

**ELK MANAGEMENT CITIZEN ADVISORY GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**FWP STAFF ASSESSMENT**  
**AUGUST 31, 2022**

**Create an A9 Tag Bundle**

Division/Unit/Bureau	Staff Assessment
Accounting Bureau	The revenue distribution is straightforward, but it is generally not common practice to bundle resident and non-resident tags. It is difficult to track and report out revenue. Resident vs non-resident revenue by license type is a statistic that is frequently requested by the public and other interested parties.
Comm Ed	With all regulation and license changes, our focus should be keeping the regulations simple. This change would add some significant complexity. Questions we should consider are: Do we have other tools within our regulations and license structure to meet the objectives here? Will the added confusion make it unlikely to meet objectives? If we pursue an A9 bundle as described, Communication staff will develop key messaging points to clearly explain the change, the purpose and how hunters can take advantage. We will work closely with licensing and customer service staff to track hunter confusion and questions and work to alleviate those as they come up.
Enforcement Division	<p>Vision and Guide states to “keep regulations as simple and streamlined as possible.” FWP just eliminated antlerless permits due to the confusion with elk b licenses. Creating an A9 tag bundle now would be a step backwards in elk management. Keep things simple for the public. Tools are already in place.</p> <p>This could create a great deal of confusion for both the public and staff.</p> <p>Could increase violations by hunters.</p>
Legal Unit	As noted – legislative fix is required to carry out proposal.
Licensing Bureau	<p>An <i>A-9 tag</i> is a resident antlerless elk b license. 87-2-501 limits elk harvest to a maximum of 3.</p> <p>ALS does not currently include bundled licenses of the same license type may be complicated to implement. Development work related to drawing implementation and e-tags required.</p>
Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division	Division staff observe it is already difficult for hunters to know what licenses/tags they hold and where it is legal to use them. It’s anticipated this recommendation could cause more confusion, creating risk for increased violations on intermingled public land in Block Management Areas. It’s also anticipated this recommendation could end up increasing hunter crowding on open private lands, including those enrolled in Block Management, contrary to the intended goal. An increased concentration of more hunters on Block Management Areas could negatively impact hunter experience without additional capacity to better manage hunters.
Technology Services Division	If the specific tag/opportunity is to be included in the Hunt Planner map there would need to be areas designated by Wildlife staff and GDS and then work would need to be done to get that information to display correctly in the HP map. If there are objective numbers (like a quota), additional work would be needed to close areas once an objective is reached. This would have to be managed in an internal system, like MRRE. Development work would be needed in ALS and Regs to support a new feature like this. Tags like this with fewer

Division/Unit/Bureau	Staff Assessment
	prerequisites are usually easier to implement at least. The “bundled” tags being sold as an individual item might be complicated. Development work would need to be done in the mobile app to handle multiple tags for validation that are associated with a single “item” in ALS.
Wildlife Division	<p>The concept of this proposal is logical in that it is focused on reducing elk numbers and redistributing elk. The Commission recently considered an unlimited over-the-counter cow tag valid only on private lands in over objective units, similar to what is proposed here. Ultimately, they did not pass this and opted for existing over-the-counter, 3 per hunter B-licenses. Given the current very liberal antlerless opportunity has not been successful at solving the elk problem in over objective units, it is uncertain whether the A9 bundle would change that dynamic. It seems that access to the elk is more of an impediment than access to needed licenses. It doesn't appear that this option addresses landowner concerns including misuse of property or time spent giving hunters their expectations, etc. Additionally, most hunters want to maintain the option to take a bull elk, so purchasing the bundle would preclude that (by statute not more than 3 elk may be taken). It is unclear if FWP would charge for the price of 3 tags (thus increasing license cost for those who do only want/need 1 license). Because prices are set in statute, not sure if 3 elk for the price of 1 would be legal.</p>