habitat quality. Therefore, carrying capacity remains an important consideration in elk management, but using measurements of indices associated with it have proven challenging to incorporate in any management paradigm.

Habitat Selection

Wildlife select habitat at different scales. The distribution of elk across North America is the coarsest selection scale (first order). The home ranges that individual elk inhabit within the overall distribution is a finer scale of selection (second order). Within an individual's home range, certain habitat types and areas of use are considered a fine-scale selection (third order). Finally, within those areas of use, elk select certain food items to consume, which is the finest scale typically assessed (fourth order) ^{Johnson 1980}.

A review of the recent literature (within the last 20 years) of elk habitat selection studies conducted in Montana show some general patterns. Factors other than simple resource availability influence habitat selection. Selection may change based on factors such as predation risk, hunting pressure, or weather conditions such as deep snow. Although elk exhibit predictable resource selection patterns at and within their home range, the specifics of those patterns may differ among years, seasons, sex, scale, and locale. Because Montana has diverse habitat types across the state, selection patterns documented in one area may not be representative of elk selection in other areas/habitat types.

Elk of both sexes use a variety of habitats, from open grasslands to dense stands of forested habitat throughout

winter ^{Boyce et al. 2003, Creel et al. 2005, Mao et al. 2005, Proffitt et al. 2010, Cleveland et al. 2012, Shamhart et al. 2012}. Winter habitat selection is influenced by hunting pressure, risk of predation ^{Creel et al. 2005}, and environmental factors like snow depth and forage availability as influenced by slope and elevation ^{Mao et al. 2005 Proffitt et al. 2010, Boyce et al. 2003}. During winter months, elk will select previously burned forest ^{Mao et al. 2005} and rested pastures ^{Shamhart et al. 2012} to take advantage of the forage resources of these areas provided they occur in areas where snow cover doesn't limit use.

During spring, female elk will select moderate elevation and slope, ridgetops, and faces that provide high solar radiation and intermediate "greenness" (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index, NDVI) values. They also select areas with agricultural landcover. Female elk avoid areas with snow accumulations during this period as well as roads ^{Rayl 2019}.

In summer, males select for greater forest cover while avoiding roads ^{Morris et al. 2016}. Female habitat selection across multiple study areas in southwestern Montana indicated nutritional resources, represented by NDVI, were most important in habitat selection, followed by motorized route density ^{Ranglack et al. 2022}. Also, previously burned areas (12 to 14 years old) may be important for selection during this time ^{Boyce et al. 2003}.

Open hunting seasons influence habitat selection by elk. Both male and female elk make selection decisions based on similar risk factors ^{Lowrey et al. 2020}. Elk select for nutritional resources during this time ^{Ranglack et al. 2017, DeVoe et al. 2019} found within various habitat types including forest valley bottoms, shrublands, grasslands, or burned forest ^{Mao et al. 2005, Proffitt et al. 2013, Proffitt et al. 2016, DeVoe et al. 2019, Snobl 2022}. Female elk select for increased canopy cover, ^{Ranglack et al. 2017, Lowrey et al. 2020, Proffitt et al. 2016}, but male elk habitat selection is not strongly influenced by canopy cover ^{Lowrey et al. 2020}. Elk avoid roads ^{Ranglack et al. 2017, DeVoe et al. 2019, Lowrey et al. 2020, Proffitt et al. 2016, Proffitt et al. 2013}. Elk seem to exploit terrain roughness or ruggedness ^{Proffitt et al. 2016, DeVoe et al. 2019, Lowrey et al. 2020} and elevation ^{Mao et al. 2005, Proffitt et al. 2013} to avoid disturbance from hunters. Furthermore, elk disproportionately use areas with restrictive access during hunting season to avoid disturbance ^{Proffitt et al. 2016}.

Overall, elk use a variety of habitats, and habitat selection may change throughout the year depending on weather, vegetative phenology, and disturbance. Managing for a mosaic of habitat types seems optimal to provide habitat for elk to use during different times of the year. Although factors such as slope, elevation, and ruggedness cannot be influenced by management actions, these characteristics define high use areas where habitat management efforts will yield the greatest benefits for elk.

Forage and Nutrition

Elk nutrition has been described as a function of frequent decisions made by an individual at small scales, and includes interactions between foraging behavior, abundance of forage, nutrient content, and vegetation composition ^{Cook et al. 2013, 2016}. Nutrition has been linked to conception dates, pregnancy rates, age of puberty, body size, and calf survival ^{Hines et al. 1985, Noyes et al. 2002, Cook et al. 2004, Cook et al. 2013, Eacker et al. 2016}. Numerous studies have indicated that forage quality may be more important than forage quantity ^{Cook et al. 2004, 2013, 2016, DeVoe et al. 2019}, and elk have been shown to select habitat based on forage qualities over vegetation composition and other landscape characteristics ^{Van Dyke and Darragh 2007, Ranglack et al. 2016}. Elk may not be able to compensate for a lack of high-quality forage ^{Cook et al. 2016}, indicating that there is a minimum threshold for the abundance of high-quality forage required for elk.

Although nutritional influences are difficult to detect, they can affect many aspects of elk productivity ^{Cook et al. 2013}. The first is the age of puberty; in a year with high nutritional condition, more yearlings may enter estrus as compared to years with low nutrition ^{Hines et al. 1985}. Next, nutrition may influence conception rates and dates ^{Cook et al. 2004, Cook et al. 2013}; in an experimental nutrition trial, 80 percent of cow elk in the low nutrition group failed to conceive ^{Cook et al. 2004}. Additionally, inadequate nutrition in the months before the breeding season may delay conception, de-synchronize the birth pulse, or result in low pregnancy rates ^{Noyes et al. 2002, Cook et al. 2013, Proffitt et al. 2016b}. And lastly, summer elk calf survival can be dependent on biomass of preferred forage ^{Eacker et al. 2016}. If we assume high precipitation in winter precludes the pregnant cow from accessing or acquiring adequate nutrition when the calf is in utero, then maternal carryover effects of low nutrition may also explain lower calf survival the following summer. Each of these influences on elk productivity may be subtle, but cumulatively could result in a major effect ^{Cook et al. 2013}.

Although nutrition throughout the year is important for elk herd health, summer nutrition may be more

influential to elk productivity than nutrition during other times of the year. Elk body fat levels in spring were a function of fat levels from the previous fall ^{Cook et al. 2013}. This indicates that when elk are found to be malnourished during winter, the cause may in fact be poor summer-fall nutrition. The influence of summer nutrition on elk can affect pregnancy rates, body size, fat accretion, and body size of calves ^{Cook et al. 1996, Cook et al. 2013, Proffitt et al. 2016b}. Summer nutrition was found to have a larger effect on elk population dynamics than limited winter forage and winter weather ^{Cook et al. 2013}. Pregnancy rates under 85 percent in prime-aged adult females may indicate summer or fall nutritional limitations ^{Cook et al. 2004}. In southwest Montana, nutrition is not a common limitation on pregnancy rates or overwinter survival ^{Cook et al. 2004, Evans et al. 2006, White et al. 2011}; however, some Montana elk populations do experience lower pregnancy rates correlated with lower nutrition ^{Proffitt et al. 2016a}.

Elk Security Habitat

Elk vulnerability has been defined as the measure of an elk's susceptibility to being harvested during the hunting season. Security habitat has been defined by different standards, but generally it is an area where elk are less vulnerable to harvest while meeting their seasonal habitat needs. There is an inverse relationship between elk vulnerability and elk security; as elk security declines, elk vulnerability increases. Managing security habitat allows for additional control over total harvest without changing harvest regulations.

Security habitat was first formally defined by Hillis et al. (1991) as including areas that were at least .5 mile (800 m) from an open road, at least 250 acres in size, and comprised at least 30 percent of an analysis unit. Lyon and Christensen (1992) defined security areas as "any area because of its geography, topography, vegetation, or a combination, that will hold elk during periods of stress."

Although Hillis et al. (1991) defined the concept of security habitat and put forth guidelines, the paper was explicit about the need for improvement based on further research. Refinements to the original definition of security habitat have been developed using elk habitat selection during hunting season and assuming elk seek security habitat during this time. A study conducted in southwest Montana analyzing 9 different elk herds developed security habitat recommendations that included over 13 percent canopy cover, 1.7 miles (2,760 m) from motorized routes in patches at least 7.8 mi² (20 km²) ^{Ranglack et al. 2017}. Similarly, another Montana study recommended managing for canopy cover of 23 to 60 percent in areas 1.1 to 2.3 miles (1,846 to 3,679 m) from motorized routes ^{Lowrey et al. 2020}. Exploring interactions between cover and distance to roads has shown that elk in roaded areas select for greater canopy cover ^{Unsworth et al. 1998}. When canopy cover is adequate, road management alone can drive elk security and elk distribution on public lands ^{Christensen et al. 1993, Proffitt et al. 2013}. In central and eastern Montana, where there is less canopy cover, private lands with limited hunting access, topography, and distance to roads influence elk security.

Because nutrition and hunter pressure may drive habitat selection in some instances, the importance of security habitat has been challenged ^{Proffitt et al. 2010 and 2013, Cleveland et al. 2012, Ranglack et al. 2016, 2017, DeVoe et al. 2019}. Yet, the presence of security habitat on public lands may entice elk to spend more time there than on private lands with restricted hunting access, which may serve as refuges ^{Proffitt et al. 2013, Ranglack et al. 2017, DeVoe et al. 2019, Lowrey et al. 2020}.

Elk and Mule Deer Competition

In parts of western North America, elk populations have increased, and mule deer populations have decreased. This leads some to wonder if increasing elk numbers have caused mule deer to decline. Considering some of the physiological and behavioral differences between the two species, oftentimes elk do have an advantage over mule deer. For example, mule deer have smaller stomachs and highly specialized diets whereas elk have larger stomachs and more general diets ^{Wickstrom et al. 1984}. This means elk can take advantage of preferred mule deer forage (browse), but rarely do mule deer take advantage of elk preferred forage (grasses) ^{Keegan and Wakeling 2003}. Also, when quality habitat is limited, an elk's larger stomach can obtain adequate energy from higher quantities of low-quality forage ^{Wickstrom et al. 1984}.

During winter conditions, mule deer movements become restricted in snow depths greater than 10 inches, whereas elk are not significantly restricted until snow depth reaches 18 inches ^{Lindzey et al. 1997}. However, less snow may still cause elk to move to areas with more accessible forage ^{Sweeney and Sweeney 1984}, whereas mule deer may not readily move in response to snow accumulation because of their specialized diet. Also, because elk are taller, they can use forage that may be out of reach for a mule deer ^{Keegan and Wakeling 2003} and may more easily

navigate obstacles such as fences and downfall. This means when severe winter weather occurs, elk may not be impacted to the extent mule deer are. Also, when severe winter weather occurs and elk move down in elevation, they can physically displace mule deer from their winter range.

In addition to the behavioral and physiological advantages elk may have, habitat alterations that have occurred during the last several decades may benefit elk more than mule deer ^{Keegan and Wakeling 2003}. Elk consume a higher proportion of grasses on winter range than mule deer ^{Christianson and Creel 2007}. Therefore, replacement of early succession shrublands (preferred deer forage) with grassland (preferred elk forage) and forest habitats may benefit elk more than mule deer.

Often-times there are social differences in opinions with some wanting more deer, more elk, or more of both species. Although there is considerable overlap in the habitats they can use, often habitat needs diverge, and therefore managing habitat to maximize populations of both species in the same landscape can be difficult.

Types of Habitat Management

There are a variety of habitat management techniques to enhance or restore elk habitat, many of which focus on resetting forest succession to earlier seral stages. Generally, forest succession begins with early seral stages consisting of deciduous shrubs, forbs, and grasses, and then as conifer overstories close, shade-tolerant evergreens become dominant ^{Cook et al. 2016}. Early seral stages are crucial for providing high nutrition for elk as digestible energy declines with forest succession ^{Cook et al. 2016} and generally, advanced forest seral stages have negative effects on ungulate nutrition ^{Irwin and Peek 1979 & 1983, Collins and Urness 1983, Riggs et al. 1996, Peek et al. 2001, Keane et al. 2002, Cook et al. 2016}. These results imply that forest managers may need to promote forest disturbances to reset forest succession to an earlier seral stage to provide higher nutrition for elk. Forage can be affected by fire, livestock grazing, noxious weeds, and forest management.

Burning is one method of resetting forest succession. Prescribed burns or allowing wildfires to burn when socially and ecologically acceptable could improve forage quality ^{Barker et al. 2019a} and quantity ^{Snobl et al. 2022}. However, effects of burning on elk nutrition and use are variable through time ^{Van Dyke and Darragh 2007, Long et al. 2008}, and elk typically increase use of recently burned sites but eventually return to levels of pre-burn use ^{Van Dyke and Darragh 2007}. This elk use pattern follows forage quality patterns after a burn ^{Van Dyke and Darragh 2007, Proffitt et al. 2019}. Small burns at dispersed time and space intervals are recommended ^{Van Dyke and Darragh 2007, Long et al. 2008, Proffitt et al. 2016b}, and maintaining a mosaic of fire history may benefit elk by producing and maintaining nutritious habitats ^{Proffitt et al. 2016b}.

Livestock grazing is a common land management practice. Managed grazing is a tool that can improve elk habitat by enhancing forage palatability and altering herbaceous composition and structure ^{Krausman et al. 2009}. In Montana, elk select pastures that have been recently grazed ^{Grover and Thompson 1986} or those grazed within a rest-rotation grazing system ^{Shamhart et al. 2012} more so than pastures where livestock grazing has been eliminated. These findings indicate that well designed rotational grazing systems on public lands may help shift elk distributions away from ungrazed private lands.

Forest management techniques including the use of herbicides, forest thinning, and clearcut logging may create early seral stages with high nutritional value ^{Cook et al. 2016, Vales et al. 2017}. The effectiveness of these treatments depends on the specific locations and the ecological characteristics of the site ^{Cook et al. 2016}. Clearcut logging in Montana has been shown to remove canopy cover, allowing for an increase in forage production and species diversity ^{Hammond 1980}. However, an important consideration for logging is the increase in the number of roads and the loss of canopy cover, both of which affect elk security habitat.

Natural changes to canopy cover have occurred across Montana and other Western states with recent mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*) outbreaks. In the Elkhorn Mountains of southwest Montana, 80 percent of lodgepole pines (*Pinus contorta*) were killed by pine beetles ^{Lowrey et al. 2020}. Despite high lodgepole pine mortality, canopy cover remained high, higher than uninfested ponderosa pine and Douglas fir forests ^{Lowrey et al. 2020}. However, elk may experience negative consequences of pine beetle infestations through time as dead trees blow down, making travel difficult ^{Lowrey et al. 2020}.

When evaluating habitat for elk, forage is a primary physiological need and is a primary management focus when elk needs are being considered. Elk are primarily grazers that will use browse, especially during winter.

Early seral stages, especially within conifer forests, provide suitable forage. Security cover is an important behavioral need and is secondary to the physiological need for forage. Components of security cover include physical screening cover as well as topographical and spatial (distance) aspects that help elk avoid humans, especially during hunting season. In habitats with fewer trees, steep terrain and distance from roads comprise greater proportions of security cover than in forested habitats. Using techniques to reset forest succession to earlier seral stages may improve nutrition for elk but may also reduce cover resulting in a loss of security habitat.

Habitat Recommendations

Dispersing habitat efforts through time and space will provide a variety of seral stages in a mosaic pattern across the landscape ^{Van Dyke and Darragh 2007, Cook et al. 2016, Vales et al. 2017, Barker et al. 2019b}. Managing habitat for a mosaic of early successional vegetative communities could improve both quality and predictability of forage ^{Barker et al 2019b}, and spatially separating small treatment areas will also stabilize the boom-bust cycles of forage and cover ^{Vales et al. 2017}.

Managers should consider the scale of alteration necessary to achieve goals. For example, small acreages of high-quality food may be nutritionally beneficial to elk during the winter when herds are concentrated on winter range; these small areas are less effective during summer when elk are widely distributed ^{Cook et al. 2013}. If summer nutrition is a limited resource, managers may want to consider larger-scale alterations. Alternatively, disruptions of large tracts of habitat may make forage unpredictable and hamper elk migration ^{Barker et al 2019b}.

Wildlife managers and land managers need to collaborate and simultaneously consider security habitat, license structure/levels, and access management. The best habitat may go unused if hunting pressure is too high, because areas without hunter access tend to be a driving factor in elk selection during fall.

Predation

Predator-prey interactions are dynamic across space and time and are difficult to generalize in that local herds experience the effects of predation differently. Predation can be a source of additive mortality or compensatory mortality. Additive mortality is mortality that would not have otherwise occurred, thus it is in addition to existing mortality. Compensatory mortality replaces mortality that would have occurred anyway, decreasing the other types of mortality that would have otherwise occurred, meaning it has little effect on the population. For example, if an elk population is at carrying capacity and there are not enough food resources, some individuals are bound to starve to death. In this case, if a predator killed an individual that was doomed to starve to death, there would be no net difference in the number of dead elk; the predation compensated for the starvation loss (compensatory mortality). However, in a system where the elk population is below carrying capacity, food resources are plentiful, and survival is high, an elk that would have otherwise survived but is killed by a predator is added to the baseline level of mortality (additive mortality). Therefore, population responses to predation depend on multiple factors including environmental conditions such as habitat type, habitat quality, weather, and other mortality sources (including human harvest of elk). These can affect how significant the effect of predation is on an elk population.



Large carnivore populations are recovering and expanding in the west, including Montana. Montana currently has complex predator communities including wolves, grizzly bears, black bears, and mountain lions.

Large carnivore populations are recovering and expanding in the west, including Montana. Montana currently has complex predator communities including wolves, grizzly bears, black bears, and mountain lions.

Direct Effects

The direct effects that predation can have on elk populations depend on whether the mortality is additive or compensatory. If additive, then predation could cause population declines. Predation not only influences elk at the population level, but also at the individual level. At the individual level, characteristics such as age and size can influence the likelihood of predation ^{Horne et al. 2019}. Most newborn calves cannot evade predation until they are about a week old ^{Johnson 1951}; during this vulnerable time various predators have been linked to calf mortality. Black bears, grizzly bears and mountain lions have been documented as primary predators and the impact is variable, likely dependent on habitat security. As calves get older, wolves also become a primary predator ^{Raithel 2005, White et al. 2010, Eacker et al. 2016, Barber-Meyer et al. 2008, Horne et al. 2019}. Primary predators of adult elk in Montana include mountain lions and wolves.

Coursing predators, like wolves, may be more selective in the prey they take, focusing on vulnerable individuals, compared to stalking predators, like mountain lions, that are more opportunistic in their prey selection. For example, if a pack of wolves detects a group of elk and begins to chase the herd, the elk begin running; this provides an opportunity for wolves to focus on the weaker or slower individuals. When a mountain lion detects and stalks or ambushes a herd of elk, vulnerability may be more a function of proximity and prey size than of performance.

Indirect Effects

Predators can also indirectly affect elk by causing them to alter movement patterns, foraging behavior, vigilance, grouping patterns, and habitat selection. Elk may exhibit behavioral changes to predation risk at large spatial and temporal scales ^{Creel et al. 2005, Liley and Creel 2008, Proffitt et al. 2009}. However, behavioral responses to predators vary temporally and spatially, are hard to predict, and may depend on habitat type ^{Garrott et al. 2005}. For example, elk disaggregate in response to predation risk in sagebrush habitats and aggregate when in grasslands ^{Proffitt et al. 2009}. When elk alter habitat use because of predators or perceived predation risk, there may be nutritional consequences ^{Pierce et al. 2004} resulting in less access to grazing opportunities that could enhance survival or reproduction ^{Christianson and Creel 2007, Christianson and Creel 2010}. However, this trade-off has not been shown to affect elk body fat ^{White et al. 2011} or pregnancy in Montana elk herds ^{White et al. 2011, Proffitt et al. 2014, Paterson et al. 2022b}. Also, Paterson et al. (2022) conducted a comprehensive analysis of forage-risk tradeoffs for elk in Montana and found that elk had to trade off between selecting high-quality forage and avoiding lions, but there was no such trade-off for avoiding wolves (i.e., impact varies among predators). Additionally individual elk behave differently, which may be why there is not a population-level effect ^{Paterson et al. 2022b}.

Another behavioral response to predation risk is altering group size. Although some research found no relationship or a weak relationship between wolf predation risk and elk group size ^{Gude et al. 2006, Proffitt et al. 2015}, others in more forested winter ranges documented that predation risk can affect elk group size ^{Creel and Winnie 2005, Winnie and Creel 2007}. Group size is important to an individual's risk of being preyed upon. For example, a lone elk may be able to evade predation by avoiding detection. If detected, the single elk is the sole target of a predation attempt. In contrast, elk in larger groups are more likely to be detected by predators, but their individual odds of being killed by a predator once detected are influenced by the number of other elk in the group. There is a trade-off in group sizes between detectability and a dilution effect and an ideal group size may be six to nine in forested winter ranges ^{Winnie and Creel 2007}.

Lastly, vigilance is the action of keeping careful watch for potential predators. As elk display heightened vigilance, they spend less time foraging or resting. Elk vigilance is dependent on variables associated with prey and predator characteristics ^{Liley and Creel 2008}. For example, elk adjust vigilance levels based on the group they are in (prey) and the type of immediate threat (predator) they are facing ^{Liley and Creel 2008}. Elk groups of 10 to 20 displayed more vigilance than groups that were larger or smaller ^{Liley and Creel 2008}.

Carnivore Management

Carnivores are a functional and valued part of Montana's wildland ecosystems and FWP is committed to conserving them. Current statewide management for large carnivores that have the potential to impact elk (i.e., mountain lions, wolves, and black bears) focuses on public hunting and trapping through existing rules and

laws that provide the regulatory framework for hunting or trapping seasons. Because grizzly bears are federally listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act and are currently not managed by the state of Montana, they are omitted from further management and monitoring discussion herein. MCA § 87-1-217, Policy For Management Of Large Predators, identifies “preserve citizens’ opportunities to hunt large game species” as a primary goal in managing large predators, superseded only by protecting humans, livestock, and pets and preserving and enhancing the safety of the public during outdoor recreational and livelihood activities.

Carnivore management through increasing harvest or agency-initiated lethal removal may be considered to increase prey populations that are at lower numbers than desired. Relationships between carnivore harvest and ungulate populations are unclear in many cases. Carnivore harvest can increase elk calf survival, recruitment, or population growth^{White et al. 2010, Proffitt et al. 2014, Paterson et al. 2019, Proffitt et al. 2020}. However, increasing carnivore harvest may not influence elk survival if there are other significant sources of elk mortality, such as human harvest^{Brodie et al. 2013}, extreme weather conditions (calves), or if non-target carnivores are having a significant impact to elk mortality in place of the targeted species^{Proffitt et al. 2014}. Prey responses to predator management may also be influenced by the proximity of the prey population to the capacity of the habitat to support them. For predation management to be effective, predators must be regulating the prey population^{Ballard et al. 2001}.

Under certain circumstances, liberalizing carnivore harvest may increase elk calf recruitment. A recent study in Montana monitored elk calf survival throughout changes in mountain lion harvest and found that summer and winter calf survival were lowest before liberalized harvest, highest during liberal harvest, and intermediate four years post liberalized harvest^{Proffitt et al. 2020}.

Integrated Carnivore-Ungulate Harvest Management

To address concerns regarding effects of predation on elk populations, wildlife managers may design integrated carnivore-ungulate harvest management programs. These programs use a combination of liberalized carnivore and restrictive ungulate harvest regulations to achieve population abundance goals^{Proffitt et al. 2020}. Two key factors distinguish integrated carnivore-ungulate management from predator control programs: the focus of public hunters and hunting seasons as the primary mechanism for carnivore removals, rather than agency staff, and the adjustment of ungulate harvest regulations simultaneous with liberalized carnivore harvest^{Proffitt et al. 2020}. Additionally, integrated carnivore ungulate programs involve careful assessment of system-specific carnivore-ungulate relationships, such as cause specific mortality and the degree to which predation is additive versus compensatory for each carnivore species involved. Rather than simply reducing all carnivore populations locally, this information is used to target the most likely carnivore species to a specific degree to improve the most important vital rate(s) believed to be limiting performance of an elk population. Thus, individual prescriptions for an integrated carnivore-ungulate management program will vary from one location to another depending on limiting factors and regulation flexibility of carnivore species involved (e.g., quotas, season lengths, bag limits).

Monitoring ungulate and carnivore populations while integrating management programs is important to evaluate the effects on both populations. Ungulate data needed to evaluate effects varies depending on the vital rates believed to be limiting the ungulate population. Elk data that could be collected and used to evaluate effects may include adult, neonate, and juvenile survival, recruitment, and population trend. For information on carnivore population monitoring, see **Carnivore Monitoring Programs** section.

The ability to implement carnivore harvest treatments to benefit ungulate populations is challenging given the social dynamics and controversy surrounding carnivore harvest, and public support for carnivore harvest regulations is often unknown or controversial^{Decker et al. 2009, Treves 2009, Boertje et al. 2010, Mitchell et al. 2018, Proffitt et al. 2020}. Formal public involvement of the full diversity of stakeholders is critical to program success. FWP has used a structured decision making (SDM) format to implement integrated carnivore-ungulate management (e.g., [Northwest Lion Ecoregional Population Objective Committee](#)) and uses the framework in the development of carnivore monitoring programs to ensure adequate information is available for the development of integrated carnivore-ungulate management programs.

Carnivore Monitoring Programs

Predator-prey dynamics are inherently complex and dynamic; employing adaptive strategies is a key to developing solutions. Monitoring programs serve as a cornerstone for adaptive carnivore management ensuring the long-term conservation of populations while responsibly managing the population and addressing potential impacts to prey populations. In recent years, FWP has advanced new monitoring protocols for mountain lions, wolves, and black bears to better inform carnivore-ungulate management decisions.

Montana Mountain Lion Monitoring and Management Strategy—In 2019, FWP began implementing the Mountain Lion Monitoring and Management Strategy ^{FWP 2019a}, which outlines the state’s new approach to conserving, monitoring, and managing mountain lions within an adaptive management framework. The strategy incorporates 25 years of field research that improved understanding of lion ecology and interactions with their prey. The strategy divides the state into four ecoregions, which delineate the spatial boundaries and scale of all monitoring and management moving forward. Population abundance is estimated in each ecoregion using an IPM, which combines data from mandatory reporting of lion harvest, vital rates estimated from past radio-collar studies, and a field-based spatial capture-recapture (SCR) method for estimating population density relative to habitat quality utilizing lion DNA. The IPM is also used to develop projections of future population change under alternative harvest scenarios that will inform management decisions. For more information see: <https://fwp.mt.gov/conservation/wildlife-management/mountain-lion>.

One of the management guidelines from the Management Strategy states: “FWP will maintain a balance between mountain lion populations, their prey, and humans by helping direct local harvest of mountain lions, if and as needed, to manage prey survival and reduce human-lion conflicts.” Upon completion of population monitoring in each ecoregion, information from the Mountain Lion IPM, ungulate survey data, and conflict data are presented to a stakeholder committee which works through a structured decision making process to develop a recommendation to the department on (1) target population trend over a 6-year period, (2) degree of ecoregional population size change (percent up or percent down), and (3) Lion Management Unit (LMU) emphases (e.g., older-age class harvest, conflict reduction, aid ungulate populations, more opportunity, etc.). During the Northwest Lion Ecoregional Population Objective Committee (LEPOC) process in 2022, the committee recommended additional population decreases in three ungulate focal areas and one conflict focal area. The process repeats every six years in each ecoregion with updated population estimates and a new committee.

Wolf iPOM (Integrated Patch Occupancy Modeling)—The primary means of monitoring wolf distribution, numbers, and trends in Montana is now Integrated Patch Occupancy Modeling (iPOM). The iPOM method uses annual hunter effort surveys, known wolf locations, habitat covariates, and estimates of wolf territory size and pack size to estimate wolf distribution and population size across the state. The iPOM estimates of wolf population size are the preferred monitoring method due to accuracy, confidence intervals, and cost efficiency.

Regulated public harvest of wolves was recommended by the Governor’s Wolf Advisory Council as the main management tool for wolves and was included in Montana’s Wolf Conservation and Management Plan that was approved by the USFWS during 2004. FWP has developed and implemented wolf harvest strategies that maintain a recovered and connected wolf population, reduce wolf-livestock conflicts, reduce wolf impacts on low or declining ungulate populations and ungulate hunting opportunities, and effectively communicate to all parties the relevance and credibility of the harvest while acknowledging the diversity of values among those parties. FWP is currently revising Montana’s Wolf Conservation and Management Plan. The Montana public has the opportunity for continuous and iterative input into specific decisions about wolf harvest throughout the public season-setting process. For more information on wolf monitoring and harvest see: <https://fwp.mt.gov/conservation/wildlife-management/wolf>

Black Bear Monitoring—In response to changing harvest regimes in recent years, FWP proposed new research objectives and methods for monitoring black bears across the state. The primary objective of the monitoring protocols is to obtain population density and abundance estimates for black bears at spatial scales comparable to that of bear management units (BMUs). This is accomplished through the synthesis of periodic abundance estimates (every 4 to 5 years) and an IPM which incorporates harvest, harvest sex ratios, age of harvested bears, hunter success, and black bear vital rates to project population trends in periods between abundance

estimates.

The monitoring program operates at two spatial scales: (1) regional (or ecoregion) level, and (2) within each region at the bear management unit (BMU) level. Monitoring population density and abundance at the regional level cycles temporally using a 1-year “on,” 3 to 4 years “off” schedule and is staggered across the state so that only one region is sampled each year. During “off” years an IPM will use harvest, population vital rate, and environmental data to project population estimates between the cyclical 4 to 5-year field efforts.

Human-Elk Conflict

Increases in elk numbers and distribution over the last century have created management challenges on private and public land over issues such as crop damage, competition for forage with livestock, lack of vegetative regeneration, vehicle collisions, and transmission of diseases to livestock Bunnell et al. 2002, Haggerty and Travis 2006, Walter et al.

2011. Habituation of elk to human presence can strongly influence conflicts involving elk Thompson and Henderson 1998 and areas with inadequate hunting access are more likely to have complaints than those with hunting opportunities Adkins 1991. Elk conflict sometimes occurs among individuals who allow hunting but whose neighbor does not Adkins 1991.

Management decisions consider concerns about agricultural damage Van Tassell et al. 1999.

Conflicts surrounding elk can result in decreased social tolerance, which may influence lower elk population size goals more so than biological factors. In fact, Montana statute states, “ ‘landowner tolerance’ means the written or documented verbal opinion of an affected landowner regarding the impact upon the landowner’s property...” (§ 87-1-301, MCA). Also, Montana statute (§ 87-1-323, MCA) states the Commission, “shall determine the appropriate elk...numbers that can be viably sustained. The department shall consider the specific concerns of private landowners when determining sustainable numbers pursuant to this section.” Therefore, the Commission is obligated by statute to consider landowner tolerance of elk when determining appropriate or target number of elk. In many areas, especially where there is significant elk use of private land, the biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacity for elk numbers is above the sustainable number which incorporates landowner tolerance.



In the 2005 elk management plan, the statewide sustainable number of elk was determined to be 86,355 with a range between 72,413 to 101,525. In this plan, the statewide sustainable number of elk is determined to be between 96,015 and 151,425. This range is derived from a sum of all HD population goals. In some HDs, population goals have increased commensurate with landowner tolerance, as measured through the public process described in this Plan. Increased goals in these areas are set to not exceed current biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacities. In HDs where the population goal has decreased since 2005, either landowner tolerance has decreased, or biological, nutritional, or ecological carrying capacity has decreased. Additionally, some HDs did not have population goals in the 2005 Plan but do have established population goals included in this Plan; others had population goals established in the 2005 Plan that have since been eliminated

due to surveying constraints.

In a 1990s study, 44 percent of Montana landowners with elk on their property thought numbers were too high at that time ^{Irby et al. 1997}. Similarly, in a 2007 survey, 43 percent of landowners surveyed agreed that, “*there are too many elk in Montana right now*” ^{Lewis et al. 2007} and 50 percent of landowners thought, “*FWP needs to take measures to decrease Montana’s elk populations*” ^{Lewis et al. 2007}.

Over populated elk herds may need to be reduced to alleviate damage to native vegetation and agricultural production and to reduce risk of disease transmission ^{Walter et al. 2011}. In areas where elk populations have exceeded landowner tolerance, added harvest of adult female elk is commonly prescribed. However, adult female harvest goals may not be met if public access to the animals is limited ^{Proffitt et al. 2016}.

While landowner tolerance helps to define acceptable population levels, public perceptions also influence the methods prescribed to adjust elk populations ^{Walter et al. 2011}. Although the public generally supports many non-lethal methods of redistributing local elk populations ^{Walter et al. 2011}, elk become habituated to non-lethal deterrents if elk do not experience negative physical stimuli ^{Nolte 1999, Jones et al. 2021}. Non-standard tools for elk population control such as agency sharpshooting may be useful in small, controlled settings, where agency staff could obtain access, but these approaches are unlikely to reduce populations on a large scale. Additionally, non-standard tools are generally less socially acceptable, biologically effective, or fiscally feasible at a larger scale ^{Walter et al. 2011}.

Elk Distribution

The distribution of elk on the landscape is dynamic and can be described at multiple spatial and temporal scales. At the statewide scale, distribution can be defined as areas inhabited by elk at some point during the year, and the current Montana statewide distribution estimate is at a 1 mile² scale. At a more local scale, distribution can be defined as elk inhabiting a property, pasture, or specific area during a shorter time scale such as a night/day, week, month, or season.

Statewide elk distribution in Montana has been estimated differently over time. Regardless of methods, the elk distribution has increased in the last century (Figure 13). Elk are currently inhabiting areas that were unoccupied by elk in 1940.






Figure 13. Montana estimated elk distribution 1940 to 2022. Note: Elk distribution is not mapped in Indian reservations or national parks.

Although the Department can note changes in the statewide elk distribution over time, local concentrations of elk are typically more noticeable and more problematic. At the local scale, elk concentrations appear to be changing, resulting in higher numbers of elk or higher elk densities in some places. When these concentrations occur on private lands, they can cause damage.

Local elk distributions are of high interest and are highly important to stakeholders; however, quantifying local elk distributions during various times of the year has proven difficult. Biologists mark elk locations during aerial surveys, but those locations only represent a single day within a single season. Because elk move daily and seasonally, winter survey locations are often not helpful in determining elk distribution during other times of the year, such as during hunting season. In areas where adequate sample sizes of elk are radio-collared, GPS location data during different seasons can help determine local seasonal elk distributions. Elk harvest locations can also be used as an index for elk distribution during the hunting season. However, harvest locations must also be interpreted with caution, as certain factors such as access or ownership restrictions on valid licenses may lead to harvest locations not being reflective of the true elk distribution across the landscape during a hunting season.

Changes in Land Use

The Homestead Act of 1862 along with the Enlarged Homestead Act of 1909 undoubtedly shaped the present and future of Montana. These acts accompanied by the Industrial Revolution allowed for agriculture in Montana to become established. Homesteaders were required to live on the land for five years and make improvements (such as building a dwelling and cultivating) before they could become legal owners. This era invited and encouraged changes in land use from native vegetation to cultivated crops and livestock production. These products were essential food sources during westward expansion of European settlement in the U.S.

Certain attributes contribute to land being suitable for conversion from native range to crop production. Some of these factors include deep arable soils, ruggedness, solar intercept, water holding capacity, annual

precipitation, temperature, duration of frost-free period, and soil type ^{Smith et al. 2016}. The attributes that make land suitable for conversion are some of the same factors sought after by big game during winter. Big game winter range must have the right combination of elevation, slope, aspect, and vegetation; often this includes low-elevation grasslands near timbered areas ^{Vore 2012}.

In Montana, grasslands are the primary ecosystem converted to croplands. Wheat, alfalfa, and barley are the most common first crop planted upon conversion ^{Lark et al. 2018}. Irrigated agriculture on elk winter range can provide quality nutrition for elk, but the increased use of this type of land can create conflict between elk and landowners who rely on agricultural production as a major source of income. In recent decades, there has also been an increasing trend of Montana landowners that rely little on their property as a sole source of income and receive a majority of their income from other sources; these landowners are more interested in natural amenities like wildlife and scenery than they are with livestock production ^{Haggerty and Travis 2006}. For many of these landowners, their Montana property is not a primary residence, and they may only spend a portion of the year residing in Montana ^{Haggerty and Travis 2006}.

Traditionally, a large portion of Montana landowners in rural areas relied on their property's agricultural production as a primary source of income. These property owners may have a lower tolerance for elk, as elk can compete with livestock for forage, damage stored or growing crops, damage fences, and may pose disease risk to livestock. Whereas landowners that rely less on their property for income may have a higher tolerance for elk on their property. This scenario creates tension because elk are not sedentary, and although one landowner may have high tolerance and encourage herds to grow, a neighboring landowner may have less tolerance for herds causing damage to their property resulting in financial loss. Not only is there disagreement of elk tolerance between these types of landowners, but this disagreement results in conflict over tools used to decrease the elk population, such as hunting.

Refuge Areas

At times, even liberal hunting seasons have resulted in low harvest. Many of these situations involve refuge areas on private lands or inaccessible public lands where concentrations of elk result. Elk quickly adjust their behavior as they discover and use refuge areas, including residential areas. A single refuge area may affect elk distribution and limit elk harvest across an entire HD. Often elk become yearlong residents on refuge areas and affect neighboring non-refuge properties that do not want more elk presence. If not disturbed, elk use of refuge areas may expand to yearlong use ^{Burcham et al. 1999} thus creating a management challenge when they remain concentrated during fall hunting seasons. If large concentrations of elk do move from a refuge area to one with public hunting access during hunting season, a "shoot-out" situation may occur where a high number of hunters shoot into the large herd, raising safety and ethical concerns.

Refuge areas can cause:

- High numbers of elk
- High elk densities
- Large elk group sizes
- Increased disease transmission potential
- Problematic distributions
- Reduced seasonal elk migrations to public lands
- More yearlong resident elk
- Game damage on private lands
- Reduced harvest
- Impaired management

Many of these consequences are detrimental to the long-term health and management of elk, domestic livestock, and private and public lands supporting elk. History has shown that efforts to manage elk numbers, distribution, or disease risk without addressing refuge areas are minimally effective and often unsuccessful. The Department, with direction of the legislature, has implemented multiple access tools trying to improve hunter access to elk on and through private land, see **Elk Hunting: Access** section. Elk availability for harvest is reduced when elk use refuge areas ^{Proffitt et al. 2010}, which creates a challenge for wildlife managers ^{Haggerty and Travis 2006}.

During hunting seasons (both archery and rifle), elk move to and use privately owned areas that restrict hunter access ^{Burcham et al. 1999, Proffitt et al. 2010, 2016, Ranglack et al. 2017, Sergeev et al. 2022}. Elk tend to select areas with less hunter access ^{Proffitt et al. 2010, 2013, 2016} and areas farther from hunter access points ^{Unsworth et al. 1998, Rumble et al. 2005, Proffitt et al. 2010}. Hunter access has more influence on elk habitat selection than distance to motorized routes or canopy cover ^{Ranglack et al. 2017}. This fundamental principle emphasizes why gaining and maintaining public hunting access to private lands is so critical to FWP's and the Commission's ability to manage Montana's elk population.

A study researching hunting access in the Upper Yellowstone area of southwest Montana found a substantial increase (8 percent to 22 percent) in the amount of land closed over time to any hunting during 1979 to 2003; public hunting access decreased in this same time frame from 63 percent to 49 percent ^{Haggerty and Travis 2006}. A landowner survey conducted by FWP found that free public hunting access for bull elk on private land also decreased from 4.6 million acres to 4.3 million acres (7 percent decrease) from 2015 to 2019, whereas free public hunting access for cow elk remained relatively stable at 5.1 to 5.2 million acres (approximately 1 percent increase) ^{FWP 2020a}.

Because elk avoid hunters, increased hunter opportunity may exacerbate the problem by pushing more elk to seek refuge areas resulting in less overall harvest ^{Proffitt et al. 2016}. Elk have more difficulty avoiding hunters when duration and amount of hunting pressure is varied spatially and temporally ^{Cleveland et al. 2012}. Increasing harvest opportunities and hunting activity within refuge areas would distribute elk more evenly across ownerships ^{Sergeev et al. 2022}.

Other Causes of Problematic Distributions

Hunting

Hunter numbers can affect elk in various ways such as shifting distributions ^{Proffitt et al. 2013}, changing concentrations ^{Gude et al. 2006}, increasing movement rates ^{Proffitt et al. 2009, Cleveland et al. 2012}, movements into more secure habitats ^{Morgantini and Hudson 1985}, or selection for areas with little or no hunting pressure ^{Proffitt et al. 2010, 2013, 2016, Ranglack et al. 2017, Sergeev et al. 2022}. Additionally, elk discern temporal variation in risk within and outside of hunting seasons ^{Gude et al. 2006, Unsworth et al. 1998, Proffitt et al. 2010, Coe et al. 2011}. For example, during hunting season, elk distribution was centered on private land that prohibited hunting, whereas during non-hunting time periods, elk distribution was centered in a different location ^{Proffitt et al. 2010}. Hunting may cause changes to elk group sizes ^{Gude et al. 2006, Proffitt et al. 2009}, but this response is dependent on habitat type. In grassland flats, group sizes decreased during hunting season whereas in forested areas or grassland hills, group sizes increased in response to hunting ^{Proffitt et al. 2009}.

Other Outdoor Recreation

Recreation can occur in various forms, including all-terrain vehicle (ATV) riding, cross-country skiing, horseback riding, hiking, and snowmobiling. Although this section focuses on these activities, which are common activities in Montana, other recreational activities also influence elk movements and distribution. Recreation can cause elk to shift their behavior ^{Naylor et al. 2009, Wisdom et al. 2018} and avoid recreationists. After recreational activities have ceased, elk may return to trails previously recreated on by humans ^{Cassirer et al. 1992, Wisdom et al. 2018}. Viewshed is an important component of elk response to recreationists and elk move to areas out of view of trails and recreationists ^{Cassirer et al. 1992, Wisdom et al. 2018}.

Not only do elk avoid recreationists, but there can be consequences to young calves if their mother is repeatedly disturbed. Cow elk with calves that were subjected to repeated disturbance for 3 to 4 weeks during peak calving season were 22 percent less likely to have a calf survive to summer compared to those with "normal disturbance levels" ^{Phillips and Alldredge 2000}. Similarly, productivity decreased during disturbance treatment years, then rebounded once disturbance treatment had ceased ^{Shively et al. 2005}. These data indicate that repeated or chronic disturbance by humans could result in population-level impacts.

ATV riding is a common activity in many areas of Montana and often occurs during hunting season and hunting activity. Elk moved more in response to ATV riding ^{Naylor et al. 2009} and distanced themselves more from ATVs than from other types of recreationists ^{Wisdom et al. 2018}. ATV riding in proximity to elk caused them to feed less ^{Naylor et al. 2009}. In Montana, the number of registered off-highway motorcycles and quadricycles increased during 2011 to

2022 (Figure 14), likely increasing their use commensurately. Elk movements and distance from recreationists increased in response to mountain biking, hiking, and horseback riding, but to a lesser extent than that observed during ATV riding ^{Naylor et al. 2009, Wisdom et al. 2018}.




Figure 14. Registrations of Motorcycles or Quadricycles in Montana for off-road use (includes off-highway, and street/off-highway). Data obtained from the Montana Department of Justice (<https://dojmt.gov/driving/mvd-by-the-numbers>)

Elk were temporarily displaced by cross-country skiers, but typically returned to the same drainage after recreationists had left the area ^{Cassirer et al. 1992}. Although elk move away from heavily used ski trails, they did not alter overall winter distribution in response to skiers ^{Ferguson and Keith 1982}. Additionally, elk may respond to snowmobile activity by displaying more vigilant behavior, traveling, or defensive actions ^{Borkowski et al. 2006}, and snowmobile activity can cause an increase in elk stress hormones, although there is no evidence of a population-level effect from these hormones ^{Creel et al. 2002}.

Often, roads and trails are a metric used when researching elk responses to recreation and elk resource selection in general. Both road density and distance to roads can influence elk distribution and habitat selection ^{Proffitt et al. 2013, Ranglack et al. 2017, Wisdom et al. 2018}. Ultimately, if roads and recreation are influencing elk distributions, then managing motorized road access could affect elk distribution on public lands ^{Proffitt et al. 2013}.

Currently, there is ongoing collaborative research between FWP, University of Montana, and Colorado Parks and Wildlife to quantify the effects of trail-based recreation on elk habitat use across a range of trail-use intensities; Montana is providing data from an area with few trails (Ruby Mountains) whereas Colorado is providing data with numerous trails, trails being added, and high trail use.

Hunting for and collecting elk antlers that have been shed in the late winter or early spring has become a popular activity in Montana and elsewhere. This activity occurs during the time of year when elk are the most physiologically stressed, as fat reserves are depleted, and forage is not optimal. Antler hunters often use ATVs or snowmobiles to access difficult terrain under difficult conditions. Therefore, antler hunting, and associated activities can displace wintering wildlife, including elk, during a critical time of the year. In Montana, there are some restrictions in place to minimize such disturbance, for example, WMAs that provide security for elk during winter are closed after hunting season until May 15 to protect wintering wildlife. FWP encourages antler hunters to avoid areas where big game are currently wintering, and to give wildlife their space until the snow has melted and the animals are less stressed.

Montana’s Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan ^{FWP 2020b} outlines six goals for 2020 through 2024:

- Goal 1: Promote outdoor recreation opportunities for all Montanans.
- Goal 2: Enhance public access to outdoor recreation resources and facilities.
- Goal 3: Support economic vitality of communities and state.
- Goal 4: Improve quality of life through outdoor recreation experiences.

- Goal 5: Adapt outdoor recreation for a changing environment.
- Goal 6: Honor Montana’s outdoor legacy ^{FWP 2020b}.

Within Goal 6 of the Plan, one of the recommendations is to “Conserve Montana’s outdoor and natural resources,” and two of the strategies to meet the recommendation include “balance outdoor recreation use with ecological function of natural resources including fish, wildlife and their habitats” and “Integrate social and ecological goals in outdoor recreation planning efforts.” FWP is striving to meet the rising demand of outdoor recreation opportunities and simultaneously ensure that negative effects on wildlife and their habitats from outdoor recreation are reduced.

Habitat and Landcover

Elk distribution in Montana can be driven by differing nutritional resources found on public and private land ^{DeVoe et al. 2019}. Irrigated agriculture includes significantly higher crude protein content and percent digestible protein than native grasses or browse ^{Mould and Robbins 1981}, making irrigated agriculture attractive and valuable for elk. Although irrigated agriculture makes up a small portion of resident elk year-round ranges (0.01 percent) elk disproportionately use it compared to other available habitat types ^{Middleton et al. 2013}. Additionally, elk group sizes are influenced by habitat type, and the probability that a group of elk will be large increases in grasslands ^{Gude et al. 2006, Proffitt et al. 2015}; elk aggregations tend to be largest on flat grasslands and smallest in forests ^{Gude et al. 2006, Proffitt et al. 2009, Proffitt et al. 2015}.

Predators

Predators are commonly implicated as one of the causes for problematic elk distributions and there is evidence that large predators and predation risk can affect elk seasonal distributions, habitat selection, aggregations, and group sizes ^{Mao et al. 2005, Cross et al. 2010b, Creel and Winnie 2005, Proffitt et al. 2009}. Elk may be less likely to migrate away from agricultural areas if they provide a refuge from predation ^{Barker et al. 2019b}, which may provide another incentive for elk to remain resident (nonmigratory) ^{Middleton et al. 2013}. The presence of wolves has been found to influence elk group size (dependent on habitat type) ^{Creel and Winnie 2005, Gude et al. 2006, Winnie and Creel 2007, Gower et al. 2009, Proffitt et al. 2009}.

The effects of large carnivores influencing elk distribution vary by species and location ^{Paterson et al. 2022b}. Other factors such as habitat quality or human presence were equally or more important than predators in influencing distribution. Elk adjust behavior and small-scale distribution in response to predators, but they are consistently more sensitive to human activity. For more information see **Predation** section.

Management Strategies

Problematic distributions which result in limited harvest confound management. Hunting affects distribution; hunting can be a source of problematic distributions, or a tool used to address problematic distributions. Hunting was shown to be the only effective tool in reducing the use of restricted hunting access areas when compared with hazing and herding ^{Burcham et al. 1999}. Hunting pressure can decrease elk group size ^{Gude et al. 2006, Proffitt et al. 2009}, and by manipulating levels of hunting pressure on public and private lands, managers may be able to affect elk distributions ^{Proffitt et al. 2016}. Game damage hunts increase elk movement more than the general hunting season and had the greatest ability to generally disperse elk ^{Cleveland et al. 2012}. However, manipulating hunting pressure may not have an effect on changing the selection patterns of individual elk after they are aware of specific resources like agriculture ^{Proffitt et al. 2016}. Punctuated hunting seasons (varying hunting pressure in space, time, and location) may be valuable in breaking cycles of habituation ^{Cleveland et al. 2012}.

Allowing limited hunting within a refuge area can reduce the proportion of elk using the area as well as time elk spend there ^{Burcham et al. 1999, Sergeev et al. 2022}. However, sometimes gaining hunting access to restricted areas is not an option and elk management strategies may not be viable if neighbors are making different choices regarding elk tolerance and hunting access ^{Haggerty and Travis 2006}. Therefore, managing the surrounding areas may be the only option. When hunting pressure varies spatially and temporally, elk cannot reliably determine safe or risky areas; doing so can limit use of refuges, particularly if the refuge experiences some level of hunting pressure ^{Proffitt et al. 2009, 2010, Cleveland et al. 2012}. Gradation in hunting pressure can reduce elk herds that seek areas with restricted hunting access ^{Proffitt et al. 2009}.

Liberalized hunting pressure on elk using public lands can result in increased use of refuge areas by elk. If elk

that occupy publicly accessible areas are consistently hunted more frequently and thus experience increased harvest, that segment of the elk population may be reduced^{Proffitt et al. 2016}, although inaccessible elk numbers may increase. To keep elk on public lands, recommendations include reduced hunting pressure on public land during archery season, more restrictive hunting seasons in areas with high motorized route densities, closure of certain motorized routes during archery and rifle hunting seasons, and increasing security in areas with high hunter effort^{Ranglack et al. 2017, Devoe et al. 2019}. Providing some level of hunter access across public and private lands will be necessary to manage elk population numbers and distribution^{Proffitt et al. 2016, DeVoe et al. 2019}. Enhancing habitat on public lands may be an effective tool for shifting problematic elk distributions away from private land onto public lands, but long periods following treatment are often necessary to generate desired future conditions.

Migration

Elk in Montana often make substantial migrations, ranging from 15 miles to 125 miles^{FWP 2020c}. Elk benefit from migration by gaining access to high-quality forage and reducing predation risk^{Fryxell and Sinclair 1988}. However, some migratory populations of elk have shown declining recruitment and may be struggling^{Middleton et al. 2013}. This begs the question if the benefits that these populations historically gained from migration still exist under current conditions, or if declines might be more severe if migrations no longer continued?



One Montana study showed that forage quality for migratory elk was lower than that for resident elk^{Barker et al. 2019a}. To gain the nutritional benefits of migration, elk need areas along the migration route that have predictable high-quality forage^{Barker et al. 2019b}. Habitat changes such as wildfire may create high-quality forage for elk. Because wildfires are unpredictable and managers often work to suppress them, habitat changes from wildfire may not be as common as they were historically. Habitat improvements such as silvicultural treatments or prescribed burns will result in quality habitat being consistently available if they are implemented in a mosaic pattern across space and periodically through time. Additionally, elk harvest may be a useful tool in reducing elk becoming resident, particularly in areas with irrigated agriculture on winter range^{Barker et al. 2019a}.

Exposure of migratory elk to predation varies and is difficult to generalize across migration routes, seasonal use areas, local predator communities, and other factors such as human activity^{Middleton et al. 2013, Hebblewhite and Merrill 2007}. Certain land uses that create refuge from harvest or predation, in addition to providing high quality forage, can contribute to elk becoming yearlong residents^{Barker et al. 2019 a & b}.

When considering elk management and harvest regulations, managers must consider the consequences of migratory elk being subject to different harvest pressure compared to resident elk. In some areas, proportionally more migrants that inhabit public lands are harvested compared to resident elk on private, inaccessible lands; alternatively, some migratory herds are not available for harvest during the general season because they are not present in the HD when hunting occurs. These scenarios may require tailored regulations to address migratory populations.

In February 2018, Department of the Interior Secretarial Order 3362 was signed. This Order is directed at improving habitat quality of big game winter range and migration corridors. This Order directs bureaus within the Department of the Interior to work in close partnership with states in a way that recognizes state authority to conserve and manage big game species and respects private property rights. In response to this Order, Montana developed a State Action Plan. The State Action Plan focuses efforts in Montana by prioritizing focal areas of interest. FWP considers elk migration when developing elk conservation projects and implementing elk management strategies, as described in FWP's Terrestrial Wildlife Movement and Migration Strategy.

Disease

Although elk may carry and transmit many viruses, bacteria, and parasites, there are several that are currently of concern in Montana. These are concerning due to their potential to have a negative population level effect on elk herds (i.e., CWD) or potential risk of transmission to domestic livestock, which may result in substantial financial and biological impacts on the livestock industry (i.e., brucellosis and bovine tuberculosis).

Chronic Wasting Disease

Chronic wasting disease is a fatal neurologic disease caused by an abnormally folded prion protein (referred to as a “prion”). The disease is known to affect elk, deer, moose, and caribou and there is no known cure. At an individual level, an elk infected with CWD will die. At a population level, reductions in population and decreases in population growth rates may occur

Gross and Miller 2001, Miller et al. 2008, Wasserberg et al. 2009, Almberg et al. 2011, Monello et al. 2014, Geremia et al. 2015, Edmunds et al. 2016, Samuel and Storm 2016. Animals infected with CWD may show no clinical symptoms of the disease for months or years, meaning that a harvested animal that appears healthy may still have CWD. If the animal has progressed to the symptomatic stage of disease, symptoms include behavioral changes, poor body condition, increased salivation, increased thirst, a “pot-bellied” appearance, incoordination, and loss of awareness.


CWD prions have been detected throughout the body of infected animals and can be transmitted through direct contact with bodily fluids such as saliva, feces, urine, semen, or any of the infected animal’s body parts after death. Additionally, CWD prions can persist in the environment for years. This means that susceptible animals can contract the disease after contacting contaminated soil or feed. Once CWD is present within a wild population or its environment, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to eliminate. To date, no reported cases of CWD infection have occurred in humans, but human health officials recommend avoiding consumption of the brain, spinal cord, eyes, spleen, tonsils, and lymph nodes of any harvested game animal, and to avoid consuming any animal known to be infected with CWD.

Montana first detected CWD in free-ranging elk during fall 2019, which followed the first CWD detection in deer in the state in 2017. Captive elk in Montana have tested positive for CWD in 1999 and 2020. Montana has a CWD Management Plan that was initially developed in 2017 and is updated periodically.

The Montana CWD Management Plan focuses on (1) managing CWD detection in new areas in Montana, (2) limiting the spread of CWD in Montana, (3) maintaining or reducing prevalence of CWD, (4) improving CWD communication and educational outreach, and (5) providing testing of hunter-harvested animals. FWP’s CWD Management Plan generally focuses on mule deer and white-tailed deer, because these species tend to exhibit the highest prevalence in areas where multiple cervid species overlap. Even in areas where CWD is detected first in elk, it is extremely likely that mule deer or white-tailed deer in the area are also infected and have higher prevalence of the disease. Consequently, when CWD is detected in an elk, FWP’s response will likely still focus on deer. Samples from elk will be collected, but intensity of sampling will be dependent on the individual circumstances. FWP will continue to use the CWD Management Plan to guide surveillance, monitoring, and management of CWD in Montana.

Brucellosis

Brucellosis is a disease caused by the bacteria *Brucella abortus*. The disease is present in free-ranging elk in and around the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, which poses a risk for transmission from elk to livestock. The disease typically causes abortion in pregnant females and is transmitted by oral contact with infected birth tissues and fluids Thorne et al. 1978, Cheville et al. 1998. Brucellosis was likely introduced from cattle to wildlife in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem shortly before 1917 Meagher and Meyer 1994. In 1954, the United States began a national



Courtesy of Jenny Jones

brucellosis eradication program which was successful in eradicating known brucellosis infections from cattle by the end of 2000 ^{Ragan 2002}. However, more recently, infections in domestic herds of cattle and domestic herds of bison have occurred around the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and were all presumably infected by free ranging elk ^{Beja-Pereira et al. 2009, Higgins et al. 2012, Rhyan et al. 2013, Kamath et al. 2016}. In Montana, brucellosis in elk is spreading beyond the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem to new elk populations ^{Cross et al. 2010a} and is expanding at a rate of 3 to 8 km per year ^{Kamath et al. 2016}. As of 2022, prevalence in elk populations in Montana ranged from 0 to 38 percent ^{FWP 2022}.

In elk, brucellosis can result in abortion during the first pregnancy after infection and can cause abortions in subsequent pregnancies, birth of weak calves with high mortality, or reduce pregnancy rates ^{Thorne et al. 1978, Cotterill et al. 2018, FWP 2022}. Although elk may retain antibodies to brucellosis long after an infection, only about 8 percent shed the bacteria during an abortion or live birth ^{FWP 2022}, and they likely only shed the bacteria for 1 to 2 years ^{Thorne et al. 1978, FWP 2022}. Detectable antibodies to brucellosis may diminish over time; however, the individual elk is likely still immune for their lifetime ^{Benavides et al. 2017}. Although it appears brucellosis can have a substantial effect on the fecundity of infected individuals, measurable effects on elk populations have not been detected.

Domestic livestock experience similar individual effects when infected with brucellosis. Typically, an abortion occurs, and other impacts may include subsequent abortions, weak calves, future infertility, and decreased milk production ^{Xavier et al. 2009, Herrera 2008}. Because of the potential for transmission to humans, brucellosis in livestock has very restrictive rules. These restrictions can result in reduced trade with other states and nations, increased testing and vaccination requirements, and potential quarantine or eradication of a herd, all of which come at financial costs to individual producers and the Montana livestock industry as a whole. Therefore, although brucellosis has little direct impact on elk populations, the transmission risk and the effects to the state's domestic livestock industry are substantial and ultimately result in decreased tolerance for elk on private lands.

Transmission risk varies by elk density, elk seroprevalence, and environmental conditions that vary by location and year ^{Cross et al. 2010 a & b, Proffitt et al. 2015, Rayl et al. 2019 & 2021}. The highest elk-livestock transmission risk in Montana is on private lands in the Madison and Paradise valleys and generally occurs in March and April, but may extend into May depending on snow conditions. Most of the transmission risk comes from large populations of migratory elk ^{Rayl et al. 2019 & 2021}; however, per-capita risk is higher from resident elk, so dissuading resident elk is expected to help reduce transmission ^{Rayl et al. 2021}. Decreasing elk density may decrease brucellosis seroprevalence; however, large reductions in elk density are likely required to see a noticeable effect on seroprevalence and this magnitude of reduction may not be feasible ^{Brennan et al. 2014, Proffitt et al. 2015}. In general, the acceptability of elk management tools in areas with brucellosis relies on multiple factors and the specific context of the situation ^{Metcalf et al. 2017}.

Elk management in areas with brucellosis often employ different strategies than those used in areas without brucellosis. Currently Montana has a plan for these specific areas: [Elk Management in Areas with Brucellosis: Work Plan](#). This plan was developed in 2012 by a citizen work group. The plan is reviewed by the citizen work group and Commission annually. The work plan has three fundamental goals: (1) reduce comingling of elk and livestock (primarily cattle); (2) reduce associated risk of brucellosis transmission; and (3) maintain elk on the landscape. The plan uses a stepwise implementation of non-lethal tools such as hazing, fencing, or habitat adjustments to reduce comingling of elk and livestock before considering lethal tools such as management hunts or kill permits. The work plan is considered a risk mitigation plan, not a disease eradication plan. FWP will continue to use the work plan to guide management of brucellosis in Montana.

Bovine Tuberculosis

Bovine tuberculosis is a bacterial disease caused by *Mycobacterium bovis*. Bovine TB is primarily a disease of cattle, but can affect many other species of mammals, including elk and humans. The disease can spill over from livestock to wildlife, which can then serve as a reservoir, potentially transmitting the disease to other susceptible wildlife and cattle. Livestock producers may be subject to substantial regulatory and economic consequences if bTB-free status is compromised; specific consequences could include strict quarantine, increased testing requirements, and depopulation of livestock herds. Bovine TB was found in elk at a Montana game farm in the early 1990s but has not been detected in free-ranging elk in Montana.

The disease is primarily spread from animal to animal via respiratory secretions but can be transmitted by

the fecal-oral route or by ingestion of contaminated food. Shared feeding is believed to be the primary transmission pathway between wildlife and cattle, as feed becomes contaminated with infectious saliva, urine, and feces.

There are no documented elk population declines caused by bTB. However, if bTB were found in Montana elk populations, there would be decreased tolerance for elk on the landscape, likely resulting in aggressive management to decrease elk populations.

Montana currently has a Montana Bovine Tuberculosis Surveillance Plan ^{FWP 2019b} which includes goals of (1) early detection of spillover to wildlife, (2) preventing the disease from becoming endemic in wildlife, and (3) preparing to respond with increased surveillance in the event of a wildlife detection to determine the prevalence and distribution of the disease. If bTB were found in free-ranging elk in Montana, the current surveillance plan would provide guidance for sampling to determine the distribution and prevalence. Following those initial efforts, a management response would be crafted based on the information gained.

Harvest Strategies

Currently in Montana, General Elk Licenses are unlimited in number with one license available to each hunter for Montana residents. Additionally, a hunter may hold an Elk B License, allocated via random draw or purchased over the counter. B Licenses are valid for the take of antlerless elk only. A hunter may hold up to three elk licenses in a year (either three B Licenses or two B Licenses and one General Elk License). Elk permits, which validate a General License in a specific area, are allocated through a random draw; an elk permit does not allow the hunter to harvest additional elk. An elk permit allows hunters to hunt in a restricted area, restricted time period, or for a specific sex of elk where there are other restrictions in place for General Elk License holders. Elk harvest in Montana is allocated by using combinations of valid license types, permits, and season dates. Limited numbers of licenses and permits are available to nonresident hunters as well.



Antlerless Hunting Regulation Types

Allowing harvest of antlerless elk on the General Elk License is a common method of allocating antlerless harvest and has been used in Montana longer than the other antlerless harvest regulation types described in this section. There are various ways to allocate antlerless harvest with a General Elk License, such as:

- Authorized for the entire season
- Authorized for only a portion of the season
- Authorized for only the archery season
- Authorized for youth and holders of a Permit to Hunt From Vehicle (PTHFV)
- Authorized only on certain landownership types, such as private land only

As of the 2022 hunting season, 60 percent of HDs have General Elk License antlerless opportunity offered for at least a portion of the HD and portion of the season.

B Licenses were first used in 2004 which allowed the take of a second elk for each hunter. In 2020, hunters were authorized to harvest up to three elk per hunter. B Licenses may be limited by a quota or unlimited and sold over the counter. B Licenses may only be valid for certain dates, or certain landownership types, such as private land only. As of the 2022 hunting season, 57 percent of HDs offer limited B Licenses and 37 percent offer unlimited B Licenses (10 percent of HDs offer both limited and unlimited B Licenses).

Shoulder seasons are defined as any firearm season printed in the hunting regulations that occurs outside the five-week general firearm season between August 15 and February 15. The primary purpose of shoulder seasons is to supplement existing antlerless harvest. Montana started using shoulder seasons on a trial basis in winter 2015. From 2016 to 2022, shoulder seasons were used in 44 to 54 HDs depending on the year. As of the 2022 hunting season, 38 percent of HDs use shoulder seasons (22 percent of HDs have both early and late, 6 percent offer early only, 10 percent offer late only). General Elk Licenses, Limited B Licenses, and Unlimited B Licenses are used in different HDs to allocate antlerless harvest during elk shoulder seasons.

Bull Hunting Regulation Types

Some areas in Montana offer limited elk permits that hunters must apply for and draw via random allocation. Demand for these limited opportunities is high because they often provide the opportunity to pursue older, larger-antlered bulls. This regulation type typically allows for greater bull survivorship into older age classes and increased bull:cow ratios but limits overall hunter opportunity ^{Bender and Miller 1999}. As of 2022, about 24 percent of HDs in Montana use limited permits for bull elk hunting; Montana did not make use of limited permits for bull elk hunting until 1964.




Figure 15. Bull hunting opportunity types in Montana 1950 to 2020.

Antler Point Restrictions – Restricting bull harvest on the General Elk License to only branch-antlered bulls and brow-tined bulls are regulation types that have been used in Montana as early as 1940. The regulation types became popular during the mid-1980s and 1990s with the intent to increase the total number of bulls that survived the hunting season. The brow-tined bull regulation type is still common in Montana. A study conducted on these regulations indicated that about 15 percent of spikes were illegally harvested ^{Hamlin and Ross 2002}. The brow-tined bull regulation has been successful in increasing total post season bull:cow ratios, although this increase occurred slowly ^{Hamlin and Ross 2002}. The regulation type does not increase the number of mature (over 4-year-old) bulls ^{Hernbrode 1987, Carpenter 1991, Bender and Miller 1999, Vore and DeSimone 1991, Hamlin and Ross 2002}. As of 2022, 58 percent of HDs in Montana have a brow-tined bull on a General Elk License regulation type.

Another form of an antler point restriction regulation used in Montana allows spike bull harvest on the general license while limiting brow-tined bull harvest by permit. Because some yearling bulls have branches or brow-tines longer than 4 inches, they may not be lawfully harvested using the General Elk License protected by permits. This regulation type was implemented in the Elkhorn Mountains (HD 380) in 1987 and in HD 339 in 1996. Under this regulation in HD 380, the number of bulls 2.5 years or older increased, the annual bull mortality was halved (45 percent), and the percent of branch-antlered bulls increased from about 4 percent to 40 to 50 percent on winter range ^{FWP 1990} when compared with the previous regulation type that allowed any

antlered bull to be harvested with a General Elk License. This regulation type allows spike harvest to continue with the General Elk License while increasing the proportion of older age class bulls.

The implementation of other types of point restrictions on bull harvest is a topic occasionally raised by hunters. One such example is to restrict harvest to only those bulls with at least six points on one antler. These regulation types focus harvest on the single segment of the population that hunters tend to want more of (older age class) rather than spreading harvest across multiple age classes. Eventually this will decrease the average age of the male segment of the population, reduce the number of larger antlered animals by protecting only the smaller, younger males, and potentially promote genetics of individuals who will never reach the number of points that would make them eligible for harvest.

ANTLERLESS HARVEST MATRIX



This section represents available antlerless harvest opportunities during each of five seasons (early shoulder season, archery season, general rifle season, muzzleloader season, and late shoulder season). Within each season's table, the most liberal antlerless harvest opportunity is at the top with the most restrictive harvest opportunity at the bottom. Using a combination of seasonal opportunities, the Commission can liberalize or restrict harvest as necessary to meet population demographic objectives, distribution objectives, and/or recreation objectives as described in the HD sections. It is not required to move up and down through the tables one row at a time, i.e., at times season proposals may skip rows to move to more liberal or more restrictive season types.

There may be instances where increasing harvest opportunity does not result in an increase in realized harvest. Additionally, increased opportunity may result in a distributional shift that results in elk being unavailable or inaccessible for harvest. These are potential outcomes considered when determining the appropriate season type to propose for an HD.



Early Antlerless Season Options (Early Shoulder Season)		Quota Type ¹
Liberal   Restrictive	August 15 to General Season opener: General License opportunity for antlerless elk and B Licenses	Unlimited Limited
	August 15 to General Season opener: B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited Limited
	August 15 to General Season opener: General License opportunity for antlerless elk and B Licenses	Limited
	August 15 to General Season opener: General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	August 15 to Archery-Only Season opener: General License opportunity for antlerless elk and B Licenses	Unlimited
	August 15 to Archery-Only Season opener: B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
	August 15 to Archery-Only Season opener: General License opportunity for antlerless elk and B Licenses	Limited
	August 15 to Archery-Only Season opener: General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	August 15 to Archery-Only Season opener: Limited OTC B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Limited
	No antlerless opportunity during Early Season	

Table 2. Antlerless harvest opportunities during early antlerless season (early shoulder season).

¹ Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.


6-Week Archery Only Season Options		Quota Type ¹
Liberal  Restrictive	6-week Archery-Only Season with General License and B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
		Limited
	6-week Archery-Only Season with B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
	6-week Archery-Only Season with General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	6-week Archery-Only Season with B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Limited
	1-6 weeks of Archery-Only Season allows General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	No antlerless opportunity during Archery-Only Season	

Table 3. Antlerless harvest opportunities during archery-only season.

¹ Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.


5-Week General Season Options		Quota Type ¹
Liberal  Restrictive	5-week General Season General Elk License antlerless opportunity and B Licenses	Unlimited
	5-week General Season with B Licenses	Unlimited
	5 week General Season General Elk License antlerless opportunity and Limited B Licenses	Limited
	5-week General Season General Elk License antlerless opportunity	
	1 - 4 weeks General Season General Elk License antlerless opportunity	
	5-week General Season with B Licenses	Limited
	5-week General Season youth ONLY opportunity	
	General season antlerless with quota	
	1-4 week General Season with B Licenses	Limited
	No antlerless opportunity during General Season	

Table 4. Antlerless harvest opportunities during general rifle season.

1 Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.

9-Day Muzzleloader-Only Season Options		Quota Type ¹
Liberal  Restrictive	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with General License and B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
		Limited
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Limited
	No antlerless opportunity during Muzzleloader-Only Season	

Table 5. Antlerless harvest opportunities during muzzleloader-only season.

1 Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.


	Late Antlerless Season Options (Late Shoulder Season)	Quota Type ¹
Liberal  Restrictive	End of General Season to February 15: General License and B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited Limited
	End of General Season to ending prior to February 15: General License and B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited Limited
	End of General Season to February 15: B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
	End of General Season to February 15: General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	End of General Season to February 15: B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Limited
	End of General Season to ending prior to February 15: B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Unlimited
	End of General Season to ending prior to February 15: General License opportunity for antlerless elk	
	End of General Season to ending prior to February 15: B License opportunity for antlerless elk	Limited
	No late season antlerless opportunity	

Table 6. Antlerless harvest opportunities during late antlerless season (late shoulder season).

¹ Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.



This section represents available antlered harvest opportunities during each of three seasons (archery season, general rifle season, and muzzleloader season). Within each season's table, the most liberal antlered harvest opportunity is at the top with the most restrictive harvest opportunity at the bottom. Using a combination of seasonal opportunities, the Commission can liberalize or restrict harvest as necessary to meet population demographic, distribution, and/or recreation objectives as described in the HD sections. It is not required to move up and down through the tables one row at a time, i.e., at times season proposals may skip rows to move to more liberal or more restrictive season types.

There may be instances where increasing harvest opportunity does not result in an increase in realized harvest. Additionally, increased opportunity may result in a distributional shift that results in elk being unavailable or inaccessible for harvest. These are considerations that FWP will use to determine the appropriate season type to propose for an HD.

Bull Management in HDs chronically and significantly above population goal range

As part of biennial season setting process, FWP will provide the Commission a list of HDs that are using limited either-sex or limited bull permits and are considered chronically and significantly above the population size goals listed in this plan. Chronically and significantly above population goal range is defined as being the midrange of the population goal above the top of the goal range (i.e., if the goal range is 100 to 200, then mid-range is 150 and mid-range above the top would be 350) for three or more consecutive years without a demonstrable change in population trajectory.



6-week Archery-Only Season Options		Quota Type ¹
Liberal   Restrictive	6-week Archery-Only Season with General Elk License opportunity for any bull	
	6-week Archery-Only Season with General Elk License opportunity for brow-tined bull	
	6 week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for any bull	Unlimited ²
	6 week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Unlimited ²
	1-5 week Archery-Only Season with General Elk License opportunity for any bull	
	1-5 week Archery-Only Season with General Elk License opportunity for brow-tined bull	
	6-week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for any bull and 6-week spike harvest allowed on General Elk License	Limited
	6-week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for any bull and 1-5 week spike harvest allowed on General Elk License	Limited
	6 week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for any bull	Limited
	6 week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Limited
	1-5 week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for any bull	Limited
	1-5 week Archery-Only Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Limited
	No antlered opportunity during Archery-Only Season	

Table 7. Antlered harvest opportunities during archery-only season.

1 Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

2 Unlimited bull permits are located in the table based on the level of opportunity they provide; however, past experience has demonstrated that at times, use of unlimited permits increases interest above that of general license opportunity, thus in reality they may be more liberal than indicated in the table.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.



	5-week General Season Options	Quota Type ¹
Liberal   Restrictive	5-week General Season with General Elk License opportunity for any bull	
	5-week General Season with General Elk License opportunity for brow-tined bull	
	5-week General Season with permits valid for any bull	Unlimited ²
	5-week General Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Unlimited ²
	1-5 week General Season with General Elk License opportunity for any bull	
	1-5 week General Season with General Elk License opportunity for brow-tined bull	
	5-week General Season with permits valid for any bull and 5-week spike harvest allowed on General Elk License	Limited
	5-week General Season with permits valid for any bull and 1-5 week spike harvest allowed on General Elk License	Limited
	5-week General Season with permits valid for any bull	Limited
	5-week General Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Limited
	1-4 week General Season with permits valid for any bull	Limited
	1-4 week General Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Limited
	No antlered opportunity during General Season	

Table 8. Antlered harvest opportunities during general rifle season.

1 Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

2 Unlimited bull permits are located in the table based on the level of opportunity they provide; however, past experience has demonstrated that at times, use of unlimited permits increases interest above that of general license opportunity, thus in reality they may be more liberal than indicated in the table.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.

	9-Day Muzzleloader Only Season Options	Quota Type ¹
Liberal   Restrictive	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with General Elk License opportunity for any bull	
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with General Elk License opportunity for brow-tined bull	
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with permits valid for any bull	Unlimited ²
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Unlimited ²
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with permits valid for any bull and spike harvest allowed on General Elk License	Limited
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with permits valid for any bull	Limited
	9-day Muzzleloader-Only Season with permits valid for brow-tined bull	Limited
	No antlered opportunity during Muzzleloader-Only Season	

Table 9. Antlered harvest opportunity during muzzleloader-only season.

1 Within a limited quota permit option, changing permit quotas can further restrict or liberalize opportunities within those season types.

2 Unlimited bull permits are located in the table based on the level of opportunity they provide; however, past experience has demonstrated that at times, use of unlimited permits increases interest above that of general license opportunity, thus in reality they may be more liberal than indicated in the table.

Note: In some cases, increased opportunity does not result in increased harvest, specifically if/when additional hunting pressure shifts elk distribution to areas where harvest cannot be achieved. The ultimate season structure for any hunting district will rely on several factors including status relative to population goals, other goals of the HD, and social considerations. Per MCA § 87-1-301, the Commission has full authority to set elk hunting seasons.

STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT DIRECTION



Statewide management direction was generated using a combination of citizens group inputs, public comment input, and FWP staff input. It is intended to guide statewide programs and practices that affect elk management. The statewide management direction is organized in a format that includes 7 objectives, 20 goals, and numerous measures and strategies. Goals are individual pieces necessary to achieve the objective. Measures of Success define criteria for success and will be evaluated by FWP to track progress. Strategies are tools FWP can use to accomplish the goals and objectives. At times, certain goals and the strategies necessary to accomplish them may be in conflict with other goals and strategies. When this occurs, FWP can be more transparent in the tradeoffs associated with prioritizing certain goals over others.



Objective 1: Resolve disagreement about population objectives and how they are set and implemented

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
Maximize public input in setting elk objectives	Implement feedback collection methods during elk plan development and during periodic reviews of plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide at least one in-person meeting where each HD's population Goal is reviewed and feedback is collected • Provide an online comment option with specific information for each HD/population Goal; feedback collected by HD • Use human dimensions surveys regarding population objectives for specific HDs. Use elk IPM, historical population data, and recent elk habitat research to inform potential population objective ranges for survey.
Maximize local grassroots input	Local working groups are assembled and hold annual meetings to discuss elk management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where feasible, existing or new local working groups including hunters, landowners, outfitters, pertinent wildlife staff, and interested community members are assembled to assist with developing and evaluating objectives, provide comment on season structures, and discuss any other issues with elk management in the area

Objective 2: Resolve conflicts in concentrations, distributions and behaviors of elk

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
Maintain hunting as a primary tool for elk population management	99 % or more of elk lethally removed by humans are hunter harvested; less than 1% of elk lethally removed by humans are done using alternative methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider alternative population reduction methods only if the most liberal antlerless season available is applied and if hunting access is considered adequate, yet populations still remain higher than desired or if hunting is not considered a safe option under the circumstances • Evaluate use and timing of shoulder seasons • Consider redefining the timing and length of the current 5-week general season to maximize effectiveness in areas where population control is an issue; effectiveness for alternative season structures would be considered, and public acceptability of having inconsistent season lengths and timing across HDs would be evaluated



Objective 2: Resolve conflicts in concentrations, distributions and behaviors of elk (continued)

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
Maximize partnerships between private landowners, land management agencies, and FWP	Implement a check box consent included on game damage hunt roster sign-up. Provide hunter contact information in batches to the landowner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow hunters to provide FWP permission to share their contact information with landowners when they are selected for a management or game damage hunt on that property, so the landowner can contact them directly (in situations where this helps) • Allow hunters to provide FWP permission to share their contact information with landowners when they apply for a special permit or B License, so landowners seeking hunters/harvest on their property can contact permit/B License holders if desired
	FWP is annually providing habitat recommendations to land management agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FWP provides habitat project recommendations to land management agencies. FWP will revisit and reconsider previous recommendations that may no longer apply. • Reaffirm FWP’s relationships with USFS, BLM, and DNRC • Create and study new methods for defraying damage to fences and crops while improving landowner relations
	See additional applicable Strategies and Measures within the “Maximize satisfaction with elk distribution in MT for: Hunters, Landowners, Wildlife Enthusiasts, Outfitters, Ag Producers” Goal section	
Minimize prevalence and spread of CWD in Montana	Maintain prevalence rates below 5% in elk that have been sampled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow CWD Plan (e.g., minimize spread by humans, reduce concentrations around localized food sources, etc.)



Objective 2: Resolve conflicts in concentrations, distributions and behaviors of elk (continued)

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
Maximize hunter access to elk	Maintain or increase number of Block Management Areas (BMAs) with elk opportunities statewide annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on access programs that provide elk hunting opportunities in existing FWP programs (including outreach to landowner community) • Work with private landowners to increase the number of public hunters allowed access via FWPs contractual public elk hunting access agreements • Hire and maintain sufficient numbers of hunting access technicians and other staff to meet the needs of the Block Management Program • Develop access easements or lease program to provide elk hunting opportunity on private land • Implement an online reservation system for Type 2 BMAs to more efficiently manage hunters and increase opportunities for elk hunters to obtain access (available for landowners that prefer this method) • Promote use of the ‘Hunter/Landowner Stewardship Course’ by updating and improving the course, providing an incentive for those who complete the course, and ensuring adequate number of FWP staff to implement/promote • Increase education/training about FWP’s Hunt Planner • Increase Block Management incentives • Continue to support the Private Land Public Wildlife Council and facilitate implementation of their recommendations
	Maintain or increase number of Public Access Land Agreements or Access Public Land agreements annually that include public access for elk hunting, where compatible with other objectives such as elk security habitat	
	Maintain or increase number of elk hunting access agreements annually	
	Total number of hunters who have passed the Hunter/Landowners Stewardship course is greater than 30,000	
	Maintain or increase acreage within elk distribution enrolled in Block Management Program	



Objective 2: Resolve conflicts in concentrations, distributions and behaviors of elk (continued)

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
<p>Maximize satisfaction with elk distribution in MT for: Hunters, Landowners, Wildlife Enthusiasts, Outfitters and Ag Producers</p>	<p>Maintain or increase percent of public land that is considered secure elk habitat in each region</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote collaboration among neighboring land owners and land managers to homogenize elk hunting pressure across land ownerships, thereby reducing elk refuge situations and maintaining a more desirable distribution of elk • Use hunt information coordinators and hunting access technicians to efficiently manage hunter distribution and pressure across BMAs and broader areas that allow public hunting access; hunt coordinators will submit a postseason summary including hunter and harvest data
	<p>FWP will implement projects to improve elk forage on WMAs as necessary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve elk forage habitat on state and federal public lands; each region will identify opportunities to improve elk forage on public lands not managed by FWP • Formally define elk security standards describing habitat features such as open road densities/distance to open roads, vegetation and topography that will encourage elk use of public lands, based on recently published research; FWP will provide comment on public land management consistent with FWP elk security habitat standards
	<p>Regional staff will meet with land managers at least every two years to share priority habitat improvement information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build from research results and recommendations to limit the impacts of non-hunting recreation on elk distribution during winter, calving and hunting seasons • FWP will continue facilitating elk movement and migration by working closely with private landowners and public land managers as outlined in FWP's Terrestrial Wildlife Movement and Migration Strategy
	<p>Elk population status (below, at, above) relative to population goal will be shared with FWP-assembled citizen groups that are tasked with making recommendations for mountain lion populations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In areas where elk are not meeting objectives, integrate existing data and expert opinion into a coordinated, adaptive management program; use predictive models (where available) and monitoring of elk populations and distribution, incorporating the effects of carnivore, habitat, hunter access, and harvest management, to clarify why elk populations are outside of objective ranges and improve the ability for management decisions to result in elk populations within objective ranges in the future



Objective 3: Reduce elk impacts on agriculture

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
<p>Minimize impacts on agricultural production, private rangeland, and infrastructure</p>	<p>A majority of surveyed landowners feel they have tools available to them to minimize elk impacts to their operation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use FWP Game Damage Program to determine eligibility and provide tools available within program • Provide season structure that provides private landowners harvest tools for their properties • Use herders/hazers to disperse elk causing damage • Streamline hiring process of herders/hazers • Promote wildlife-friendly fencing construction • Encourage and fund permanent solutions to chronic/recurring game damage situations • Add text messaging as an additional notification for hunters who are selected for game damage hunts with a response window of 24 hours to respond if interested
	<p>Game Damage Program becomes more efficient and effective; hunters are notified and arrive to hunt area faster; a higher proportion of initial notified hunters accept/participate in game damage hunts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide list of hunters who accepted to landowners, when desired, for landowners to contact those hunters when the elk are present • Pre-approve those for landowners who have had game damage complaints in the past and are eligible for assistance • Add second sign-up period for hunt roster for hunts that will occur after the General Rifle season • Encourage neighbor-to-neighbor discussions about the impacts of hunter access decisions on one another



Objective 3: Reduce elk impacts on agriculture (continued)

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
Minimize transmission of brucellosis to livestock	Trend of annual confirmed positive elk-livestock transmission cases in the Designated Surveillance Area (DSA) is not increasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and maintain annual Brucellosis Work Plan and present to Commission for approval annually • Annually summarize number of elk captured, maps of movements, brucellosis distribution, seroprevalence rates in elk herds and assess transmission risk to local livestock • Annually summarize number of hazers and hazing hours, management removals, management hunts per complaint
	Producer satisfaction with FWP risk reduction efforts at regional level is not decreasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employ fencing, management hunts, management removals, and hazing as needed, following research recommendations and guidelines • Continue work with Department of Livestock to capture, collar, and test elk in peripheral areas to the DSA to determine distribution of brucellosis in elk to inform Board of Livestock decisions about the DSA boundary • FWP will partner with other groups (Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Master Hunters) to improve the general understanding of diseased elk and possible solutions to protect working ag lands and the habitat they provide
	Annually review elk-livestock brucellosis transmission risk including the latest information on elk population size, distribution, seroprevalence and research findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FWP will work with the hunting community to increase their awareness of brucellosis and what effects it has on livestock producers • Work with absentee landowners to educate them on the need to implement strategies such as hazing • Commit to long-term research related to brucellosis in elk herds with the goal of identifying ways to reduce elk-livestock transmission risk, such as manipulating elk populations, migratory propensity, seroprevalence (if possible), or developing new techniques to reduce contact with cattle
	Annually review management tools' ability to minimize transmission risk and develop research projects to test new management techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop research projects to test new management techniques



Objective 4: Provide both hunting opportunity and hunt quality

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
Maintain over-the-counter opportunity to hunt elk	Montana residents have the opportunity to hunt elk somewhere in the state using a General Elk License or an Elk B License purchased over the counter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide General Elk License opportunity (antlered, antlerless, or either-sex) in as much area of the state as possible, given other management direction specified in the elk plan or other socio-political or biological issues • Provide over-the-counter Elk B Licenses or large quotas of limited-draw Elk B Licenses (that may go to surplus over-the-counter sale if not fully prescribed) for elk populations in districts or regions that can handle that level of opportunity
Minimize impacts of crowding on hunter experience	A majority of survey respondents report the number of hunters observed per day is acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct resident hunter satisfaction survey to determine the extent to which crowding is negatively impacting hunter experiences in each region • Repeat hunter satisfaction survey every five years for continuous monitoring of hunter crowding perceptions • Consider alternative season structures that limit crowding • When limiting hunters in an area, consider the impacts of hunter displacement resulting in increased hunter pressure/crowding in other areas
Maintain limited-draw permit areas for hunting mature bulls	Hunters have the opportunity to apply for limited-draw permit areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use limited-draw permit areas for bull or either-sex hunting opportunity where public access to elk could be high enough to be detrimental to the elk population and/or either-sex permits to create an older-age bull structure as directed by the Elk Management Plan
Maximize the use of the general rifle season as a primary management tool, reducing the need for additional hunts	Harvest during the General Season is greater than harvest in other seasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adjusting general rifle season structure if antlerless harvest during the general season is less than antlerless harvest in other seasons • Consider redefining the timing and length of the current 5-week general season to maximize effectiveness in areas where population control is an issue
Maintain the availability of a variety of hunting tools for addressing elk conflicts	The number of hunting season types is maintained or increased from those available when the Elk Management Plan is finalized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain flexible season types for use as needed • Eliminate sideboards on using shoulder seasons so that they can be used as needed, as long as population is not below population goal
	Tools like shoulder seasons are not linked to population status relative to population goal (no longer required to be above population goal)	



Objective 5: Resolve conflict regarding recognizing landowners for providing elk habitat

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies			
<p>Maximize landowner-hunter cooperation with elements of the Elk Management Plan</p>	<p>FWP hosts “Elk Summit” within first year of new plan adoption</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present information on new elk plan, such as research used in plan development, how the new plan will function, partnership stories, etc. • Market existing material (videos, etc.) on hunter and landowner behavior in more places to make it more accessible • Create more inclusive ways for the general public to receive, contribute to, and find data • See additional applicable Strategies and Measures within the “Maximize public input in setting elk objectives” and “Maximize local grassroot input” Goals sections 			
<p>Maximize opportunity for FWP to improve hunter-landowner relations</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Increase certifications from hunter-landowner stewardship online training</p> </td> <td rowspan="3" style="padding: 5px; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update, improve, and promote hunter-landowner stewardship online training • Incentivize collaboration among stakeholders • Promote the importance of hunter-landowner relations to the CACs; CACs will be asked to provide ideas for promoting hunter-landowner relations • Develop a public hunter/bowhunter education advisory group to improve existing hunter/bowhunter education </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Landowner relations is a topic at one Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting in each region annually</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <p>Make improvements to landowner relations portion of existing FWP hunter education courses</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Increase certifications from hunter-landowner stewardship online training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update, improve, and promote hunter-landowner stewardship online training • Incentivize collaboration among stakeholders • Promote the importance of hunter-landowner relations to the CACs; CACs will be asked to provide ideas for promoting hunter-landowner relations • Develop a public hunter/bowhunter education advisory group to improve existing hunter/bowhunter education 	<p>Landowner relations is a topic at one Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting in each region annually</p>	<p>Make improvements to landowner relations portion of existing FWP hunter education courses</p>
<p>Increase certifications from hunter-landowner stewardship online training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update, improve, and promote hunter-landowner stewardship online training • Incentivize collaboration among stakeholders • Promote the importance of hunter-landowner relations to the CACs; CACs will be asked to provide ideas for promoting hunter-landowner relations • Develop a public hunter/bowhunter education advisory group to improve existing hunter/bowhunter education 				
<p>Landowner relations is a topic at one Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting in each region annually</p>					
<p>Make improvements to landowner relations portion of existing FWP hunter education courses</p>					



Objective 6: Promote good hunter behavior

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
<p>Maximize internal and external programs that promote ethical hunter behaviors</p>	<p>Promote Master Hunter Program during scheduled hunter education classes, and create press releases annually</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publicly support external ethical hunter programs. Examples of support include promoting the program during hunter education classes and via press releases as well as providing instructors when requested • Develop a public hunter/bowhunter education advisory group to improve existing hunter/bowhunter education courses
	<p>Make improvements to hunter ethics portion of existing FWP hunter education courses</p>	
<p>Maintain the fair chase principles in the management of hunting and regulation of hunting technology</p>	<p>Encourage commission to use existing commission policies or develop new ones when regulating hunting technology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FWP requests the Commission use existing commission policies, such as the “Fish and Wildlife Commission Policy on Archery Season Intent and Equipment Evaluation Criteria” or develop new similar policies when making decisions on regulation of hunting technology as it relates to fair chase • Enhance the fair chase portion of the hunter education class

Objective 7: Promote Good Governance

Goals	Measures of Success	Strategies
<p>Specific elk management strategies and actions in Montana’s new Elk Management Plan must be consistent with current rules and statutes</p>	<p>FWP Legal will identify any practices inconsistent with statutes prior to each legislative session</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FWP Legal Department will review Elk Management Plan for compliance with existing rules and statutes





Elk are typically surveyed by HD, and occasionally multiple HDs when elk from multiple HDs mix or congregate during the survey period. The 2005 Elk Management Plan local scale was the Elk Management Unit (EMU). FWP still recognizes that elk interchange and overlap at the EMU scale (Figure 16). However, because FWP and the public tend to focus on the HD scale, and regulations are set at the HD scale, HDs are now used to describe local scale objectives and goals.




Figure 16. This figure includes 2023 EMUs. FWP recognizes elk interchange, overlap, and similarity in elk management circumstances at the EMU scale.

The following HD information includes characteristics and description of each area, tables and figures of elk counts, classification data, harvest, and hunter effort where those data are available. Data used to generate HD information were obtained from FWP’s Hunt Planner Mapping Application (HD size, primary habitat, and ownership), FWP’s Harvest Reports (harvest and hunter effort), and FWP elk survey data (elk counts, recruitment, bull:cow ratios).

HD management direction was generated using a combination of public and FWP input and is tailored to the unique circumstances of each HD or group of HDs. It is intended to define management goals at the HD or multi-HD scale. It is organized in a format that includes objectives, goals, measures, and strategies. A standard set of three objectives was used for nearly every local scale. Those objectives include:

- Manage toward elk population size and demographic targets.
- Maintain an acceptable elk distribution.
- Provide public elk recreation opportunities.

Goals are the individual pieces necessary to achieve the objective and vary depending on the unique circumstances of each HD or group of HDs. Measures define criteria for success and will be evaluated by FWP to track progress. Strategies are tools FWP can use to accomplish the goals and objectives. Setting numerous goals and measures for every local scale better captures the complexity and diversity of elk management components. When FWP periodically evaluates the measures of success, not all measures for an HD or group of HDs may be met. This should not be viewed as management within the HD failing as a whole, but rather should highlight the pieces of elk management that could be improved upon. Failure to meet a measure could be attributed to conflicting goals or strategies. When this occurs, FWP can be more transparent about the tradeoffs associated with prioritizing certain goals over others. The evaluation process can also highlight the components of elk management that are considered successful or satisfactory.

As noted previously, former “population objectives” from the 2005 Elk Management Plan are now called “population goals”. Additionally, most population size goals will be evaluated using an average of counts (most commonly 3-year average for annually surveyed HDs and 4-year average for biennially surveyed HDs). Using an average of counts can help buffer against survey variability and requires interpretation of multiple years of count data and the trend of counts. At times, when population counts are trending upward or downward, using an average may result in a lag time before the average moves up or down drastically. However, in instances where counts are variable through time, using an average can help mitigate variation in data resulting from fluctuating survey conditions. Also, using multiple data points to make management recommendations was supported through public comment received during scoping and draft plan comment periods. FWP is required by statute to release annual game counts (MCA § 87-1-201), and thus will release both the annual count, and the average of recent counts. Population status (at, over or below) will be based on the average of counts.

Elk population levels and bull:cow ratios have broad biological sideboards, but social values, landowner tolerance, and advocacies can contribute to narrower management prescriptions. Similarly, non-elk elements like hunter distribution, density, and access can have impactful relationships with elk and their management. These circumstances are often reflected in the Commission direction to which FWP manages. Both biological and social elements relevant to elk management in specific areas are identified in this plan.

The former elk management plan (2005) included the following statement on page 55: *“Elk populations in portions of some EMUs may be almost entirely inaccessible to hunters during the general hunting season or accessible to only a few hunters. To avoid over-harvest of accessible elk on public lands or private lands open to hunting, the inaccessible elk may not be included in objective numbers. Trend count number objectives may include only elk normally accessible to general hunting (if they are a distinct segment), though hunter access negotiations will continue. Elk occupying these ‘refuges’ may be counted separately where practical (if they are a distinct segment) and sub-objectives established that could be operative if access negotiations are successful. If significant harvest of these ‘refuge’ elk is possible with special management at some times and locations, they should be included in objective levels.”* This statement is omitted from this plan for the following reasons:

- Elk are a public resource managed by FWP to benefit the public. FWP’s management responsibility apply to all elk, not only those elk that are available for general public harvest.
- Elk that are not available for public harvest during hunting season do impact habitat and other wildlife throughout the year. Therefore, neglecting to consider them when evaluating the overall elk population in a given area and setting population goals based on inaccurate information would be irresponsible.
- The term “inaccessible elk” is not well defined. First, hunting access would need to be defined with a common understanding among stakeholders, and current definitions of hunting access range from paid access by one individual to unlimited free access for the public. Second, if a common definition could

- be determined, FWP does not have the resources to track access status across all properties through time. Third, there is no definition for how long or frequently an elk would need to be on “inaccessible” property to be considered “inaccessible.” For example, if an elk is on public, accessible land during archery season, then moves to “inaccessible” land during rifle season, then back to public, accessible land during shoulder season, would it be most appropriately classified as “accessible” or “inaccessible?” FWP does not have fine-scale data on individual elk movements throughout the year, and collecting this data with a degree of reliability would be extremely difficult and resource intensive.
- Biologists fly aerial surveys to count elk during winter or spring (or summer for migratory herds). Aerial surveys are not conducted during archery or general rifle seasons. At the earliest, elk surveys are conducted in mid to late December with most being conducted January through March. During these surveys biologists are counting congregated wintering herds, or congregations on spring green-up. The number of counted elk that were on “inaccessible” property three to six months prior cannot be determined at that time. Elk surveys are not conducted during the general and archery hunting seasons because elk are not highly visible during this time due to lack of snow and less congregation in open areas. Additionally, surveying can cause short-term displacement or distributional changes which can temporarily disrupt hunting.
- FWP has included distribution goals within this plan. Some of these goals are intended to recognize and address problematic distributions.
- The tools to address “elk refuge” situations, such as offering different levels of harvest opportunity across ownership types, are currently available for the Commission. These tools can allow for hunting pressure to be applied in areas that elk are using (e.g., private lands) and limited in areas where elk are desired (e.g., public lands). Therefore, quantifying the numbers of “inaccessible elk” vs. “accessible elk” is not necessary for FWP to recommend the harvest tools available when attempting to address issues surrounding distribution.

Special Management Districts for Bull Elk

This plan recommends designating some HDs as “Special Management Districts for Bull Elk” (SMDs). Hunting districts recommended to be SMDs include: 250, 339, 380, 401, 410, 411, 412, 417, 424, 425, 442, 426, 441, 445, 455, 447, 502, 515, 535, 555, 575, 590, 620, 621, 622, 630, 690, 700, 702, 704, 705 (Figure 17). These HDs have a history of special bull management and there is public support for maintaining special bull management in these areas. HDs that are SMDs are identified as such in the heading of the HD section. All SMDs have bull:cow ratio goals that are higher than the minimum threshold of 10:100 used in other HDs. Most of the SMDs have bull:cow ratio goals of 30 to 45:100. Exceptions include HD 250 (bull:cow ratio goal of 20:100) and HDs 380, 339, and 401 (bull:cow ratio goals of 15:100). HDs 250, 380, and 339 have lower bull:cow ratio goals because they offer a hybrid of special management for bulls while maintaining high opportunity for bulls. HD 401 has bull elk that move into and out of Canada on an irregular yet frequent basis. This circumstance results in variable bull counts and at times limited influence on harvest rates, which can make meeting any bull:cow ratio difficult. Some SMDs have additional goals related to bulls, such as older age class bulls based on tooth aging, certain proportion of surveyed bulls having six or more points on at least one side, or a certain proportion of harvested bulls having six or more points on at least one side.






Figure 17. Special Management Districts for Bull Elk defined as such in this plan.