

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 17, 2021 1:23:54 PM
Last Modified: Friday, December 17, 2021 1:27:01 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:06
IP Address: 107.77.198.143

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Wayne Kerr
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support any of the changes proposed. Please keep all existing boundaries, licenses and quotas.

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 17, 2021 1:46:46 PM
Last Modified: Friday, December 17, 2021 1:53:46 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:59
IP Address: 199.96.16.11

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brian
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am for the unbundling of the 900 tag but I would like to see it as first choice only with a quota on each unit so that it is known how many people are archery hunting the unit. These areas will get over ran with out of state and pay to play hunters if it is not limited. For instance you proposed 300 for 447 and that would be great for the pressure on those elk and allow a better archery and rifle opportunity and you can do the same with the rest of these units.

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 17, 2021 5:33:18 PM
Last Modified: Friday, December 17, 2021 6:22:52 PM
Time Spent: 00:49:34
IP Address: 174.242.234.236

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Joshua Schaff
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Why don't you just break the areas out the 900 permit you believe need to be general and keep the rest in the 900 permit. If all the areas are over objective and archery is a management tool now because success rates are up why would it matter which district you kill your elk in. Keep the 900 permit so we can bowhunt more than one small area and make the 900 unlimited. If you have 2500 people put in for the 702,704,704 bundle and it is overrun with people it gives us another option. I don't like the way this is structured at all.

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 17, 2021 6:55:24 PM
Last Modified: Friday, December 17, 2021 6:56:03 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:39
IP Address: 50.46.6.81

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Dorian Boling**
City/Town: **Libby**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support the above changes

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 4:25:23 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 4:33:15 AM
Time Spent: 00:07:51
IP Address: 63.153.1.66

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Dave Shimek
City/Town: Shepherd
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to the unlimited archery permits in 704/705. This area is over run with nonresidents. Cap the number of archery permits at the number of residents who apply. I would like you to limit no residents to 5% of the tags. With the extremely fast growing montnana population, FWP needs to start realizing hunting numbers and pressure is increasing dramatically. Elk pressure alone in 704 is up many times what it was 15 years ago. Make 704 a first and only choice. Make it the only unit you can hunt if you draw, like you do with special draw Mule deer tags. The Custer National Forest can't take the pressure that this proposal would create. Again I am opposed to unlimited archery and ask to keep a quota.

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 9:09:41 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 9:23:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:13:32
IP Address: 69.144.110.7

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Sidney Ziegler
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

In my opinion Proposals to change archery licenses will do nothing to affect over objective populations.....most are targeting bulls during archery and would say it's easier to kill a bull during archery
Take the gloves off on cows, all general everywhere needed and even extra unlimited 2nd b tags (unit specific) if we need to kill more bulls up the limited rifle quotas

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:16:40 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:22:48 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:07
IP Address: 135.134.190.212

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Richard A Schneider
City/Town: Ekalaka
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not go to an unlimited archery elk permit in these areas. This will absolutley put a ton more presure on the elk herd as well as the landscape. This will affect the bull elk to a point where you will damage the bull to cow ratio which is in good shape right now. If fact breaking the 900 bundle down so you have more control on hunter numbers is the correct way to go about the proposal. Moving forward I ask that you actually reduce the permits offered that allow the harvest of bulls and offer more cow elk opportunities to control the herd. Don't try and fix something that is currently working.

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:22:53 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:22:56 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:03
IP Address: 135.134.190.212

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Richard A Schneider
City/Town: Ekalaka
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not go to an unlimited archery elk permit in these areas. This will absolutley put a ton more presure on the elk herd as well as the landscape. This will affect the bull elk to a point where you will damage the bull to cow ratio which is in good shape right now. If fact breaking the 900 bundle down so you have more control on hunter numbers is the correct way to go about the proposal. Moving forward I ask that you actually reduce the permits offered that allow the harvest of bulls and offer more cow elk opportunities to control the herd. Don't try and fix something that is currently working.

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:45:39 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:56:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:13
IP Address: 69.57.95.72

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Diane Borgreen
City/Town: Glasgow
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly disagree with the proposal to make these units general or unlimited. The result will be exacerbation of private land harboring issues and further hampering of efforts to move populations to objective.

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 11:48:27 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 12:28:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:39:39
IP Address: 216.187.155.41

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kevin Frazer
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

First off let me say I am in favor of proposals and changes being made based on input from biologists that have knowledge and are payed to make these decisions! I am NOT in favor of changes from coming from political appointed individuals or outfitters or private land owners wanting to make changes for their own personal reasons or benefits. I believe the director has shown he is out of touch with the every day MT hunter and needs to listen to the people employed with actual management knowledge of the animals we all love to hunt.

I also strongly appose only being able to hunt a single area with a bow if you draw a specific archery tag. Weather and precipitation can play a huge role in how good or bad hunting can be in a certain area from year to year. Killing an elk with a bow is hard enough but if you take the ability away to be able to go from area to area to to chase the “rut” or find elk on public ground you could be greatly limiting the opportunity for hunters to fill their tag. If people are stuck hunting one area that is just not good that specific year. For example on dry years elk tend to spend more time around Ag fields and wetter areas that are almost always on private land. If you are hunting an area like the Missouri breaks or several areas in region 5 and the elk just aren’t there hunters should have the ability to head to general areas in the state higher in the mountains or areas that received more moisture that year to try to fill their tag. This new rule would remove that ability and I believe it will result in overall even lower success rates. This is a problem for the hunter, but also for the state when one of the main focuses is to knock down elk numbers that are “over objective”. I appreciate your consideration and beg the commission to take much greater stock in information coming from biologists across the state and ignore the opinions of politicians and special interest groups that are only interested in benefitting themselves and not the overall management of our game species.

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 12:52:30 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 1:04:12 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:41
IP Address: 184.166.89.221

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Chad Cunningham**
City/Town: **Missoula**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I definitely agree the 900 units should be un-bundled. I am leery of how this is being done.

I think allowing General OTC or unlimited permits may negatively impact the quality of the hunt, and to me the hunt is more than harvesting the animal but being able to pursue elk without running into another hunter or back country camp around every bend. If you want to be this liberal with archery tags, please consider putting strong limits on the number of Non-Resident tags you can allocate, this should be a small portion of these numbers. Tag allocation should be different for resident vs non-resident. We have many new Montana residents in the last few years, and don't want Montana to become Colorado.

I would say in the least, consider making allow these Limited Entry permits, with the number of tags coming from the biologist and the consideration of managing for mature animals.

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 18, 2021 5:48:47 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 18, 2021 6:02:14 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:27
IP Address: 107.77.197.208

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Drew Stuart
City/Town: Three Forks
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I think making archery permit holders choose a district to hunt and stick to that district for the duration of archery season is a very good idea that will spread out public land hunting pressure. However I think increasing either sex quotas (bull tags) on public land and especially private land is a terrible idea that will move elk herds off of public land onto inaccessible private land and ultimately caters to the outfitting industry, large landowners and the overall commercialization of MT's big game-a slippery slope! If the true intention is to reduce elk populations, reduce either sex tags and increase cow tags during the general seasons-ESPECIALLY ON PRIVATE LAND. This approach will work immediately to dramatically reduce crop damage.

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, December 19, 2021 8:19:07 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, December 19, 2021 8:26:33 AM
Time Spent: 00:07:25
IP Address: 71.222.177.113

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Chris Ogle
City/Town: Trafalgar
State/Province: IN

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I'm one of the fortunate few who has access to private land within 702. Unfortunately as NR I've only drawn this permit once in four years (900-20). I fully support this proposed change and hope to hunt this unit with only a general permit!!

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, December 19, 2021 3:11:38 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, December 19, 2021 3:14:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:14
IP Address: 153.90.19.34

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Luke Colberg
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the archery-only permit proposal. The public lands these districts are already crowded, and increasing the number of archery hunters will only exacerbate the problem of low-populations on public lands and private lands that allow hunting, and high-population densities on private lands that limit hunting.

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, December 19, 2021 6:17:07 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, December 19, 2021 6:17:49 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:41
IP Address: 174.204.16.236

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Tyler Mullaney**
City/Town: **Shepherd**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

My thoughts of changes that need to be made:

New season for mule deer to start from opening day of Antelope season to November 1. Our mule deer need some attention and need protected. We have to do something and for anyone that says they are okay, obviously don't spend a 150+ days in the field every year. Yes there are deer but we have problems, a lot of people see it, some are blind to it.

Elk Landowner Tags should be given to landowners that have above X amount of acres. There are plenty of areas that don't get managed because they can't get a tag and there is no public ground around. Yes they can allow access and a lot of them do, but that's pretty shitty they can't hunt their own property. At least with a landowner tag you can control how many tags are given for that many acres. Right now with the proposal they have in place, as many general licenses they want can go hunt in coveted permit areas on private ranches. That's not management, that's a free for all. Those areas will be ruined.

I do think our public land is getting over hunted. I think bringing back a percentage of the outfitter tags would be a great idea. That would also help control how much pressure an area is getting. A big majority of outfitters usually hunt private ranches which would be taking a lot of pressure off the public land.

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 20, 2021 9:45:17 AM
Last Modified: Monday, December 20, 2021 9:54:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:46
IP Address: 47.44.124.100

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Dan Gagner**
City/Town: **Helena**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Isn't the stated goal here to lower elk numbers down to objective? Moving to unlimited archery elk permits will have the complete opposite effect. The increased hunting pressure will drive all the elk onto private sanctuaries and the herd will expand even further beyond objective.

This proposal was whipped up at the last minute by the FWP Director after receiving an unbelievable public outcry against his original idea to have general tags on private. However, this is basically the same thing, just wrapped up a little differently.

We can all see this proposal has nothing to do with too many elk and it has everything to do with handing Montana's bulls over to wealthy, out of state landowners and rich out of state trophy hunters. Please do the right thing for Montanans and vote this proposal down.

However, with all that said, if the unlimited permits were changed to limited quotas based on biologist recommendations, I could get behind that.

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 20, 2021 11:32:42 AM
Last Modified: Monday, December 20, 2021 1:17:27 PM
Time Spent: 01:44:44
IP Address: 204.124.92.253

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Chad Krause**
City/Town: **Cody**
State/Province: **WY**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support unbundling of the 900-20 archery-only either-sex permits because the proposal 1) will not address the over-objective population status that exists in a majority of the affected hunting districts; 2) will increase already saturated public land hunting pressure in the affected units; and 3) decrease drawing odds for remaining limited-entry permits in the State.

Please consider the following recommendations as alternatives to the 2022-2023 archery-only permit proposal.

- 1) Leave the archery-only either-sex 900-20 bundle status quo.
 - 2) Implement archery-only either-sex permits for each hunting district (or grouped hunting districts) with quotas based upon past estimates of hunters.
 - 3) Make the 2022-2023 archery-only unlimited permit proposal first and only choice and hunters cannot hunt bull elk in any other hunting district (regardless of season dates).
-

#18

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 20, 2021 9:45:28 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 20, 2021 10:18:34 PM
Time Spent: 00:33:06
IP Address: 174.212.228.148

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Robert Titus
City/Town: MISSOULA
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The unlimited archery permits holder should only be allowed to hunt elk in that district during that set of season dates. Like the unlimited mule deer permits are under past regulations. That would help ease some pressure on general license district. A major concern was hunter over crowding on public land.

#19

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 7:26:32 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 7:30:41 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:08
IP Address: 174.204.13.31

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Nick Trott**
City/Town: **Glasgow**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

FWP:

I hunt these districts and I oppose the proposed changes to the 900-20 limited archery elk permit regulations in HDs 401, 403, 411, 426, 447, 450, 455, 530, 580, 500, 502, 520, 557, 570, 702, 704, and 705; from limited permits to unlimited permits or unlimited permits on public lands and general license on private lands.

And I oppose eliminating the limited archery elk permits in HD 417.

These proposed changes will not contribute to lowering elk populations; they will only lower elk populations on public lands and will increase populations on private lands where elk are harbored.

These proposed changes in regulations only cater to nonresident land owners and private land outfitters that harbor elk. Eliminating the limited archery elk permits, with the nonresident cap of 10% of the total number of permits, is what nonresident land owners and private land outfitters have lobbied for. Outfitter clients and nonresident land owners will not have to draw a permit for a trophy elk hunt.

The reason for the limited archery elk permits was to eliminate crowding in the Missouri River Breaks and the other 23 HDs with limited rifle elk permits. Non residents were taking 55% to 65% of the bulls.

Please keep the limited archery elk permits.

Thank you

Nick Trott

#20

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 8:21:19 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 8:23:32 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:13
IP Address: 128.177.52.54

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brayden Davis
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to unlimited archery permits in in all the listed HDs. I support the limited archery permits as proposed by the area biologists earlier in the season setting process which were removed by the Director. I support HDs 450, 401 and 403 proposals.

#21

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 9:01:35 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 9:06:07 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:31
IP Address: 170.144.253.81

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Matt Voigt**
City/Town: **Great Falls**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of the proposed units going to individual unit permits HOWEVER I am opposed to these unit specific permits being unlimited. The biologist in each respective unit submitted a proposal for sustainable quotas in each of these units. FWP should utilize the information they have available to set a quota in each unit that will balance hunter opportunity / competition with biological / social carrying capacity. Since archery harvest does not contribute greatly to herd reduction, particularly when coupled with a permit for bulls, this unlimited proposal is not a sufficient management tool for reducing elk numbers therefore having permit quota's in each unit should not affect the objective of this regulation.

#22

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 9:08:24 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 9:15:24 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:59
IP Address: 216.166.170.254

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Robert Jensen
City/Town: BOZEMAN
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The unlimited archery permits should be resident only. Nonresidents should have to draw and have a limited number. If we don't do this outfitters and landowners will once again be selling our elk for their profit and further restricting access making current situations worse. In addition it will further over run currently available public hunting areas with nonresidents.

#23

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 10:27:12 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 10:33:59 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:47
IP Address: 184.167.114.66

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jeremy DeHerrera**
City/Town: **BILLINGS**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose having an unlimited archery only permit for the districts listed above. These districts already have a problem with overcrowding and now allowing the unlimited archery tags for both instate and out of state residents will only further this problem. This will not help with the over objective elk numbers and will further push elk from the public onto the private land. I see this as further pushing the agenda for outfitters who would greatly benefit from the increased number of permits and pressure on public. Again this will not do anything to decrease herd numbers because cows will not be targeted. I agree with the having to hunt your district but you need to limit permits in these areas based on what the biologists state. With the added pressure in the archery season it will make the rifle tag that much harder to fill come rifle season.

#24

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 11:23:51 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 11:43:37 AM
Time Spent: 00:19:46
IP Address: 67.5.3.126

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Glen Berry
City/Town: Medical Lake
State/Province: WA

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

This would be a needed change. I hunted 2021 in Montana for elk in archery season 30 days found it to be over crowded in general area elk where pushed on place's where we couldn't hunt. I am a archery only hunter I do not gun hunt, Montana has been my last choice to hunt because of the general season

#25

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 12:05:35 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 12:07:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:31
IP Address: 199.155.252.64

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Alex Dado
City/Town: McAllister
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of breaking up the 900 archery permit, however, I support all the districts going to individual limited entry permits

#26

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 1:02:29 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 1:27:25 PM
Time Spent: 00:24:55
IP Address: 174.204.18.43

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Josh Kamrath
City/Town: stevensville
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The fact that as a state we are looking at opening up lots of bull elk tags in eastern MT in special draw units only confirms that our leaders are looking at it from a money standpoint and not science based. These new rules only hurt public land locals. Not in favor

#27

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 3:10:29 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 3:11:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:24
IP Address: 162.218.101.142

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Lewis Leathers
City/Town: Joliet
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I think you should add a fee to cover the cost of having decent tags instead of the paper ones we print out.

#28

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 4:24:08 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 4:30:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:45
IP Address: 174.242.233.81

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kris Castro
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

This is terrible idea because the 900-20 tag gives me the opportunity to hunt in multiple places that are in different areas the chance to do that with having one tag. This new idea will get rid of that to where I can't hunt in the different places unless this proposal doesn't require me to have to put in for a special draw and only get one place.

#29

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 8:48:59 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 8:59:22 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:23
IP Address: 89.251.222.9

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Joseph Ezell**
City/Town: **Nye**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Why are y'all wanting to do this? I like to bow hunt but i love you gun hunt too! Please don't cut our season!

#30

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 5:40:04 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 5:42:48 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:43
IP Address: 72.174.29.211

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kristopher George
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support the unlimited elk license opportunity in region 4. If the rest of the opportunity is based off science and not social pressure I support it.

#31

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 12:13:17 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 12:24:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:17
IP Address: 199.155.58.173

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Michael Lucas
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am intensely opposed to an unlimited archery-only permits. I believe 900-20 needed to be broken up, but tag allocations for archery only permits should be limited and based on Biologist recommendation. I am opposed to combining 411 and 412 permits and would prefer 411 and 511. If proceeding with unlimited archery-only permits, please consider that these have to be first choice and not guaranteed as second choice.

#32

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 3:12:15 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 3:17:08 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:53
IP Address: 66.171.17.139

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Tom Lipko
City/Town: Poplar
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose any changes to these regulations. Proposed season and boundary changes are too extensive to allow for proper consideration of the impacts. I support no change to regulations.

#33

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, December 23, 2021 7:52:32 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, December 23, 2021 7:55:43 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:11
IP Address: 128.177.52.54

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Hannity Davis
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to the unlimited archery permits in these HDs, except HDs 401/403. These limited entry permits have been working successfully for decades. They were unlimited prior to that which DID NOT WORK due to over crowding. The public commented and fully supported maintaining limited with the biologists throughout the season setting process, and their proposals were removed for some reason. Maintain limited entry permits in these HDs.

#34

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, December 23, 2021 6:03:09 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, December 23, 2021 6:39:55 PM
Time Spent: 00:36:46
IP Address: 154.27.110.81

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jon Gabrio
City/Town: Townsend
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am all for some sort of change here, however, the issue with most of the eastern Montana units and over population of elk is not having access to hunting them on private land. Work with landowners and obtain access to private lands and maybe make it a cow hunt only. Reduce cows, reduces new calves, reduces elk numbers. Making unlimited archery tags in most of these districts is going to destroy some of the best elk hunting in the west.

Owning 2 businesses in the hunting industry, I get to talk with people the U.S. frequently. Most people save money to come hunt Montana and look forward to a quality hunt if they're lucky enough to get a special 900 tag or even 410 / 700, 621, etc. Opening up these units to unlimited licenses is going to allow everyone to put in that would have just a general license and now go hunt some of the best units in the west. Our elk herds will be destroyed in no-time. I've watched the blue mountains in Washington go from some of the best quality for a trophy bull in the country to a fraction in 10 years. Over-hunting, predators etc. Now being a person with 20 points and 20 years of waiting to draw, my odds of a quality hunt are gone. A waste of money now. Don't make Montana turn into the same thing. Keep eastern Montana a quality place and attractive destination for hunters.

#35

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 24, 2021 10:08:58 AM
Last Modified: Friday, December 24, 2021 10:19:01 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:02
IP Address: 174.215.19.4

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jake Williams
City/Town: Libby
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support the proposed changes.

#36

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 24, 2021 10:22:55 AM
Last Modified: Friday, December 24, 2021 11:00:34 AM
Time Spent: 00:37:38
IP Address: 107.77.201.191

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	David Wolfe
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

FWP has a problem on their hands. They have mismanaged the wildlife in our great state to the point that people like me are willing to pay the extra money to hunt out of state in Wyoming. Montana has better habitat but public land hunting has degraded and opportunity for excellent hunting on private land is often only for the wealthy. I suspect from some of the nonsensical rules they have made and crazy hunting seasons employed FWP is looking into ways of managing wildlife without the use of the sportsperson that has been crucial to management in years past. Unfortunately the top brass of FWP is a politically appointed person. This does not always fit with the trust placed on them by the public. I lost all faith in FWP when they hired another top brass person trained in social engineering to oversee all our wildlife regions! No history or experience in wildlife biology or law enforcement yet this person oversaw these departments! It appears the "social" management of the hunters and people that care about our wildlife are a bit more important to the people in charge of our wildlife heretage than the wildlife itself. The last straw for me was when volunteering as a Hunters Safety and Education instructor for FWP they started giving us a more and more politically correct and canned programs to teach that strayed from the actual hunter safety and education! We were not even allowed to have real firearms in front of the class for demonstration. Kids could not practice with the actual weapon they would use in the field and we would never know just whether the weapon new hunters were using were appropriate for that person or not. I was also an archery instructor but only for one short while were we able to see our students actually use a bow. This left precious little time for us as instructors to see what might be a problem with shooting to avoid wounding and needless misery of wild game. But hey, they really were well versed with how and where to buy a license and how to attach it to a carcass! Its time to rethink MT FWP from the top. The top manager should be an ELECTED position if he or she is going to be entrusted with the wildlife we find so dear to us in this great state. The top brass needs to answer to the people and management needs to be scientifically based rather than politically based. I hope other people will also demand this. We the taxpayers deserve to be served in an egalitarian manner and our wildlife deserves to be managed in a ethical and sustainable way.

#37

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 24, 2021 6:31:15 PM
Last Modified: Friday, December 24, 2021 6:39:18 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:03
IP Address: 208.123.201.227

Page 1

Q1 Respondent skipped this question

Please provide the following information:

Q2
Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

No

#38

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 25, 2021 10:34:58 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 25, 2021 10:37:52 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:53
IP Address: 172.221.98.213

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ron j Hoagland
City/Town: Big Timber
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

i am against the unbundling of the 900archery tags. I have permission to hunt in several districts and own property in 2 different units, This proposal takes away my right to hunt on my own property in different units.

#39

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, December 25, 2021 11:15:17 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, December 25, 2021 11:21:06 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:48
IP Address: 172.221.98.213

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Ron J Hoagland**
City/Town: **Big Timber**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

FWP needs to be mandated to start MANAGING our wildlife!!
It was the worst hunting season I have ever seen in 55 years of hunting here.
The mule deer numbers are the lowest I have ever seen and the number of hunters is the highest Ive ever seen!! I hunted every day of the entire big game season and never fired a shot, I never saw a mature mule deer buck and it is so sad watch everybody shoot EVERY 2 and 3 point buck that shows up. Please start to Manage our wildlife and NOT just be in business to sell as many tags as possible
Show some responsibility!!

#40

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, December 26, 2021 9:09:13 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, December 26, 2021 9:10:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:39
IP Address: 72.227.121.226

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Tyson**
City/Town: **Lincoln**
State/Province: **NH**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Delist and hunt grizzly bears.

Increase the wolf harvest.

Increase resident tag fees.

Charge people for wanton waste of the animals they hit with their cars.

#41

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, December 26, 2021 9:34:21 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, December 26, 2021 9:40:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:42
IP Address: 63.153.1.66

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: David Shimek
City/Town: Shepherd
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to your method of evaluation. I have been hunting 704 for 20 years and put in more than 28 days this season hunting. I never once hit a game check station and haven't reported my elk/deer hunt to anyone. Your method of evaluating hunting regs and hunter satisfaction is simply inadequate and does not use any statistically or scientifically valid method of obtaining information. You need to have required game check like you do with migratory birds. You are truly missing a large population of hunters with your current methods. I am opposed to a general archery tag or unlimited tags in public land in 704. You will be overloading the area with archery hunters. It needs to remain a limited draw.

#42

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, December 26, 2021 12:03:35 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, December 26, 2021 12:09:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:36
IP Address: 174.192.78.49

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: John west
City/Town: Chippewa Falls
State/Province: WI

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Quit punishing public land hunters for private land mismanagement. Owning land does not give the landowner possession of the resource. If they are concerned with elk populations incentivize them to allow antlerless hunting on their property. Harvesting trophy bulls will not impact populations. The majority of hunters hunting on a general tag would be happy to harvest any legal animal. Trophy hunting and private ranches will ruin Montana's hunting heritage.

#43

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 9:15:36 AM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 9:17:55 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:18
IP Address: 137.26.84.2

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Derrick Mueller
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to this proposal as it stands. Making these units general or unlimited will do nothing to address "over population" and only serve to get outfitters more archery clients in limited draw rifle areas. The 900-20 tag should stay as is or be broken back up by district with increased tag allocation per area.

#44

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 9:19:06 AM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 9:55:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:36:12
IP Address: 170.144.214.132

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Matt Todd
City/Town: Philipsburg
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

An archery-only permit should be an opportunity to hunt a certain district but not a requirement to only hunt that district. A holder of the proposed archery-only permit should still be allowed to hunt any other hunting district that is open to the general permit. Resident hunters want to maintain the flexibility in our hunting opportunities as we have in the past. Hunters who acquire this permit may only be able to make one trip or no trip due to unforeseen reasons but could still hunt a general permit hunting district close to home.

#45

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 9:58:08 AM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 10:12:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:14:45
IP Address: 216.187.155.13

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Matt Salvi
City/Town: Shepherd
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree with this proposal. Your justification of doing this I believe is spot on. It will spread people out and spread people out during the drawing process. BUT, this proposal hinges on also implementing the statewide restriction that permit holders can only hunt bull elk during the archery season where their permit is valid. This is VERY important to control the overcrowding that hunters are complaining about. I've heard and read from some folks that are against this proposal because they think everyone is just going to go to these districts and hunt bull elk (overcrowding). But this will not happen if you implement the statewide permit proposal. You are also correct that archery hunting is an opportunity hunt, not a management tool. There are very few elk killed by bow in most of these districts each year. I agree with all your proposals, but again the statewide permit proposal is VERY important. If it is not implemented, then yes, you are going to have chaos during the archery season in some of these districts. Please, I urge you to implement the statewide permit proposal.
Thank you.

#46

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 12:31:12 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 12:55:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:24:05
IP Address: 72.21.226.76

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Brody Chapman**
City/Town: **Monticello**
State/Province: **MN**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am Currently booked for a high end private land archery elk hunt next year. This regulation change could benefit me personally by increasing the likelihood I am able to draw the tag. That said, moving the best elk tags in the state to unlimited or general status is appalling. It's appalling because of the negative consequences it will have for the publics wildlife and quality of the herd. It's appalling because it is blatantly obvious there is no biological or scientific basis for these changes. The single form of logic that would support these changes is a handout for ultra-wealthy chronies of Governor Gianforte. These changes will functionally do nothing to help managing elk objectives and the insinuation that they would is insulting to anyone who understands how the elk herd in MT works.

Splitting up the 900-20 tags makes sense if the FWP does something to collect usable data (like mandatory harvest reporting!) and makes data backed management decisions for each of the respective areas. These proposals suggest that with worsech and gianforte at the helm the FWP is wasting it's money on biologists and and data collection anyway as they are not clearly not being used as a basis for the decisions made in managing the public's wildlife.

I am for splitting up 900 bundle into units that can be managed based on data, in a manner that does not degrade the public's quality of hunting experience. FWP should strive to avoid any increase in hunter crowding above what is currently being experienced with the 900 tag bundle. What is proposed would destroy the quality of the public's hunting in these areas.

#47

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 12:58:54 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 1:08:14 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:19
IP Address: 184.167.113.231

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Cory Hess
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am against unlimited Archery Only permits. The limited entry permits were originally used to reduce public land pressure. Currently public land pressure during archery season in many of these districts is overwhelming. Without a limited number of permits in these sought after units, there will be no way to limit non-resident hunters to 10% of these permits. This coupled with the unlimited outfitter sponsored tags will lead to way more overcrowding in these areas. I am for requiring hunters to pick their unit, however these archery tags should remain limited in numbers.

#48

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 12:57:49 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 1:14:31 PM
Time Spent: 00:16:42
IP Address: 174.204.16.209

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Shane Johnson
City/Town: Columbus
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

While I don't think this will be a big change for most of the Districts, I do think this will affect the 700 districts some. I believe this unlimited tag will increase pressure on public lands as most DYI hunters will head to these areas where the chance for trophy bulls are greater and there is more public ground. This will drive more elk to private and increase the problems that these changes are supposedly trying to fix. There will not be an increase to private land hunting as these lands are mostly locked up by outfitters. Please make a portion of these tags private land only if you are intent on catering to the landowners over the public. I also think if there are landowners who have elk and would like them killed, give them the cow tag holders contact info so they can contact them to hunt. My son had a cow tag in 2021 and I asked several landowners for permission and they all stated that no cow hunting could take place until the local outfitter was done with his clients. Several had elk but they couldn't allow hunting because it may move the elk off and then they wouldn't get paid by the outfitter. This is the major problems with management of the public owned wildlife. Don't cater to the landowners when they don't own or pay for the management of this resource.

Thank you

#49

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 8:14:59 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 8:34:54 PM
Time Spent: 00:19:55
IP Address: 72.250.159.116

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Alyssa Kelly
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Providing unlimited permits, will result in over crowded public land with increased non-resident hunters. I propose 3 options to accommodate the land owners and resident hunters. As previously done, place a resident limit with a high objective draw for those hunters of 750 in HD 417/426, almost a guarantee draw but will limit non-resident hunters and pressure on public land to the 10% for non-residents. Option 2 - If keeping unlimited permit for HD 417/426 is a must, a way to limit non-resident hunters is limiting the number of bow stamps available to those non-resident hunters, and put those hunters into a draw. Option 3 - Non-resident hunters must hunt through a licensed outfitter.

#50

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 8:35:06 PM
Last Modified: Monday, December 27, 2021 8:35:49 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:42
IP Address: 72.250.159.116

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Dylan Kelly
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Providing unlimited permits, will result in over crowded public land with increased non-resident hunters. I propose 3 options to accommodate the land owners and resident hunters. As previously done, place a resident limit with a high objective draw for those hunters of 750 in HD 417/426, almost a guarantee draw but will limit non-resident hunters and pressure on public land to the 10% for non-residents. Option 2 - If keeping unlimited permit for HD 417/426 is a must, a way to limit non-resident hunters is limiting the number of bow stamps available to those non-resident hunters, and put those hunters into a draw. Option 3 - Non-resident hunters must hunt through a licensed outfitter.

#51

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 28, 2021 11:32:44 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 28, 2021 11:47:38 AM
Time Spent: 00:14:54
IP Address: 72.175.198.249

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Vincent Castro
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The objectives FWP is saying they need to address with elk numbers will not addressed with this proposal. This will not decrease elk populations in these areas because from experience most of the large herds settle on private ground. With little or no access all this proposal will do is push more people on to public land during archery season. With unlimited tags for certain districts there will be the same influx of out of state hunters as there has been during rifle season on these lands. In my opinion most Montana hunters understand that fair chase and taking animals with clean and ethical shots. I feel many people who do not live in our state come in with limited time and more expensive tags will be inclined to take poor shots in turn having a negative impact on every Montanans natural resource. More private lands will be able to book expensive out of state hunts which in turn will displace local hunters. Also, archery season the last couple years has been very hot and dry. Not only is this a fire hazard in the works to allow more people to hunt in these early days of the season but it also will require hunters to be confined to one district instead of many where they could try and avoid these dangers. I cannot support such changes to the regulations when there is no way these will fix the problem. This proposal does not have the best interest of the Montana people in mind who live, work, volunteer, support, and raise their families in this state.

#52

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, December 28, 2021 12:26:26 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, December 28, 2021 12:39:20 PM
Time Spent: 00:12:54
IP Address: 174.199.41.227

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Nicholas Dahlquist
City/Town:	Williston
State/Province:	ND

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

As a former resident of Montana and now resident of ND as of 2 years ago and still will return to Montana to hunt, I couldn't be happier about majority of changes I've seen. I don't quite understand the private lands Elk B tags thing yet. The thing I have liked most is the shortening of Mule deer season in certain districts. A good step in managing the bucks and maybe getting a few more quality bucks in the western side of the state. I personally think MT FWP should go above and beyond that and put antler restrictions in some of those districts to give some of those Bucks time to grow and mature ultimately allowing them to breed better genetics. I'll take the shortening of the season for now. Also the 15 permits in 270 for mule deer bucks with less than 3 points is not good. I understand the purpose to maybe rid the area of the old and/or bad genetic bucks, but ultimately it's probably going to be a young buck that hasn't had the opportunity to spread the good genetics. Other than that I like all proposed changes and districts combining.

#53

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 7:58:18 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 8:01:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:01
IP Address: 71.36.62.14

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: jimmy morine
City/Town: WHITEFISH
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

no comment; review

#54

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 8:33:16 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 8:55:07 AM
Time Spent: 00:21:50
IP Address: 72.174.74.225

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kyle Reedy
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I love the sound of unbundling these units and have specific units only for archery hunting. Only concern I have is some of the real popular ones might have even more overcrowding if you leave them unlimited. If the hunter can't use their general tag elsewhere because they have a draw permit could be dissapointing for folks.

#55

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 3:50:38 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, December 29, 2021 4:04:24 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:45
IP Address: 208.83.44.80

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Joel LaLiberty**
City/Town: **Belgrade**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of un-bundling the archery 900 permits and implementing unlimited 1st and 2nd choice archery-only permits by hunting district. However, I am opposed to limiting permit holders to only hunting their permitted district. This opposition is due to limitations it would impose on hunters that hunt with family/friends in general hunting districts around Montana and it would also cause crowding and hunter concentrations in both the unlimited permit districts and the general hunt districts. Further, it adds another level of complexity to the regulations. This proposal would only make sense in the case of hunters that hold permits in limited permit areas. For example, if a hunter held a permit for a limited permit district then they would be limited to hunting that district during the time period that permit is valid.

#56

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, December 30, 2021 8:52:23 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, December 30, 2021 8:56:36 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:13
IP Address: 98.97.50.14

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brian Barney
City/Town: Ennis Montana
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not agree with the changes being proposed. In my opinion it undoes a lot of the the management we have done over the last 15-20 years. The changes are not good for Montana public land hunters.

#57

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, December 30, 2021 9:47:55 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, December 30, 2021 9:50:13 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:18
IP Address: 4.53.41.196

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Rodger Holscher
City/Town:	Nampa
State/Province:	ID

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Please manage the wildlife in a manner that reflects the best practices for the health of the herd. Make it science based and not public opinion based. Thank you

#58

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, December 30, 2021 4:44:13 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, December 30, 2021 4:55:31 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:18
IP Address: 174.45.240.179

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Rodger E WARWICK
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I think the entire elk management plan (especially in Region 7) needs to be redone. There are so many items in the proposed plan with which I disagree that I think the Department needs to take a step back and try again. Increased licenses are not going to result in the desired harvest unless and until sportspersons have access to the areas occupied by the elk.

#59

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, December 31, 2021 12:07:48 PM
Last Modified: Friday, December 31, 2021 12:43:42 PM
Time Spent: 00:35:54
IP Address: 216.161.192.30

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jon K Von Eschen
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of unbundling the 900-20 archery permit. However I am opposed to making all of the districts that made up that permit either unlimited or valid on a general license. I believe that there needs to be a cap on permits issued for the individual districts based on their size, OR make them a First Choice Only permit. Hunters historically had to put in for the 900-20 as a first choice for high success in drawing the permit. By making them unlimited, those hunters can now put in for a rifle permit, and still draw an archery permit for the district they wish to hunt. This also eliminates the 10% cap of non-resident hunters who could hunt these units, which blatantly favors outfitters operating in these districts. I do not support changing a district that has been a permit district into a general district. I believe if these permits are to be unlimited, then they need to be a First Choice Only. If they are reasonably capped, then they could be either first or second choice. Either way, permit holders should be restricted to hunting only in that district.

#60

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, January 02, 2022 9:49:46 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, January 02, 2022 9:57:15 AM
Time Spent: 00:07:28
IP Address: 216.14.233.206

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kyle wengerd
City/Town: Noxon
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support the change to separate units for archery tags

#61

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 9:50:28 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 9:54:48 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:19
IP Address: 98.97.44.77

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Montana Bowhunters Association (Stephen LePage)
City/Town: Statewide (Lewistown)
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

FWP,

As promised the Montana Bowhunters Association polled our membership and here are the results and recommendations based on the results of that poll.

66% of our membership is supportive of breaking the 900-20 tags into individual units.

59% of our members are supportive of making the tags “First and only Choice.”

63% of our members are supportive of “Hunt your permit area only.”

69% of our members wish to have hunter crowding considered when establishing permit numbers.

59% do not support a “hunt your region” type of tag.

*As there were multiple answers to each of these questions, the listed poll numbers are the majority of the respondent’s opinions.

Based on these results the Montana Bowhunters Association recommends:

1. Breaking the 900-20 into individual elk management districts.
 - Existing concerns with the 900-20 permit:
 - o Large percentage of bowhunter use is on public land with very restricted private land access. Crowding and elk displacement is a common complaint.
 - o Making a permit valid for such a broad landscape makes it difficult to manage which HDs are receiving the most pressure.
2. These new tags should remain permitted with a limited number of permits offered, to control hunter density.
 - Resident and nonresident bowhunter interest in the involved HDs has been growing each year. Opening these areas to unlimited permits in a very limited public access landscape will only exacerbate crowding and elk displacement.
3. These tags should be the “First and only choice” when applying.
 - Unfortunately, the time has come for Montana’s sportsmen to make a choice between putting in for a rifle permit or an archery permit in some HDs. The limiting effect of making that choice gives the more committed applicant a better chance of drawing a permit. This option is currently used only where applicant numbers are high, and the positive experience potential is equally as high.
4. Once awarded a permit, the holder should be required to hunt their permit area only.
 - Should reduce the number of non-committed permit applicants. Makes no sense to draw a coveted, hard to draw permit and then not use it. Lots of that being noted these days. Gives the local or more dedicated sportsmen a better chance of drawing.

Regarding the proposal in its entirety:

As written, the FWP elk management proposal is a concerning crossroad transformation. With the stated goals being population reduction and regulation simplification, the challenge is many-sided. Because of this complexity, we “the MBA” would ask that only the urgent, have-to changes be made to the existing regulations until the NEW elk management plan is adopted. Making major changes without equitable contribution can and is causing landowner / sportsmen animosity. We look forward to working with the department in keeping Montana’s amazing elk resource the envy of all other management programs.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Stephen LePage

President, Montana Bowhunters Association

406-535-5636

#62

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 11:51:04 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 11:55:08 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:04
IP Address: 69.145.52.107

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brett Hyde
City/Town: Gallatin Gateway
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The archery only permits need to remain a limited quota. The districts in question experienced over crowding, loss of game being pushed to private land due to over crowding, and a less than desirable hunt experience when these districts were unlimited in the past. This is a horrible idea that will lead to crowding and pushing game onto inaccessible private land.

#63

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 1:46:25 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 1:53:20 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:55
IP Address: 72.174.64.64

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: James Paul
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly disagree with this proposal.

#64

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, December 27, 2021 5:25:34 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 3:26:20 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 208.45.5.150

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Royce Dake
City/Town:	ULM
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

HD 450 - an un-limited number of archery only permits would be appropriate. Also keep firearm season either sex permits in place but increase the number of permits.

#65

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 3:28:36 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 3:31:43 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:06
IP Address: 161.7.109.158

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jacob Williams
City/Town: LEWISTOWN
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support these changes. Most of these units are already over crowded on public lands. FWP should focus on getting better access to private lands. Making them unlimited or general will not help the problems within these units.

#66

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 4:06:37 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 4:14:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:33
IP Address: 174.204.1.186

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Steve Brown
City/Town: Stevensville
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to changing the rules around special permits for elk as it is unnecessary and impacts other HDs around the State that do not have the same crowding issues as these "trophy" Districts. Specifically, limiting hunters to only hunting bull elk in the District where they draw a tag.

It is not necessary to restrict hunters that draw a limited tag to only hunting in that HD because, in all likelihood, they are going to focus most of their time in that HD anyway. These tags are, for all intents and purposes, a once in a lifetime tag and most people will not waste that opportunity by not focusing in the special draw unit.

I am opposed to limiting hunters to hunting only in an HD with an unlimited draw as well. If there is an issue of overcrowding in any given unit due to the general nature of the 900-20 tag then FWP should have a specific archery only tag for each unit, but not limit them to not being able to hunt in any other HD.

In a time where most HDs are way over objective due to elk being primarily on private land FWP and the State of MT should be focused on ways to incentivize landowners to allow hunting, rather than restricting hunting across the State. This rule will likely have negative unintended consequences for elk and elk hunters.

#67

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 6:56:42 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 7:04:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:52
IP Address: 174.204.13.170

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ronald G Schott
City/Town: Ennis
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not unbundle the archery draw tag areas. Keep the limited draw areas. Do not increase the either sex permits by 50 per cent in over objective units. Bull elk are not the problem more cows need to be harvested. To get to objective and open up more private ground go to cows only until objective is reached. All elk units need to be updated as the objectives should change after all the years since they were set

#68

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 7:28:25 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 03, 2022 7:35:09 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:44
IP Address: 69.146.14.129

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Michael Schaub
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I feel this is going to increase the amount of archery hunters in a lot of these districts dramatically. In doing so it will push elk onto private land and further exacerbate the idea that there are too many elk on private land and we should open up more rifle tags for these big landowners. If that is the goal then that will be accomplished with this plan. Keep the 900 tag and put a number on it to try to keep all the elk from getting run off of public land in September, since that is where most of these archery hunters will be hunting.

#69

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 8:36:38 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 8:40:15 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:36
IP Address: 71.15.197.241

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Schuyler Watt
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Splitting up the 900-20 tag is a good idea but the resultant single district archery-only permits should not be unlimited to preserve hunt quality. A better path forward would be analogous to how the Missouri River Breaks archery-only hunts are conducted in Region 6.

#70

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:25:26 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:32:10 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:44
IP Address: 216.228.49.1

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: craig wagner
City/Town: glendive
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Splitting up the 900 archery units makes sense. Not putting a reasonable cap on the number of archery permits in these units is either stupidity or an attempt to appease a few special interests who want guaranteed tags. This smells of politics.

#71

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:52:43 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:53:43 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:00
IP Address: 71.15.198.123

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Caleb Lucy
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I respectfully and fully oppose this change. Thank you.

#72

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 8:46:37 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 10:06:42 AM
Time Spent: 01:20:04
IP Address: 216.166.169.57

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: TROY PAULSON
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am not in favor of unlimited permits, these must be limited to keep the pressure down. There will be an explosion of hunters in these units which will push the elk to private land sanctuaries where they don't get hunted.

These permits must be 1st choice

I am in favor of unbundling the 900 tag.

I am in favor of requiring hunters who receive a permit to only hunt that unit

#73

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 12:44:54 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 12:45:29 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:34
IP Address: 168.149.138.106

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Gustavo Perez
City/Town: Plantation
State/Province: FL

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

General Tags allows hunters to hunt most of the state which results in a large among of hunters concentrated on some of the best areas. To alleviate this, I suggest requiring general tag holders to pick a district when buying general tags and only be allowed to hunt such district. That would help to alleviate pressure in some places while spreading the number of hunters around the state

#74

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 12:49:06 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 04, 2022 12:55:33 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:27
IP Address: 174.25.27.166

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Marvin Bloomer**
City/Town: **Mist**
State/Province: **OR**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Pick a weapon you want to use and go with it. Either archery or rifle. Archery tag then archery hunt. Keep a huge portion divided out to keep predator numbers to a manageable amount. Good training for people that don't know how to shoot. Hold them accountable some how. Too many wounded animals is bad. The worst predators of all is party hunters. Hunters filling other hunters tags is very hard on population.

#75

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 9:11:49 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 9:19:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:03
IP Address: 69.145.83.100

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jacob Ahmann**
City/Town: **Bozeman**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Unbundling the 900 series tag is a step in a positive direction. However, I do not agree with making many of these tags "Unlimited" or "Genera" in nature. This creates management issues with having over-pressure in many districts, pushing elk and deer from public land to private where they are not being accessed and managed, exacerbating many of the issues continually brought up year after year. Although there is a state-wide limit on general licenses for non-residents, I believe Unlimited Permits and General Licenses in what is currently a draw district goes directly in the face of protecting and preserving game animals primarily for the citizens of Montana. I urge the commission to not adopt Unlimited Tags or General Tags for either sex elk in the current 900-20 units, and instead set a limited entry quota for each district so as to more precisely manage the wildlife while ensuring the 90% Resident and 10% Non-Resident quota is still observed in these Hunt Districts.

#76

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 9:37:13 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 9:40:44 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:31
IP Address: 174.45.254.99

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Samuel Norde
City/Town: Bozemen
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Oppose

#77

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 10:37:53 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 10:44:40 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:46
IP Address: 162.57.254.49

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Russell Garcia
City/Town:	Glendive
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I DO NOT support any of these changes to the elk regulations. Unlimited tags with no harvest quota is the worst idea ever. Thousands of residents and non-residents will purchase tags and show up to these districts during hunting season. Every available place will be overcrowded, and with no harvest quota, elk herds will be decimated in just a few seasons. Your job is to increase hunting opportunity for the public, not eliminate it.

#78

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 11:09:10 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 11:11:52 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:41
IP Address: 69.144.12.73

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Bruce McGee
City/Town: LAUREL
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of this proposal.

#79

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 11:11:24 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 11:41:38 AM
Time Spent: 00:30:13
IP Address: 72.174.94.154

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: T.H. Gibson
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

As a lifetime resident archery hunter in MT, I've not seen a full vetting of this proposal in order to weigh the pros and cons for both the archery hunter and for the large land owner, which typifies the ability to access the game as one moves from west to east in MT. More either sex permits or general licenses in these districts may be a good way to reduce the animal population on private ground, but if the hunter access without a trespass fee remains largely limited, then the benefit of this proposal goes directly to the large land owner only. I'd like to see a public open and honest discussion of pros and cons between the large land owners and the archery hunters in order to evaluate the true impact of this proposal.

#80

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 5:26:51 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 5:40:41 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:49
IP Address: 174.45.107.3

Page 1

Q1 Respondent skipped this question

Please provide the following information:

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Unlimited archery permits will put added pressure on public lands, pushing elk on private faster & more than likely the elk will stay where the hunting pressure is less. If I where a land owner this would be great for them , terrible for the public land hunter. You will have three times the hunters on public land harvesting less elk than the way it is already! Leave it the way it is!!

#81

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 8:37:45 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 05, 2022 8:41:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:05
IP Address: 69.150.96.128

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kalob Ownby
City/Town: Murfreesboro
State/Province: TN

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Not everyone is able to archery hunt due to shoulder physical limitations. I disagree with this proposal.

#82

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 2:29:53 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 2:33:31 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:37
IP Address: 184.166.74.251

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jared Larsen
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Strongly oppose this one. The number of hunters currently drawing the 900-20 already makes crowds in many of these units, particularly the 700 units, this would only compound that.

#83

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 2:28:25 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 2:57:34 PM
Time Spent: 00:29:09
IP Address: 174.241.254.12

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Martin F Petritz
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support this proposal. This proposal will further compound the problem with over-objective elk herds harbored on private lands. The question that I am asking this commission is: What is your primary concern for elk management to pravitize hunting or healthy elk herds? It should be getting elk at objective for the health of the herds. Science has proven that over time liberal cow harvest will achieve a decline in elk numbers. I propose moving towards a cow only season on both public and private land during all seasons in the proposed hunting districts until objective has been obtained. This will create more harvest on private lands where the problem is. If we are going to just through ideas at a wall and see what sticks, then let's have some legitimate science data backing it. thank you, and please vote No.

#84

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 2:56:56 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 3:03:57 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:01
IP Address: 67.143.128.104

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Wade**
City/Town: **Manchester**
State/Province: **MI**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree that many of these units should be general license areas but many of the proposed unlimited areas are touted as trophy areas with limited elk populations by nationally known magazines and hunting consultants. Units such as 702/704/705, 411, 447 and 455 are some of the the better areas that actually have elk , and a few nice bulls, on public land. Making them unlimited will undoubtedly push all of these elk onto private land where the land owners will continue to complain that there are too many elk, but only allow paying clients to hunt the high numbers of elk on their land. Please reconsider making these changes, only the landowners will profit in the long run.

#85

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 5:13:41 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 5:15:52 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:10
IP Address: 72.255.188.158

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kevin B Thompson
City/Town: Molt
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

there should be a 4 point or better restriction on bucks, too many does not being bred and big bucks are almost non existing. the only bucks shot with less than 4 points should be for youth and or handi capped hunters

#86

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 5:58:08 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 6:11:49 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:41
IP Address: 72.250.159.134

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Lance Loving
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

These changes seem to be geared to benefit outfitters. All this will do is shut down access as outfitters lease up more land surrounding public ground, land locking property that is already getting difficult to access, and shutting out local hunters in favor of out of staters and outfitters. This is what happens when an outfitter is in charge of the fish and game. A clear conflict of interest

#87

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 8:44:06 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 9:24:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:40:10
IP Address: 174.204.19.218

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: John Daggett
City/Town: Glasgow
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am very opposed to limiting a hunter to just the area of their permit. The archery season is about a month and a half long and I like to go with my sons to a general area 580 for a week hunt. If I have an either sex archery in the breaks where I live, I will no longer be able to do that. Why do you want to limit a hunters options to hunt a general license area if they draw a permit. Many of these general areas are over objective like 580. Yes, I can choose to not put in for an either sex archery in the breaks where I live so I can archery hunt in the Crazies but what is the goal you are trying to accomplish? This proposal simply limits a hunters options for no good reason.

#88

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 06, 2022 9:58:25 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 06, 2022 10:39:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:41:09
IP Address: 63.153.97.53

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Stacy Welling**
City/Town: **Corvallis**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the proposed changes to permits that would limit the holder to to hunting for antlered elk within only the designated HD. Hunting opportunities in region 2 continue to be decreased as large tracts of private land are bought by land owners that don't allow hunting. The 270 HD is the only HD in the bitterroot valley that still provides viable hunting opportunities to local residents of western Montana. By restricting hunting options to only 270, it will increase overcrowding within this HD as hunters, if forced to pick 270 and give up rights and opportunities to hunt other areas, will pick 270 every year because it is a gamble more likely to lead to a successful hunt. Ravalli county is an area where game animals are increasingly learning to live on private ranches that don't allow hunting and this change in permits will limit hunter opportunity by forcing them to select 270, and only 270, which will likely be the district with the most game opportunities on public land.

Another important question to consider- why are regulations being significantly updated without an up-to-date wildlife management plan? It seems unreasonable and not biologically supported to make these types of changes until the wildlife management plan is updated and complete.

I would also like to see a local work group assembled for our area that would provide collaboration for wildlife management and regulation updates.

#89

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 07, 2022 9:07:45 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 07, 2022 9:12:36 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:51
IP Address: 67.54.218.158

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Cody
City/Town:	Bridger
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am against the unbundling and removal of the 900-20 archery ES elk permit in 502/510/520 as it restricts me from being able to go on hunts with friends in general license HDs. The freedom of the 900-20 archery permit was really nice. I am unsure if the above mentioned HDs are as affected by pressure as others in Region 5 and 7.

#90

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 07, 2022 2:05:45 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 07, 2022 2:22:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:17:05
IP Address: 50.46.6.81

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Anonymous
City/Town: Libby
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Seeing this is season setting things, I think the Commission should make a change to allow disabled persons to choose their own equipment some will choose a crossbow, others will stay with the adapted bow, and some may try a cross bow find out it doesn't work with their disabilities and return to the adapted bow, it should be the disabled persons choice. These disabled people will always be outnumbered by the non-disabled. When you think about it why does a non-disabled really not want to give a disabled person easier equipment? bows can reach the speeds of crossbows, and giving a disabled person a crossbow isn't going to make them magically get game, it may help with letting them move easier through the woods on foot with a safer piece of equipment but at the end of the day the same work it takes to call in a elk is the same for any hunter, the equipment does not magically increase game harvest. Instead of making a new permit for this adding it to the one that exists would work better and should be something that you the commissioners should be able to adjust for the upcoming hunting season, if things don't go good with it, it can always be changed back in 2 years. I think the easiest way to do this is to simply change the wording on the adaptive equipment definition listed on the form. currently it states : The "Permit To Modify Archery Equipment" (PTMAE) allows a person with a PERMANENT LIFETIME disability to use modified

archery tackle that supports the bow, and draws, holds and releases the string to accommodate the individual disability (arrows, however, are not exempt, and still need to meet current requirements for the archery season as defined in the annual regulations). Crossbows may not be used during the archery season. it could be changed to : The "Permit To Modify Archery Equipment" (PTMAE) allows a person with a PERMANENT LIFETIME disability to use modified archery tackle that supports the bow, and draws, holds and releases the string to accommodate the individual disability (arrows, however, are not exempt, and still need to meet current requirements for the archery season as defined in the annual regulations) or a crossbow with adaptive equipment can be used. I request this to be put on the agenda for the Feburary 4th meeting.

#91

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 07, 2022 2:47:08 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 07, 2022 2:52:23 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:14
IP Address: 161.7.109.185

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Arlo Pederson**
City/Town: **Helena**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Strongly opposed to moving archery elk permits to unlimited. Eliminating the limited archery elk permits would favor archery hunters over rifle hunters in terms of amount of opportunity and harvest. Additionally, the units already have crowding issues on publicly accessible lands in this area and removal or liberalizing permits will result in further crowding.

Increasing elk rifle either sex permits is a terrible idea... These public lands will be so overcrowded very few elk will be present during hunting season and the equitable allocation of elk hunting will be lost to the general public. This flies against the North American Model of Conservation and incentivizes the privatization of wildlife. Only those hunters who can afford to pay thousands of dollars for the opportunity to harvest a bull elk will have access to this public resource in these districts. We already don't have a place to access bull elk, so why give out more tags?

Lastly, there is a false narrative being pedaled, that Landowners can't hunt their own land. This is a lie. Resident and Nonresident Landowners enjoy a near 100% success rate in the elk either sex draw for the proposed districts with changes. This is a fact. Look at the draw odds. Ample opportunity is present, especially so when combined with cow elk tags. Maintain the older season structure. Update the Elk Plan. Explore alternatives for managing problem elk concentrations like Management Hunts (has worked well in the Madison). Thanks for considering.

#92

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 07, 2022 2:59:57 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 07, 2022 3:00:45 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:48
IP Address: 97.121.198.132

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Tabitha Garcia
City/Town: Glendive
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I DO NOT support any of these changes to the elk regulations. Unlimited tags with no harvest quota is the worst idea ever. Every available place will be overcrowded, and with no harvest quota, elk herds will be decimated in just a few seasons. Your job is to increase hunting opportunity for the public, not eliminate it, and this clearly eliminates hunting opportunity in the long run.

#93

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 08, 2022 4:41:25 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 08, 2022 4:44:41 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:15
IP Address: 184.166.176.144

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Dennis Mayhew
City/Town: Kalispell
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I'm not in favor of unbundling the 900-20 archery-only either sex permits

#94

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 08, 2022 9:38:20 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 08, 2022 9:47:52 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:32
IP Address: 68.235.94.112

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Tyler
City/Town: Bemidji
State/Province: MN

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Most of these 900-20 units have lower elk densities. That is why the 900-20 permit is a draw. More permits will make harvest rates lower and greatly reduce the hunting experience. Montana is not Colorado. Do not create uncapped tags. This is a poor decision and does not seem to be based on biological needs for the areas or hunter desires.

#95

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 8:42:27 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 10, 2022 8:52:58 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:30
IP Address: 161.7.109.185

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Alan Thomas
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Would like to see the Deer A tags go to a 'choose Region' permit system with the number of tags capped at a reasonable number for each Region. This would distribute pressure more evenly and avoid overcrowding. Hunting pressure for deer in eastern Montana Region 6 is out of control. Seems like every out-of-stater and an increasing number of in-state hunters are hunting deer on the public lands in R6. Both the quality of the hunt and quality of mule deer bucks is severely diminished compared to years past. As other areas of the state have declined (particularly R7) we are seeing a mass influx of hunters that are shifting over to R6 and this is unsustainable if we want to keep deer hunting quality high on public lands. Sadly, with an increasing population, the time has come to limit who goes where.

#96

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 9:34:31 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 10, 2022 9:47:52 AM
Time Spent: 00:13:20
IP Address: 174.45.123.126

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Zack Boughton
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of separating the listed districts into the tags proposed.

I am against restricting archers to only hunting the Unlimited unit in which they apply for. We are greatly restricting archers ability to bowhunt close to home when smaller chunks of time are available to the public. For example after work hunts or single day hunts would no longer be available to most people if they drew an unlimited hunt across the state. I think for residents this is a big setback. I believe we should separate the districts to allow for some pressure to be better tracked and distributed but allow unlimited tag holders to continue to hunt public, otc areas during the archery season.

I also believe that mandatory hunter reporting should be utilized in Montana.

#97

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 10:02:44 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 10, 2022 10:11:28 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:44
IP Address: 97.86.161.30

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Joe Carr
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

All unlimited archery-only permits should still be included in the non-resident cap. I hunted the breaks this fall and, as a resident, I was in the minority of hunters. We need to cap the number of non-residents in hunting districts. Idaho has changed their general deer licenses where non-residents must select the unit they wish to hunt (with caps of non-residents on each unit). This is the model I want Montana to adopt. All non-residents should have to select a specific unit and only be allowed to hunt in that unit. This way we can actually cap the number of hunters by unit and reduce the crowding on public land.

#98

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 10:17:49 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 10, 2022 10:20:50 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:00
IP Address: 184.167.222.95

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jack McCormick
City/Town: BUTTE
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Poorly thought out. Let's spend more than one minute thinking about a monumental change.

#99

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 11:56:07 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 10, 2022 11:57:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:55
IP Address: 164.159.59.2

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Tom Radandt
City/Town: Libby
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I can not support the opportunity to harvest two bulls in one year, even if the area is above objective. These opportunities should be limited to antlerless elk.
In areas below objective, do not offer a B opportunity. Keep it as elk permits.

#100

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 11:28:50 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 10, 2022 11:32:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:26
IP Address: 205.185.109.43

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	DRAKE ATWOOD
City/Town:	Rexburg
State/Province:	ID

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of the above proposals to unbundle the 900-20 tag and increase archery opportunities.

#101

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 8:38:24 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 8:40:22 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:57
IP Address: 184.167.113.231

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Cory Hess
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am for picking your unit, however these archery permits should still be limited. This would keep non-resident permit allotments to 10% to reduce overcrowding in these areas, especially since public access is so limited.

#102

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 3:11:11 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 4:03:37 PM
Time Spent: 00:52:25
IP Address: 65.154.212.131

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Matt
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose all early or late season antlerless elk opportunities on any public land. All shoulder seasons should be on private land only.

Elk season revisions should come after a thorough review of the new elk management plan, not before it.

Elk located on sanctuary private lands should not be counted towards the population objective for that district.

#103

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 9:52:33 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 9:56:21 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:47
IP Address: 66.171.23.238

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Andrew McKean
City/Town: Glasgow
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Regarding the proposal to add a new statewide unlimited antlerless B license valid on private land in those HDs that are over 200 percent of objective (the list of 14 districts should be familiar to you), I recommend that these be available through the normal draw, not as over-the-counter tags. By requiring them to be drawn - as either first, second, or third choices - we will have a more committed, dedicated hunter who is more likely to be able to achieve the goal of this proposal: to effectively and efficiently kill antlerless elk on private land.

#104

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 9:59:20 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 10:02:13 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:53
IP Address: 66.171.23.238

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Andrew McKean**
City/Town: **Glasgow**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the proposal to "unbundle" and remove these 900-series archery permits. The bundling of these has worked very well for the past 20 years and has effectively distributed archers into areas where the quotas and the opportunity match. But unbundling these, we will have "land rushes" to specific districts that may not be able to sustain the hunting pressure. As the department has long maintained, archery seasons are not managed primarily for biological purposes, but rather for social purposes. Given the high intensity of social conflict around hunting seasons the last couple years, it is unwise to contribute to escalations of social conflict that this proposal would cause.

#105

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 1:50:37 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 2:19:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:29:15
IP Address: 35.131.34.18

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Marcus Hockett
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Making 401 a general license will completely ruin the public land hunting opportunity in this district. Elk will undoubtedly be pushed to inaccessible lands and anyone who has spent any amount of time there would know this will be the outcome. This is one of my favorite places in the world, this regulation change honestly makes me sick thinking about it. At very least, please include this district in the unlimited archery only, where permit holders have to hunt there and no where else.

This proposal is unclear about whether or not the unlimited archery-only permits will restrict the permit holder to hunting only that district. I strongly support the single "choose your district" permit similar to the how limited entry mule deer tags work. I do NOT support unlimited permits if permit holders are also allowed to hunt general units.

#106

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 5:39:56 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 4:35:53 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 174.45.153.32

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Eric Bashore
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Montana FWP:

Regarding the Region 5 archery-only either-sex elk permit, I think it is a really good change to aggregate the limited draw elk Hunting Districts (502, 535, 555, and 590) on the eastern side of Region 5 into one 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit. This is a good middle ground, since the multi-region 900-20 archery-only either-sex elk permit was probably too expansive and a singular Hunting District would be too restrictive, given that you can only hunt in the Hunting District(s) associated with the archery-only either-sex elk permit. This regional 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit will also allow archery hunters to hunt migratory elk in the Bull Mountains that cross Highway 12 frequently between Hunting District 535 and Hunting District 590.

However, I would advocate that this 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit and all the other archery-only either-sex elk permits be first and only choice, and instead of being unlimited, that a relatively higher (finite) quota be established which would allow the 10 percent non-resident cap to apply to this 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit and all the other archery-only either-sex elk permits. Montana FWP has stated that the existing 10 percent non-resident cap would not apply if the archery-only either-sex elk permits are unlimited.

Regarding the general proposal to increase the firearm either-sex elk permits by 50 percent in select over objective elk Hunting Districts (411, 417, 426, 535, 590, 702, 704, and 705), I would advocate far more caution since this could destroy the mature age class structure of bulls presently in these Hunting Districts in one or two years (that has taken many years to build). Additionally, this proposal does not appear to be supported by the recommendations of the Montana FWP biologists and was certainly not widely vetted through stakeholder groups ahead of its release to the public. There are already other significant proposed 2022-2023 elk hunting changes in these same Hunting Districts to address over objective elk populations as follows: considerably increasing the number of archery-only either-sex elk permits, allowing an unlimited number of antlerless elk B licenses, continuing and expanding elk shoulder seasons, etc. I would implore you to approve the same number of 2021 firearm either-sex elk permits (no increase) in these Hunting Districts, or maybe only increase them by a more conservative and measured 10 percent, especially in light of all these other significant proposed 2022-2023 elk hunting changes mentioned above. In my opinion, this would be a much more conservative and responsible approach until the current outdated Montana Elk Management Plan can be updated.

Finally, for all big game species I advocate for mandatory reporting of hunter harvest/success as a prerequisite for issuing the following year's applicable big game license/permit (as opposed to the current inaccurate and ineffective telephone survey methodology). Especially for species such as elk where the elk harvest and elk objective numbers are so heavily scrutinized, accurate harvest/success and hunter distribution data is mandatory for effective elk management decisions going forward.

Sincerely,
Eric J. Bashore
(Billings, MT)

#107

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 4:48:52 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 4:49:46 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:53
IP Address: 174.45.153.32

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Eric Bashore
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Montana FWP:

Regarding the Region 5 archery-only either-sex elk permit, I think it is a really good change to aggregate the limited draw elk Hunting Districts (502, 535, 555, and 590) on the eastern side of Region 5 into one 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit. This is a good middle ground, since the multi-region 900-20 archery-only either-sex elk permit was probably too expansive and a singular Hunting District would be too restrictive, given that you can only hunt in the Hunting District(s) associated with the archery-only either-sex elk permit. This regional 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit will also allow archery hunters to hunt migratory elk in the Bull Mountains that cross Highway 12 frequently between Hunting District 535 and Hunting District 590.

However, I would advocate that this 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit and all the other archery-only either-sex elk permits be first and only choice, and instead of being unlimited, that a relatively higher (finite) quota be established which would allow the 10 percent non-resident cap to apply to this 595-21 archery-only either-sex elk permit and all the other archery-only either-sex elk permits. Montana FWP has stated that the existing 10 percent non-resident cap would not apply if the archery-only either-sex elk permits are unlimited.

Regarding the general proposal to increase the firearm either-sex elk permits by 50 percent in select over objective elk Hunting Districts (411, 417, 426, 535, 590, 702, 704, and 705), I would advocate far more caution since this could destroy the mature age class structure of bulls presently in these Hunting Districts in one or two years (that has taken many years to build). Additionally, this proposal does not appear to be supported by the recommendations of the Montana FWP biologists and was certainly not widely vetted through stakeholder groups ahead of its release to the public. There are already other significant proposed 2022-2023 elk hunting changes in these same Hunting Districts to address over objective elk populations as follows: considerably increasing the number of archery-only either-sex elk permits, allowing an unlimited number of antlerless elk B licenses, continuing and expanding elk shoulder seasons, etc. I would implore you to approve the same number of 2021 firearm either-sex elk permits (no increase) in these Hunting Districts, or maybe only increase them by a more conservative and measured 10 percent, especially in light of all these other significant proposed 2022-2023 elk hunting changes mentioned above. In my opinion, this would be a much more conservative and responsible approach until the current outdated Montana Elk Management Plan can be updated.

Finally, for all big game species I advocate for mandatory reporting of hunter harvest/success as a prerequisite for issuing the following year's applicable big game license/permit (as opposed to the current inaccurate and ineffective telephone survey methodology). Especially for species such as elk where the elk harvest and elk objective numbers are so heavily scrutinized, accurate harvest/success and hunter distribution data is mandatory for effective elk management decisions going forward.

Sincerely,
Eric J. Bashore
(Billings, MT)

#108

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 6:27:38 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 6:36:13 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:34
IP Address: 184.167.48.164

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Paul Martin
City/Town: Kalispell
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

To not change anything, maintain as last two years

#109

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 7:40:09 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 8:05:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:25:26
IP Address: 174.45.92.224

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Dustin fisk
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the unbundling of 900-20 archery permits! We have an access issue not a license issue.

#110

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 8:59:27 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 12, 2022 9:28:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:29:25
IP Address: 63.153.25.97

Page 1

Q1 Respondent skipped this question

Please provide the following information:

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

In many ways this is similar to the structure you had in 2008-9. It wasn't a good idea then and even more so now. We have more archery hunters than ever, or at least I see way more in 704-705. With the 900 permit I was able to hunt other areas and kill elk if all I saw was other hunters. Now if I am confined to a smaller area it's going to be tough to get away from people when the 799-21 becomes as popular as it will. At minimum it needs to be a "first and only choice" option but it still will become overcrowded. I hate what you did to the 410 and your doing the same to another great elk hunting opportunity. I hunt both private and public lands and having an unlimited permit available for draw on your 3rd choice is going to increase the likelihood of me losing access to a private ranch due to leasing. Keep the 900-21 archery and make it unlimited if you're so dead set on killing all the elk

#111

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 13, 2022 7:53:04 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 13, 2022 7:58:43 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:39
IP Address: 72.250.128.13

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Stephanie Prater
City/Town:	Lewistown
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am a 4th generation sportsman in Montana. I currently live in Lewistown. I am an avid archery hunter, but also rifle hunt. I hunt a mix of private and public lands mostly in 411/412. I am writing to discuss my concerns over the current elk proposals for archery and breaking up the 900-20 units, making them unlimited and general and would like to suggest an alternate plan that may help find middle ground.

I've heard the commission and FWP leadership use a few phrases lately: our goal is to provide excellent customer service, equitable opportunity for all user groups and simplification of regulations.

If I was to rate hunting on YELP in Central Montana right now, I would give it 1 star. The fact of the matter is, we all want a QUALITY hunt ---seeing game, not just people. That's why we get outdoors. As of late, the over-crowding in Central Montana is unbearable. In order to hunt public lately, it is a rat race to hike in several miles with several other vehicles at the trailheads, many of them non-residents. It is so frustrating to wake up at 3am and drive to a public spot in the area you live and have 7 other trucks there half with non-resident plates for a small area of access. Last season, we had 3 non-residents follow us, trailing only 60 yards behind us for 2.5 miles and then set up right next to us and blew an opportunity at a herd of elk by standing in the open and calling horribly. We never saw elk on that public again the rest of the season, they moved onto the private ground surrounding it and never came back. The QUALITY of hunting is no longer there due to overcrowding and the elk are pushed further and faster onto private lands.

Fact of the matter is, Montana is changing. Our population and number of resident tags is growing from the increase in transplants. Social media, "celebrity" hunters, and of course the public lands movement has put increased non-resident pressure on the limited access in Central Montana, really all of Montana. The people who own the land has changed dramatically since 2004 when the elk management plan was put in place-- family ranches who made money off the land have been sold to folks as recreational properties, many of whom value and want the elk there. Technology is more advanced, people are more mobile, and hunting gear makes it easier to be successful in the field.

I firmly believe we need to have all invested parties, landowners, sportsmen, outfitters at the table to create a new elk plan including fixing outdated quotas, but meanwhile, I think we need to halt some of the huge changes these proposals for archery will make.

My suggestion would be to take the 900-20 districts that were proposed to go "general" and make them "unlimited" – this would be 401, 403, 450, 515, 574, & 580.

I would like to see a limited quota range set in the districts 411/412, 417/426, 447, 455, 502/535/555/590/701 & 702/704/705. I think you could do a broad range in each of these districts say 500-1000 and adjust it accordingly. There needs to be a cap to keep the non-residents at 10%. Going unlimited on these units will ruin archery season.

If I am a non-resident, I am going to "research" where to put in. I am going to do a google search and see 411-21 is 1000% over objective! Must just be elk everywhere! Or the 700's? WOW, a non-typical and a typical record book bull in the last few years!!! Or 417/426- Look at all these nice bulls and it's the breaks!!! The crowding in these well-known units will be insane during archery, and it's already bad enough and again just pushing the elk on private early on in the season.

I think hunt your permit will help disperse residents, but I think you'll see an uptick in pressure on the public land by DIY non-residents- these are well known units and non-residents are going to want to give it a try, before realizing how limited access to those herds are. Landowners will get inundated by phone calls and door knocks asking for permission because non-locals who are not familiar with the area landowners will quickly realize how over pressured the public land is. I firmly don't think the problem of over crowding "will work itself out" either. Every year a bunch of new non-residents or non locals will keep putting in for these units and the very limited access will just continue to get hammered, pushing elk onto the "sanctuary" properties permanently.

Which brings us to reducing population in the meanwhile... with the more publicly known 454 permits and more landowners taking advantage of it, as well as an increase to the amount FWP can pay for Block Management, damage hunts, unlimited cow permits on private and shoulder seasons, I think we have some other effective tools we can use/trial until the next Elk Management plan is

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

completed to help reduce population -- without gutting our archery season.

To sum it up:

- I am for hunt your district on all special draw permits.
- I am very for the unlimited cow on private tags (I think you could offer multiple tags for purchase of the same type ie one could purchase three (3) 900-20 antlerless B permits)
- “unlimited” archery permits for 401, 403, 450, 515, 574, & 580.
- LIMITED archery permits with quota range in 411/412, 417/426, 447, 455, 502/535/555/590/701 & 702/704/705

Thank you so much for you time and working through this complex problem. Thank you for keeping Montana the Last Best Place to Hunt.

Stephanie Prater
Lewistown, Montana 59457
mthuntress406@gmail.com
406.461-6949

#112

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 13, 2022 8:51:30 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 13, 2022 9:16:30 AM
Time Spent: 00:25:00
IP Address: 70.33.15.147

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Richard Schwalbe
City/Town: Big Sky
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Applying increase to PRIVATE LANDS ONLY (in HD535)

1. Has serious political overtones implying that the wealthy have special privileges, exacerbating the rich/poor divide. It looks like corruption.
 2. Appears to be an "end-around" to the proposal removed from the December 14, 2021 agenda as the result of substantial public backlash.
-

#113

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 13, 2022 2:32:02 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 13, 2022 2:38:59 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:56
IP Address: 69.146.25.17

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Pat Van Eimeren**
City/Town: **Whitefish**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

this proposal lacks an explanation and rational as to why the unbundling. Units were bundled and limited permits established to reduce crowding. Making some of these units unlimited will increase crowding and reduce opportunity for resident hunters. This proposal runs against FWP goal to simplify regulations!

Why are some units unlimited and others general license? Where's the consistency? This regulation change will not reduce elk numbers as archery hunters largely target bulls. Don't mess with archery regs if your goal is to reduce populations and provide resident hunter opportunity.

#114

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:46:30 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 13, 2022 3:53:03 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:32
IP Address: 69.146.25.17

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Pat Van Eimeren
City/Town:	Whitefish
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

A good example as to why this proposal should not proceed is how it conflicts with HD specific regs. HD455 is proposed as under R2 regs: "Should the 900-20 permit bundle be removed, local biologists would make available 100 archery-only, either-sex elk permits valid only in HD 455 and establish a quota range of 50-150 permits."

Which proposal takes precedent? Pull these statewide regulation proposals and allow the biologists to make the calls. They are the ones with the data, expertise, and experience with managing wildlife populations not the Commission.

#115

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 13, 2022 10:24:46 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 13, 2022 10:38:38 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:52
IP Address: 69.146.148.243

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kerry Pottruff
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The biggest problem I see is with the "Unlimited" label; In theory, this eliminates the 10% cap on Nonresident applicants. "Unlimited" also has the potential to increase hunter pressure, thus complicating the hunter access to elk problem.

#116

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 14, 2022 10:48:56 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 14, 2022 11:00:09 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:13
IP Address: 174.247.146.224

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brandon French
City/Town: Whitefish
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Hi and thank you for taking the time to consider my comment.

I am opposed to the permit change that only allows hunting antlered elk in the district you draw said permit during permit dates. This severely limits the number of days a person is allowed to hunt antlered elk if the permit they draw is not near where they live. As an example let's say I draw the 690 permit which is an 8 hour drive from the Flathead. If all I have is a day or two at a time to hunt besides the time to hunt 690, I wouldn't be allowed to.

#117

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 14, 2022 3:38:02 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 14, 2022 4:09:03 PM
Time Spent: 00:31:01
IP Address: 205.233.45.206

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Laura A Buck
City/Town: Choteau
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of the unlimited archery only permits as outlined. I am in favor of extending HD-450 to the forest boundary. I am in favor of a shoulder hunt in the HD-450 area, but only for those private land owners who allow hunting access during the regular archery season.

#118

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 14, 2022 5:11:00 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 14, 2022 5:16:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:35
IP Address: 4.4.123.193

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ronald G Schott
City/Town: Ennis
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not unbundle archery limited tags. It was set up to limit over crowding and unbundling will just increase overcrowding

#119

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 14, 2022 9:59:37 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 14, 2022 10:01:30 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:52
IP Address: 50.37.159.152

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Eric
City/Town: Libby
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Leave everything alone please

#120

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 8:59:00 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 9:05:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:04
IP Address: 96.3.14.116

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jack Sorum
City/Town: Florence
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am strongly opposed to this proposal and offer the following reasons to support my opposition.

I have hunted unit 704 with an archery tag several times along with my sons who also had archery tags. This has been a great hunt in the past and we have taken two bulls over 360". This is both a challenging hunt and a frustrating hunt due to the amount of pressure and the fact that most of the elk are pushed to private land throughout the season. According to the Montana Fish Wildlife, and Parks website the amount of hunters who hunted 704 in 2020 was 1493, resident and non resident. So if you are so concerned with lowering elk numbers to the outdated objectives, the elk are already pushed to private with the current system, and inaccessible to the majority of hunters. Add to this unlimited archery tags in a relatively accessible unit and you will essentially eliminate elk on public land. You will not only make the elk more inaccessible to hunters, you will destroy the experience and quality of the hunt that this area is known for which according to your 2020 data is already overcrowded. If lowering elk numbers is your object, issue additional cow tags on private land.

The FWP changed the permit system in the Missouri Breaks in the 90's from an unlimited draw to a limited archery permit due to overcrowding and excessive pressure on the elk resource due to archery hunting. This was a great management tool to not necessarily reduce elk numbers as much as to manage hunters and maintain a quality archery hunt. History will repeat itself if you proceed with this proposal, these units will be overrun with archery hunters.

I urge you to defeat this proposal and keep the quality elk hunting in the these bundled units for generations to come.

#121

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 10, 2022 7:23:02 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 9:32:51 AM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 98.127.75.22

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Mike Mershon
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not move any of the limited entry units to general units, do not allow unlimited archery only permits. Hunting pressure in most of these units is already an issue adding more licenses/permits will only further drive animals off of accessible lands, reducing hunter success, enjoyment and reducing harvest. The problem in these units is not getting a tag it is getting access to the animals. The only effective way to add licenses/permits is if it comes with access.

#122

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 10:15:51 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 10:31:46 AM
Time Spent: 00:15:54
IP Address: 172.221.79.246

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Rachelle Schrute
City/Town:	Belgrade
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

RE: The Proposed Changes to the 2022-2023 Elk Hunting Season

OPPOSE

"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."

It seems that the mission of Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks is being disregarded. Public comments have been strongly disregarded, as has been thoroughly demonstrated with this year's proposals and re-proposals.

Because of intense pressure from the public, conservationists, and biologists, the previous proposal had to be thrown out. This new proposal is nothing more than a veiled passing of the same, non-conservation-minded outcome.

It is my opinion that the unbundling/unlimiting of the 900 permit will not decrease pressure, will not facilitate access to inaccessible herds, and will not aid in the controlling of populations. The idea that it forces bowhunters to stick to one unit will, in my opinion, make people hunt those areas harder and increase pressure in MANY units. The only benefit I see here is giving a few of the big-ticket landowners access to unlimited archery bull tags. This seems money-driven, not conservation-driven. It solves none of the issues discussed by the commission, our hunters, our biologists, or our conservation-minded landowners.

In regards to increasing the either-sex rifle permits in 411, 417, 426, 535, 590, 702, 704, 705 by 50%:

WHY? I feel like we've all been screaming it from the mountain tops.

COW ELK CONTROL THE POPULATION. Increasing the either-sex permit is blatantly for the financial benefit of a select few. It does nothing to control the population or increase access to inaccessible herds. It simply sells more trophy bull hunts.

The public comments are being ignored.

The biologists are being ignored.

True conservationists are being ignored.

Each re-proposal consists of small changes or rewordings to the previous proposals which were thrown out, showing an agenda bias that disregards the people of Montana.

I'm asking this commission to throw out these proposals and take a moment to think about the precedent being set. The mission of this commission is to speak for the benefit of the people and our wildlife populations. A choice to disregard both is a direct affront to the seats you hold and will inevitably destroy what's left of the public's faith in our own commission.

We are asking you to do what's right for our elk populations and the people of Montana. You have both an opportunity to do a lot of good here and an opportunity to do a lot of harm. I'm asking that you don't continue to take steps that will dismantle the wildlife and hunting paradise we've always protected in the great state of Montana.

#123

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 1:14:23 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 1:18:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:37
IP Address: 72.255.135.219

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ronald Sherer
City/Town: Stanford
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The ONLY WAY TO BRING ELK NUMBERS DOWN IN AREAS WAY OVER OBJECTIVE IS WITH ANTLERLESS ONLY SEASONS FOR ARCHERY AND RIFLE. YOU DONT LOWER NUMBERS BY KILLING MORE BULLS

#124

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 1:15:58 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 1:27:23 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:24
IP Address: 38.97.192.173

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jeremy Hogsett
City/Town: Roberts
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not make any district that currently has a quota into a general tag or unlimited quota tag. This will ONLY benefit outfitters and nonresidents.

#125

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 2:19:43 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 2:24:20 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:37
IP Address: 174.45.253.23

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Trevor Nichols
City/Town: Belgrade
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the 900-20 tags being removed and changed to general tags. I believe this is an effort to privatize and commercialize our public wildlife for wealthy land owner who live the majority of their year out of state. I understand elk populations are well over objective on many private lands. I believe damage hunts and cow tags should be used to managed these populations NOT the removal of the 900-20 tag in favor of the general tag.

#126

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 2:24:23 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 2:24:26 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:02
IP Address: 174.45.253.23

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Trevor Nichols
City/Town: Belgrade
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the 900-20 tags being removed and changed to general tags. I believe this is an effort to privatize and commercialize our public wildlife for wealthy land owner who live the majority of their year out of state. I understand elk populations are well over objective on many private lands. I believe damage hunts and cow tags should be used to managed these populations NOT the removal of the 900-20 tag in favor of the general tag.

#127

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 2:25:08 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 2:25:21 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:13
IP Address: 174.45.253.23

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Trevor Nichols
City/Town: Belgrade
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the 900-20 tags being removed and changed to general tags. I believe this is an effort to privatize and commercialize our public wildlife for wealthy land owner who live the majority of their year out of state. I understand elk populations are well over objective on many private lands. I believe damage hunts and cow tags should be used to managed these populations NOT the removal of the 900-20 tag in favor of the general tag.

#128

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, January 15, 2022 3:16:13 PM
Last Modified: Saturday, January 15, 2022 3:19:36 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:23
IP Address: 72.36.23.198

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ashley DeVore
City/Town: Broadus
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support the proposal to restrict archery permit use to the specific district applied for and with a cap on permit numbers in order to help limit overcrowding and better control pressure. Thank you for your hard work and your service.

#129

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 7:52:30 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 8:01:10 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:39
IP Address: 209.181.27.246

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jeff Watkins
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the opening up the units to general or unlimited archery permits.

#130

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 9:33:53 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 10:08:15 AM
Time Spent: 00:34:22
IP Address: 107.191.169.26

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jacob Jeresek
City/Town: Libby
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Committee,

In regards to the following Statewide proposal " Permits for either-sex elk or brow-tined bull-antlerless elk will limit the holder to hunting for antlered elk within only the designated HD for the period identified on the permit. Antlerless elk hunting will not be limited by the permit. A general license may be used to hunt in any open district during dates outside of that identified on the permit."

I adamantly oppose this Statewide proposal. During the public meetings, it was stated that all proposed regulation changes were recommended based on science. During a virtual meeting I attended, I asked the question on what the science behind the proposal is to provide me a scientific reason to support it. The answer I was given was that it is purely a social issue because hunters feel they have missed an opportunity to successfully draw a limited permit when another hunter draws the permit and harvests an elk in a different hunting district. This is very short sighted and there's other viewpoints regarding this issue. What these hunters don't think of is if another hunter is successful in another hunting district, there will likely be more elk in the limited draw hunting district next year, the size of antlered elk will likely be bigger, and the chance that the successful hunter draws the permit again is very slim until they have enough bonus points built up. Most of these tags are what I consider a once in a lifetime hunting opportunity and if a hunter chooses to harvest an elk in another hunting district and forfeit their permit, that is their choice. Additionally, if this Statewide proposal is adopted, this will impact my hunting opportunity as I will no longer apply for these permits similar to mule deer permits because knowing my luck, I will be hunting in my local area and see an animal that I cannot harvest legally. I ask you to please look at other viewpoints of hunters and please do not adopt this proposed regulation.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

#131

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 10:27:35 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 10:37:56 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:20
IP Address: 72.250.159.43

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Mark Mayernik
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Having a limit on archery only permits in these units is a good idea, but don't make it to where that is the only place they can hunt. Public land hunters have to move around a lot to find the elk sometimes. Let people be able to hunt general units too. Don't lump 411 and 412 together without 511. That is crazy not to be able to hunt the whole entire Big Snowies Mountain with an archery tag. Keep all the "Snowies units together under one archery tag. That is what has been proposed for the rifle tags.

#132

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 11:44:34 AM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 11:56:19 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:44
IP Address: 170.144.217.137

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Dean Pearson
City/Town: Does it matter
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to this proposal as it will generate excessive hunting pressure and degrade the quality of the hunting experience.

#133

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 12:49:44 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 12:55:05 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:21
IP Address: 208.75.142.58

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kurt Rued
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I SUPPORT the unbundling 900-20 archery, either sex permits to better allow for resource/hunting management on a more unit by unit level. This is long over-due. However I STRONGLY OPPOSE the proposed plan to make the new replacing archery opportunities either "general" or setting quota at "unlimited". This will result in extremely high hunter pressure on public land in provide more incentive for private landowners/outfitters to harbor elk. Please put the resource first.

#134

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 3:02:05 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 3:04:12 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:07
IP Address: 174.20.121.248

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Steven L. Peterson
City/Town: Princeton
State/Province: MN

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

allow x-bows for handi cap people state wide in all Montana archery seasons

#135

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 17, 2022 4:51:52 PM
Last Modified: Monday, January 17, 2022 5:03:23 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:30
IP Address: 162.57.254.49

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Mollie Hunt
City/Town: Glendive
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Although these measures are introduced as science-based, I see no information regarding the impact unlimited permits will have on the numbers of animals in the herds in the targeted areas, nor why these changes are even being proposed. There is a plan and goal numbers for the management of these animals and these changes should not be implemented without presenting how they would regulate elk according to that plan. And while historical information about the harvest rates in areas might support unlimited permit sales, that does not mean the management of the elk herds should be left to chance and a quota system should also be implemented to ensure final control of the effect of selling an unlimited amount of tags.

#136

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 11:10:00 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 11:51:51 AM
Time Spent: 00:41:50
IP Address: 174.45.45.206

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: BRIAN B MCCULLOUGH
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

eliminate spike bull license or permit in all districts for archery.

#137

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 12:35:29 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 12:46:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:28
IP Address: 69.146.1.77

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jerry Davis**
City/Town: **Helena**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I say wait for the new Elk Management Plan before there is a wholesale change Montana hunting districts and regulations.

I am opposed to the removal of limited permits for the unbundled archery permits that are now part of the 900-20 permit structure. I suspect the driving force on removing limits is to provide more money in the pockets of private land outfitters, who have complained of the limited draw since its inception.

This proposal does nothing to address limited private land access and high elk concentrations on private land. It will significantly degrade the public land bowhunters experience to the point of many Montanans and DYI nonresident hunters may choose to hunt here no longer.

#138

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 3:36:11 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 3:45:28 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:17
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Alan Thomas**
City/Town: **Helena**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Not supportive of the changes proposed in the elk districts included in the Archery-only permit proposal (eg. 417, 426, 575, etc.). Please keep the same regulations as listed in the 2020 Regs package. The changes being proposed are solutions to problems that do not exist. Example, there is a false narrative that Landowners cant draw tags - Landowner preference ensures that both NonRes and Res draw tags at a 100% success rate EVERY YEAR for these units. Example 2, these units are not Over Objective. Objectives for these units are based on a severely outdated Elk Management Plan. Update the Plan and the objectives, then lets talk about the real problems in these units and solutions that are fair and equitable to the trustees of our wildlife.

#139

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 4:21:36 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 4:26:34 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:57
IP Address: 204.124.92.254

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Michael Kelly
City/Town: Miles City

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

As a resident hunter, taxpayer, and voter of Montana, I vehemently oppose the changes to the 2022 Elk Hunting Regulations proposed by Director Worsech and the Montana Fish and Wildlife Commission. Specifically the statewide Archery-only permit changes, as well as the 50% increase of either-sex elk permits.

A key pillar in the North American Model of Wildlife Management is that wildlife shall be held in public trust by the state. I know this, you know this, and the voters of Montana know this.

The hunting community must have faith in the people appointed to carry out such tasks. The public must believe that these individuals make these decisions with the best interest of the community and resources of Montana in mind. Regardless of the actual intent of the proposed changes to the elk regulations, the perceived intent of these proposed actions seems clear:

The perception is that the opinions of Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks Biologists – whose salaries are happily paid for by the hunting public, whose job it is to manage the wildlife resources of the state in the interest of the community – are having their opinions blatantly ignored.

The perception is that these proposals are a cash-grab that favors private landowners and outfitters, who will profit off the public's wildlife at the expense of public land hunter opportunity.

The perception is that the last-minutes changes to the elk harvest proposals was just a sneaky, nefarious, and malicious ruse to make it seem as if the Montana Fish and Wildlife Commission “listened” to the voice of the people, though only serving as a diversion from other proposed changes that have no scientific justification or reasoning – other than to line the pockets of private landowners.

I feel that these proposals were devised with the interest of a few wealthy elite in mind, rather than for the men and women of Montana.

When the perception is that those appointed to serve us have no interest in the public, that perception becomes the reality. If the reality is that those in power have no interest in the public, then all notions of trust from the hunting population are severed. This will be remedied at the voting booth.

However, this perception can be changed;

Listen to the Biologists of the State of Montana and allow them to finish their elk survey reports. No management decisions should be made with outdated information from a time when elk were hardly established in the area. Hastily made, “shot-from-the-hip” proposals are unacceptable.

As I understand it, private landowners near the 702, 704, and 705 districts, as well as in many other regions in Montana, have been dealing with “too many elk” on their lands. Hunting pressure on public lands is likely driving those elk onto private. How would an unlimited archery tag in this area remedy that situation? It makes little sense unless the intent is to increase elk density on private lands, driving more of those “trophy bulls” towards high-dollar outfitters.

A 50% increase in elk tag allocation serves the same purpose, while back-handedly accomplishing the same goals as the private-only tag changes initially proposed in early December. Though hunting pressure would increase 50% on public lands, driving elk to private, the amount of wealthy hunters eager to “rent a cabin” on some private landowner's property also increases by 50%, further increasing the profit made by private landowners off the resources meant to be held in public trust. Further moving the needle away from a public resource being “public,” and closer to that resource being rebranded as “The King's Deer.”

These proposals should be discarded in their entirety.

Though it seems clear that Governor Gianforte and Director Worsech have no interest in listening to the State employees at FWP, you as the Fish and Wildlife Commission have this opportunity to listen to the people of Montana. Please hear us.

#140

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 7:25:03 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 7:27:48 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:44
IP Address: 4.4.123.193

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ronald G Schott
City/Town: Ennis
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Do not unbundle!! The Elk plan is 17 years old and very outdated! Need to redo the elk plsn foe all the units brfore you propode anything

#141

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 8:42:20 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 8:46:27 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:07
IP Address: 174.22.1.235

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Chris Griffiths
City/Town: Columbia falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do NOT Support : The arbitrary increase of either-sex elk firearm permits by 50% in elk hunting districts 411, 417, 426, 535, 590, 702, 704, 705. This proposal is not based on science or the recommendations of any of the managing FWP biologists in the region. It is furthermore not designed to address overpopulation of elk on private lands as the harvest of bulls does little for population reduction. This proposal is simply an impulsive reaction to the overwhelming opposition to the original proposal of the Commission to convert these controlled rifle elk hunts to general seasons on private lands. The outcome of this action will simply be an overharvest of bulls in the unit. This will in turn, reverse decades worth of solid management in a matter of days.

#142

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 5:09:35 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 9:01:59 PM
Time Spent: 03:52:23
IP Address: 69.144.37.184

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Scott Vollmer
City/Town: Gallatin Gateway
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Dear Commissioners,

I support the Commission recommendation to unbundle and remove the 900-20 archery-only either-sex permits. I further support all the hunting districts within this bundle having unlimited archery-only permits. Moving to this system for 900-20 permits will require the collection of hunter-use data that will be necessary in evaluating the efficacy of this program. Furthermore, this system provides a framework for more landowner engagement in the hunting permit process. We need to begin the process of incentivizing landowners to open access to their land, and the current regime where landowners are being asked to open access to their land when they cannot even get a permit to hunt their own land has proven to be a futile effort.

In 2007, the current permit structure in 900-20 was created as a strategic effort to open private lands to more access for hunters in these districts. As publicly stated by the Commission members and FWP officials in 2007, the intent was to "stop the tide of leasing and purchasing land in these areas due to our liberal licensing system" and to "de-value private land in these areas to deter sales of land for hunting purposes". This has been a colossal failure and it is time to turn to other ideas and solutions as sticking to the status quo clearly will not produce different results. Going to unlimited archery-only permits in these districts will effectively put landowners in a position where they will be more willing to grant access through incentivized systems (leasing, managed public hunting, Block Management, etc.) while still being able to hunt their own property. We need to bring more landowners to the table with the recognition that they are stewards of both the land and the wildlife that resides on their land. Recognizing this and rewarding the landowner appropriately in this manner can only serve to help alleviate the complex access issues that exist in the districts in the 900-20 bundle. It is crystal clear that the current attempt to bludgeon these landowners into granting access to land that they cannot even hunt themselves is not the solution.

Furthermore, there is no reason to limit hunting opportunity in these districts as every district in the 900-20 bundle is over objective. These limits have also served to produce an estimated aggregate economic loss to local communities that likely exceeds \$20 million since 2007. And the communities that suffer this loss are rural communities that need increased economic activity the most. In summary, the current structure of the 900-20 bundle has produced a significant loss of hunting opportunity for both resident and non-resident hunters despite a biological surplus. It is high time to change the permit structure to address this biological surplus and allow local communities to reap the economic rewards that they have been deprived of for the last 13 years.

The only problem with going to unlimited archery-only permits within these districts is exacerbating the crowding that currently exists on public lands. Therefore, I also support going to 1st and only choice for the unlimited permits in the 900-20 bundle. This will effectively cause hunters to only apply and receive a permit if they know for sure that they will hunt in that district. This will have the benefit of managing applicant numbers and helping to spread hunting pressure across the state. Further spreading of hunting pressure will also happen if more landowners open access to hunting, as explained above. Therefore, I am fully in support of unbundling the 900-20 permits, and instead going to unlimited archery-only either-sex permits with the 1st and only choice requirement in these districts. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Scott Vollmer
MOGA Director at Large

#143

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:13:07 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:28:08 AM
Time Spent: 00:15:01
IP Address: 184.167.231.199

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Scott Desena
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I would like to point out FWP seems to be working off a outdated Elk management plan. “ 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” so the current objectives are outdated, but they’re also out of compliance with current elk plan. I would like to see FWP keep status quo until new one is written up. Thanks

#144

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:28:28 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:28:32 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:03
IP Address: 184.167.231.199

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Scott Desena
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I would like to point out FWP seems to be working off a outdated Elk management plan. “ 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” so the current objectives are outdated, but they’re also out of compliance with current elk plan. I would like to see FWP keep status quo until new one is written up. Thanks

#145

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 9:00:28 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 9:35:23 AM
Time Spent: 00:34:54
IP Address: 67.143.192.187

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Robert Barham**
City/Town: **Bozeman**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Please do not change 900-20 limited archery permits regulations in any of the HD's.

The proposed changes will only lower elk populations and quality on public lands and further increase populations on private lands. I know elk are a valuable resource, but they are valuable to all of us. Don't commercialize or privatize them with special rules.

I believe the archery elk hunting experience will be destroyed by this proposal, I enjoy hunting elk on public land and not dodging hunters even if I can't do it every year. The only hunter you seem to be helping are the ones that can afford to hunt private land.

Please keep the limited archery elk permits, and the 10% non-resident cap.

#146

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 9:30:25 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:19:28 AM
Time Spent: 00:49:03
IP Address: 69.146.1.77

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jerry Davis**
City/Town: **Helena**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

My concern with the unbundling of the 900-20 limited archery only permits back into 22 separate HDs is that FWP proposes to make those HDs either general season or unlimited archery-only permits. Since these HDs were combined into the 900-20 HD we have seen a significant increase in bowhunter numbers throughout the nation. Now with unlimited or general season archery there will no longer be a limit on the number of nonresident bowhunters that can hunt in a specific HD. Add to that the harvest of a world record elk in Southeast Montana and you have a recipe for a lot of bowhunting pressure in these newly unbundled HDs. Increases in bowhunting pressure will quite likely lead to the degradation in the bowhunting experience for the Montana hunter.

#147

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:38:07 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:39:51 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:44
IP Address: 69.146.1.77

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jerry Davis
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

My concern with the unbundling of the 900-20 limited archery only permits back into 22 separate HDs is that FWP proposes to make those HDs either general season or unlimited archery-only permits. Since these HDs were combined into the 900-20 HD we have seen a significant increase in bowhunter numbers throughout the nation. Now with unlimited or general season archery there will no longer be a limit on the number of nonresident bowhunters that can hunt in a specific HD. Add to that the harvest of a world record elk in Southeast Montana and you have a recipe for a lot of bowhunting pressure in these newly unbundled HDs. Increases in bowhunting pressure will quite likely lead to the degradation in the bowhunting experience for the Montana hunter.

#148

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:55:50 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 11:00:49 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:58
IP Address: 184.166.147.61

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Helena Hunters and Anglers
City/Town:	Helena
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

January 12, 2022

RE: Montana FWP 2022-2023 Season Setting - Additional Comments

Dear Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks Commissioners,

Helena Hunters and Anglers Association (HHAA) is an all-volunteer group dedicated to protecting and restoring fish and wildlife to all suitable habitats, and to conserving all natural resources as a public trust, vital to our general welfare. HHAA promotes the highest standards of ethical conduct and sportsmanship, and promotes outdoor recreational opportunity for all citizens to share equally.

Recently we've noticed something strange going on. All of a sudden Montana seems no longer proud of its rich, diverse, and spectacular wildlife. Over the last 120 years Montana restored its wildlife: healthy deer, elk and antelope herds, strong populations of black bears, mountain lions, and more recently other predators like wolves and grizzlies. But these days it's as though the only use for wildlife is to shoot it. Predators are bad. Wildlife's only value has become the money it might generate via increased license sales and outfitting. If you are wealthy, powerful, or well connected, Montana's publicly owned wildlife belongs to you. Scientific wildlife management no longer matters. Is Director Worsech trying to take the "trust" out of public trust wildlife? Montana has been a world leader in its wildlife management. But not anymore...

General Comments

- 1) Elk regulation revisions should come after the development of a new, thoroughly vetted statewide elk management plan, not before. Don't change the regulations until the elk management plan is completed.
- 2) The elk population objectives set in the old elk management plan are anything but objective. The term "objective," as it applies to elk in Montana, has become a political term; it is meaningless as far as biology goes. The old elk plan defines the Commission's duty, and it is NOT to find out what landowners want and to give it to them. Elk numbers should be set by professionals, with landowner concerns to be considered, not as the overriding principle.
- 3) Montana should adopt mandatory hunting and harvest reporting, like most other western states have done. Current telephone survey and check station monitoring data are inadequate for testing hypotheses associated with regulation changes, as well as gauging the health of our big game populations.
- 4) Hunting pressure in Montana is increasing at an alarming rate due to state population growth (18,000 new residents from July 2020 to July 2021) and the influence of social media. It is time for all user groups (resident, nonresident, guided, unguided, archers, rifle hunters, etc.) to consider giving up something in order to restore wildlife populations and age structures. It may be time to shorten seasons, and to require hunters to pick a weapon, a season, a hunting district, etc. The Department seems bent on selling "opportunity" at all costs, while the quality of our animal populations – and the hunting experience – continues to decline.
- 5) The Department needs to engage more effectively with the public land management agencies to better address the habitat component of wildlife management. Travel management and associated restrictions, maintenance and enhancement of security cover, increasing access to landlocked public lands, and wildlife oriented vegetation management (e.g. prescribed fire) should all receive greater attention from MFWP staff and inter-agency communication should be increased.
- 6) HHAA does not support Director Worsech's "simplification" concept of combining hunting districts, standardizing harvest quotas, etc. There is no good rationale for doing this, especially from a biological standpoint. This proposal to change hunting districts, appears to be designed to intentionally muddy the waters surrounding scientific management and monitoring of Montana's highly valued big game populations.

Hunting Districts have gradually evolved over time and will likely continue to do so, but wholesale change for no good reason must be resisted. Hunters know and understand these districts. And wildlife has adapted to the human pressures within each district. Where there is reasonable justification to adjust a boundary, by all means move forward with a proposal, but this wholesale disposal of

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

50+ years of careful district design, based on wildlife use and herd idiosyncrasies, as well as land owner tolerances and hunter participation, is thoughtless destruction of a proven system.

At the very least, keep sub-district numbers intact, and continue to attribute survey and hunter harvest data to the 2021 district system in order to track trend information for population numbers and sex ratios, as well as hunter harvest effort. Doing so over the course of several years will accurately illuminate whether boundary changes have worked as expected, and how trends monitoring data can be applied to the “new” district over time.

To NOT continue long-term tracking of wildlife survey and hunter harvest information speaks to intentional obfuscation of these long-term data. One asks WHY? The answer appears to be because the current administration does not want the data to be trackable over the long term as they strive to implement a system that favors privatization of wildlife. HHAA opposes the privatization, commercialization, and exploitation of wildlife. Wildlife is supposed to be held in Public Trust for the people of Montana – not just the wealthy.

Montana sportsmen and women have spent decades working to recover wildlife from commercial exploitation of the previous two centuries, and attending to the landscape realities needed to foster healthy big game populations. All the while, scientific tracking of those achievements has been conducted thanks to a science-based, committed entourage of state wildlife biologists.

Statewide Proposals

Deer and Elk

- 1) HHAA does not support elk shoulder seasons on public land.
- 2) HHAA opposes unlimited either-sex archery tags in the Missouri breaks area.
- 3) HHAA supports focus of population control efforts on the antlerless portion of the elk population. How does giving away bull permits to wealthy landowners resolve their elk over-population complaints? Landowners should have to get a permit/license just like the rest of the general public. In the USA we do not condone, and have repeatedly resisted a “royalty model for wildlife” – by virtue of the United States Constitution, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that it is the People who are the sovereign, not a privileged few. It is widely understood that wildlife is to be held in Trust for the People, and that is the government’s obligation and responsibility. We are opposed to proposals to double the bull/either-sex elk quotas for several limited entry districts that are over objective for elk. The focus needs to be exclusively on cow elk harvest in these HDs.
- 4) In Region 2, HHAA opposes any antlerless shoulder seasons on all state and federal public lands, including Spotted Dog WMA in HD 215.
- 5) HD 281 creates a new hunting district, but is it unclear how many antlerless elk licenses are allowed in that district, and on what lands. Antlerless licenses should only be valid on private land.
- 6) HD 284 is proposed as an archery-only district. HHAA supports this, but not the addition of any form of firearms within this particular weapons restriction zone.
- 7) HHAA opposes the boundary change wherein the eastern, public land portion of HD 293 is added to HD 343. We acknowledge that the elk in this area are migratory but feel that this combination of districts is ill-advised. HD 293 public lands provide a refuge for elk during hunting season. Many of these elk will migrate to winter range on the east side of the Continental Divide in HD 343 after the rifle season ends. This refuge is responsible for HD 343 maintaining an elk population at the management objective. If we combine these districts, and allow cow elk harvest on public lands in the current HD 293, we will experience a decline in elk numbers in both HD 343 and HD 293. This elk herd has been struggling for the past two decades to adjust to higher predator densities, forest health issues, and drought/climate change. The largely roadless sanctuary provided by public lands in HD 293 has been the saving grace for this combined herd unit. Please retain the two HDs as distinct management units and do not combine cow harvest opportunities across the two regions on the west and east sides of the Divide. We will lose this herd as we now know it if we start killing cows within the west slope refuge area. The present boundary has been in place for 50 years. The proposed change would make this the only HD in Montana that crosses the Continental Divide.
- 8) HHAA supports the boundary change in HD422.
- 9) HHAA supports the boundary change in HD 455, with the addition of Whitetail Prairie, to the Beartooth WMA.
- 10) In Region 1 and Region 2, HHAA supports reducing the season length for antlered buck mule deer from the current five-week rifle

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

season, down to a three-week rifle season. Mule deer bucks are extremely vulnerable during the rut. HHAA supports the same reduction in rifle season length for mule deer bucks in Regions 3 and 4. We need to reverse the troubling trend of declining mule deer (particularly mature buck) populations statewide.

11) HHAA is opposed to combining HDs 511 and 530 into a new HD 535. We are also opposed to the proposal to “Add either-sex opportunity (for elk) on general license valid during archery, general and muzzleloader seasons on private land only.” This was described during the Region 5 public meeting by MFWP staff member as an error in the Elk Master List for Region 5. It needs to be removed immediately from the list. This area takes in the N Bar Ranch owned by the Wilks brothers.

Mountain Goat

1) HHAA recommends that MFWP be conservative with goat permits. It is far too easy to cut into the principle of the herd and jeopardize its sustainability if more than 5% of the population is harvested. At the same time, herds of 50 or less should receive even less (if any) hunting pressure.

Mountain Lion

1) Please adopt Option 1. HHAA prefers a straight quota system, where non-residents are limited to 10% or less of licenses and/or quotas. HHAA opposes allowing landowners to hunt bear and lion without a license.

Upland Game Bird and Turkey

1) HHAA is opposed to extension of the pheasant, sharptail, partridge and mountain grouse seasons through January 31. These birds are already pressured by hunters for months and have to survive winter and successfully reproduce so that there will be huntable populations of birds for the following season. Do not extend the upland bird season simply to provide greater hunter opportunity.

Black Bear

1) HHAA does not support hunting black bears with hounds.

2) Please include HD 200, 240, the entirety of HD 301, 316 and 319 in the areas where hound hunting of black bears is prohibited due to the presence of grizzly bears. If grizzly bears are to be delisted and remain delisted, then chasing bears with hounds that do not know the difference between bear species is illogical and asking for conflict.

3) HHAA recommends that FWP maintain the requirement that each harvested bear needs to be physically inspected by a Department employee.

4) HHAA supports continued professional gathering of age and sex information on harvested bears through professional tooth extraction by a qualified FWP employee.

5) Landowners and their guests should be required to have a Class D-4 license to use dogs when pursuing lions or bears. Completely removing a hunting standard for large landowners is not equitable or responsible. Allowing these unlicensed nonresident hunters to chase bears and lions on adjacent public lands is irrational and caters to the wealthy, privileged and well connected.

We ask you to return to the time tested season setting process that has worked for decades, where local MFWP wildlife professionals make data-driven decisions about what's best for Montana's wildlife, with input from local hunters.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Helena Hunters and Anglers Board of Directors:

Steve Platt

Gary Ingman

Gayle Joslin

Bob Bullie

Proposed 2022-2023 Archery-only permit proposal

ROD BULLIS

Charley McCarthy

James Crichton

Doug Powell

Steve McEvoy

Bill Orsello

Cc: MFWP Commissioners

MFWP Region 2 and 3 Supervisors

MFWP CAC members Region 2 and 3

Hank Worsech

Greg Lemon

#149

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:59:54 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 11:05:24 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:29
IP Address: 69.145.123.117

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Marvin mace
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

By removing these permits ,it is giving more out of staters on to the private lands where the only people that benefit is outfitters and the very wealthy landownrers

#150

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:12:01 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:42:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:30:43
IP Address: 184.167.238.21

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kenneth Johnson
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I feel the new proposal to limit a hunter to hunting elk in the area he draws a permit is not a good idea. If a youth hunter who hunts with several different adult hunters draws a special permit for say area 380 it limits his right to hunt with other hunters in a different area which is going to deter him from hunting something we are trying to promote, more youth hunting. Also if a hunter draws a permit in say area 380, weather can make killing an elk in that area difficult, it takes away his opportunity to harvest an elk to feed his family. I believe the state is fringing on an individual's rights of choice by dictating where a hunter may harvest a game animal.

#151

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 3:02:56 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 3:08:04 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:08
IP Address: 199.155.70.67

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Matthew Strauch
City/Town: Chester
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Changes to Montana's elk hunting regulations SHOULD NOT be made until a more current elk management plan is drafted.

#152

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:45:38 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 3:33:10 PM
Time Spent: 00:47:31
IP Address: 63.153.27.96

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Justin M Troutt
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I would like to submit my comment showing opposition to creating "unlimited" archery units. I would like to see quotas assigned to the units to uphold the 90%/10% resident to non-resident ratio.

#153

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 3:50:09 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 3:55:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:49
IP Address: 184.166.66.97

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Jake Schwaller
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The Montana Chapter of Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, on behalf of our 3,000+ dues-paying members, submits these comments regarding the statewide 2022/2023 archery-only permit proposal.

Montana BHA believes that the foundation of Montana's successful hunting heritage is rooted in our state's adoption of public trust principles, and we hold few species in higher regard than our elk. Montana's elk hunting legacy is at stake with these proposals. Montana BHA strongly urges the Fish & Wildlife Commission to maintain the status quo with the seasons as they currently stand until the following issues can be addressed by FWP.

First, we ask that the suite of changes re: elk hunting in Montana be denied for failure to follow sound public process. Both this Commission and the public have a right to fully understand what motivated FWP to suggest these changes without any updated elk management plan or clear data. Since the inception of these proposals, there have been issues with incomplete, missing or confusing information provided by FWP. During many regional meetings, FWP's biologists pointed out that the proposed changes on the website did not match the changes as they understood them, creating a situation where the public truly doesn't even know what we're commenting on. This makes it impossible for the public to fully understand the effects of these proposals, rendering the process, at minimum, ineffective, and potentially in full violation of the public's rights.

Second, the objective population standards being used to justify these statewide changes are based upon numbers that are long outdated. FWP has an obligation to provide updated management objectives prior to any comprehensive alterations to elk hunting in Montana. To make these novel changes without operating on any corresponding new data is not simply unprofessional, it is reckless. It puts the cart well before the horse and provides no means to measure and quantify success, nor to justify the wholesale changes being proposed.

Third, if we were to accept the process and the reasoning behind many of these proposals (which we don't), we're still forced to point out that these proposals do not address the stated problem of too many elk, especially on private lands:

Removing and unbundling the 900-20 permits will only make the stated problem worse: unlimited archery pressure on public lands will simply drive more public lands elk onto private lands. Changing these limited-entry archery permits to general or unlimited permits will also open the floodgates to non-resident hunters. While this may make some private land outfitters happy, it will not address the stated problem. Conversely, this will return us right back to the situation we were in prior to 2008, when after 2,000 public comments the Commission changed these units to limited-permit archery opportunities, with a 10% non-resident cap. Undoing this change will result in even more public land hunters and more pressure today. It's also worth noting that as a population management tool, archery opportunities are largely ineffective. For these reasons, we oppose the statewide archery-only permit proposal.

The Commission's decision now regarding the future of our elk will echo for many years to come. We implore the Commission to make its determinations based upon updated elk management objectives, sound science and comprehensive and transparent public participation and input. Therefore, we ask that the Commission please reject these proposals and maintain the status quo until new elk management objectives are in place. To do otherwise would be a gross breach of the public's trust.

Respectfully,

Jake Schwaller
Montana Chapter of BHA Board Member
montana@backcountryhunters.org

#154

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 5:51:36 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 6:05:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:14:07
IP Address: 209.200.195.28

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

City/Town: **Missoula**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree with unbundling the 900-20 either sex permits. This will allow for hunters to spread out and better harvest data.
I am extremely opposed to having these permits go unlimited archery or general license. There should be permits for archery and general season. Increasing pressure on public land will not solve over objective issues.

#155

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 6:27:45 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 6:39:25 PM
Time Spent: 00:11:39
IP Address: 172.221.109.3

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jeffrey A Wesen**
City/Town: **livingston**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

In hunting district 702/704/705. I'm against unlimited archery tags, that's one of the best area's in our state for trophy elk. And unlimited tags will put too much pressure on the public and push everything to the private. Hence this proposal benefiting the private landowners the most. I feel letting the biologists set the tags numbers where its a good balance for the elk population and a quality experience for the lucky tag holders.

#156

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:54:03 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 8:58:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:59
IP Address: 47.45.164.174

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Sean Benton**
City/Town: **Missoula**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

These changes on the whole are clearly meant to benefit outfitters and landowners who wish to be paid for hunting. They do not benefit the general hunting public nor are they driven by a sound elk management plan. I oppose these changes and strongly support holding off on substantive changes until a new Elk Management plan is completed.

#157

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:24:57 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:42:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:17:52
IP Address: 72.174.11.119

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Charlie Talarico
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support this big of an overhaul at once this has not been properly vetted. Taking away to much opportunity for the general public. I have major concerns Reducing limited entry tags and corresponding it with increased general license on private lands. Fwp is essentially rewarding landowners and outfitters extra tags when they are the root cause for harboring elk and not providing sufficient access. An idea is Offer landowners 1-5 elk licenses based on size of property annually every year. This needs to be vetted with stakeholders and additional engagement is needed to come up with a compromise.

#158

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:08:59 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:39:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:30:03
IP Address: 174.204.20.55

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **John Herzer**
City/Town: **Missoula**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I implore the commission to maintain the bundling of these tags. Though originally I was not a fan, I've come to believe it affords great opportunity for archers to spread out. Though personally I would benefit from this move, it's a bad idea for the whole of public land archery elk hunting by putting more pressure and moving herds onto inaccessible private land. If any HD's are split off that should be 401 and 403. They are so far removed from cluster it doesn't make sense that they are regulated under the same tag. Perhaps a specific unlimited bow lic for those two HD's.

#159

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:22:15 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:22:40 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:24
IP Address: 161.7.90.83

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Bret L Lian
City/Town: Jefferson City
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the unbundling of the 900 permits. Many of the 900 permits going to general, as well as an increase in either-sex permits in numerous districts, seems just another bad idea having nothing to do with reducing elk populations to alleviate the strain elk numbers cause on landowners who work the land. Instead, it is an obvious path to incentivizing harboring, removing the 10% cap on non resident hunters in the name of outfitter welfare, and increasing crowding on already crowded chunks of public earth.

I quote to you, Quentin Kujula, from a 2012 issue of Montana Outdoors:

“According to Quentin Kujula, a Wildlife Bureau official for Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, increased archery hunter numbers caused ripple effects that splashed beyond conflicts over individual animals. Growing hunting pressure on public land pushed elk onto private property. That made the animals off-limits for many archers. It also made them harder to reach during the general rifle season, when, unlike the archery season, tags were limited.”

That this is a bad idea is obvious.

#160

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:35:16 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:38:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:47
IP Address: 199.96.16.11

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Matt Fetting
City/Town: Manhattan
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Elk regulation revisions should come after the development of a new, thoroughly vetted statewide elk management plan, not before. Don't change the regulations until the elk management plan is completed.

I do not support Director Worsech's "simplification" concept of combining hunting districts, standardizing harvest quotas, etc. There is no good rationale for doing this, especially from a biological standpoint. This proposal to change hunting districts, appears to be designed to intentionally muddy the waters surrounding scientific management and monitoring of Montana's highly valued big game populations.

Hunting Districts have gradually evolved over time and will likely continue to do so, but wholesale change for no good reason must be resisted. Hunters know and understand these districts. And wildlife has adapted to the human pressures within each district.

Where there is reasonable justification to adjust a boundary, by all means move forward with a proposal, but this wholesale disposal of 50+ years of careful district design, based on wildlife use and herd idiosyncrasies, as well as land owner tolerances and hunter participation, is thoughtless destruction of a proven system.

#161

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:36:27 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:41:32 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:05
IP Address: 72.250.128.13

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Michael Prater
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of breaking up the 900-20 archery permits but I am strongly opposed to unlimited archery permits. The archery permits need to be limited & have a quota range in 411/412, 417/426, 447, 455, 502/535/555/590/701 & 702/704/705 to eliminate non-resident over crowding on very limited public access areas in popular districts.

#162

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:14:24 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 10:55:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:40:38
IP Address: 161.7.41.204

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Tanya Gates**
City/Town: **Florence**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Drastic elk changes

I believe making drastic elk changes based off data from 2005 is off balance. FWP should wait until new numbers are established by updated studies. The amount of elk on public land is minimal to private land. The social tolerance of elk is issue. The land owners who have these problems are either not allowing hunting or outfitting during the general season. I know of many ranchers who are outfitting their property and then using shoulder season to harvest some cows. Shoulder season was never intended to be from mid August to mid February. It never gives them a break and caters to the large land owners. I believe we would have better luck managing the elk population with damage hunts and either eliminating shoulder season. The problem is an access issue combined with social tolerance. If we truly have a elk problem based off 2005 numbers then only allowing cows to be taken in those districts that are over objective seems like a better idea.

I'm asking the commission to not make such drastic changes to the elk regulations until we have scientific data to show where the elk populations are and establish a population that will meet social and environment sustainability.

Another issue I have is the general season dates. The climate is changing and I believe if we pushed back general season by at least a week it could help with harvest.

I'm asking the commission to propose a two week gap between archery and general season.

Eliminating 900-20

If FWP makes these tags OTC tags for private landowners it is basically promoting the commercialization of wildlife and able to sell their access to highest bidder.

In addition to the commercialization it will eliminate the quality of the archery hunt in these districts.

I feel eliminating this tag and making a unlimited archery tag will flood the limited public land with bow hunters. It will be turning back the clock before the breaks had limited tags. The quality and it will only push the elk onto private even more.

I'm asking the commission to not eliminate the 900-20 tags until a new elk management plan is in place.

#163

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:30:29 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:35:58 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:29
IP Address: 204.124.92.253

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Guy Stickney
City/Town: Miles City
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support the unbundling of the 900-20 archery only either sex tags however I strongly oppose the unlimited archery and general season permits for these units proposed. This proposal will remove the 10% NR cap that currently exists with a quota. Furthermore the 900-20 permits were oversubscribed with only roughly 60% of residents drawing and 35% of nonresidents who applied drawing this permit. This proposal will increase substantially the number of archery hunters in these units further compounding hunter crowding in these units. These units should have individual specific archery limited entry permits with a quota set by local fwp staff and biologists.

#164

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:36:25 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 11:41:30 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:05
IP Address: 204.124.92.253

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Sarah Dawe
City/Town: Miles City
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support the increase in rifle permits nor the unlimited and general season archery changes for the subject units. These units were identified for change because they were 200% over objective. However increasing either sex permits will primarily increase bull harvest. Increased bull harvest will have no effect on population. This proposal is not based in science as stated at the region 7 season setting meeting. Proposals that implement greater cow harvest are based in science and what should be focused on for these units. Please reject this proposal in favor of science based proposals that will target cow harvest. Thanks

#165

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:24:39 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:26:22 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:43
IP Address: 216.228.40.14

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jacob Stevens**
City/Town: **Miles City**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I would like to preface my comment by saying that I support the creation of the proposed archery-only, either-sex permit 799-21. However, I do believe that a quota does need to be set in place for this permit rather than leaving it as unlimited and potentially wreaking havoc on the elk population in those respective HD's that are included in this permit bundle (HD's 702, 704, and 705). I understand that according to the 2005 Elk Management Plan these districts would be considered "over objective", however, I would argue that the plan itself is outdated, obsolete, and is in dire need of being reassessed. Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

#166

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:40:38 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 1:41:29 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:51
IP Address: 45.62.182.169

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Seth Gudgel
City/Town:	Colstrip
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I vote NO to extending late season hunting to February 15th

This change is only valid on private land and does not do much for Montana hunters who do not wish to pay outfitting fees. This would promote landowners to pull land out of block management and bring in outfitters to control hunters and to see a bigger profit off a Montana resource. I understand that this does not change the criteria for damage hunts but would effectively kill that opportunity by promoting outfitters thus making that land unqualified. This would increase tag success but not for public land and accessible land hunters. This change along with the other proposed changes will only help those who have the means (money) and those lucky few who hve private land access to be more successful and increase the potential to shoot 4 elk a year.

#167

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 2:21:39 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 2:26:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:23
IP Address: 144.46.104.12

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Angelo Reda**
City/Town: **Lewistown**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree that the 900 bundle should be broken up but allowing these units to go to a general or unlimited draw is a bad idea. I believe this proposal will cause a lot of over crowding issues for the public land hunter and will make our so call "over objective" elk herds an even bigger problem for the landowners that do not want elk on their property

#168

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 2:44:10 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 2:50:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:06
IP Address: 71.36.48.181

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Larry D Rattray**
City/Town: **Proctor**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The 900 permit was created to reduce overcrowding. The majority of the elk were killed by non residents. Opening this up to general season will really load the area. I would propose making each district a separate draw. While not reducing the complexity of the regulations, it would show the areas of intense interest and keep control of the situation.

#169

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:17:41 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:34:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:17:10
IP Address: 64.25.130.250

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Ryan R Greenside
City/Town:	Missoula
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am not for unlimited archery tags. I am in favor of using your second choice for the archery tag but instead of "unlimited" archery tags there should be more tags available than applicants which would be almost the same as "unlimited". By doing this it will limit the nonresidents to 10% of the tags. As your own biologist have said having unlimited tags will limit cause more land to be leased up and decrease access. By doing this you are almost guaranteed a tag, non residents are limited to 10% and would would still be able to apply for a limited entry either sex tag.

#170

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:34:57 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:42:29 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:31
IP Address: 64.25.130.250

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Ryan R Greenside**
City/Town: **Missoula**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am not in favor of making any limited entry either sex unit into any type of general license unit. The access study I did will say why I think it will not work.

*****PLEASE READ MY OWN ACCES STUDY*****

I hunted unit 412 last year and I invested many hours of scouting and talking to landowners I called 37 landowners starting about 6 months before the season to see if they allowed access for elk hunting for both bow and riffle. My numbers are as follows:

- 24 Landowners were a defiant NO
7 Landowners allowed either just bow hunting, just riffle hunting, or both
6 Landowners had the tag themselves and said that they might let me hunt after they get their bull and to check back later in the season.
0 Landowner allowed me to hunt their land while they had a ES tag.

This tells me and I hope it tells you that when a landowner has a ES elk tag they are not willing to allow hunting to the general public when they have a tag. (I don't really blame them), which takes us back to the access issue. I have seen the Director say "by allowing the landowners to be able to hunt their own land for a bull the landowner will be more willing to open up their land to hunting.....well that is the exact opposite of what I found and my numbers have proven that.

I think that if the landowner allows random hunters (not just their friends and family) to hunt their land then they should be given a HB 454 tag. But they shouldn't be given out until a set number of elk that were killed on their property.

I also think a better damage control hunt program will work better than eliminating the LE ES permits.

#171

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:43:05 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 3:44:21 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:15
IP Address: 64.25.130.250

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Ryan R Greenside
City/Town:	Missoula
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am not for unlimited archery tags. I am in favor of using your second choice for the archery tag but instead of "unlimited" archery tags there should be more tags available than applicants which would be almost the same as "unlimited". By doing this it will limit the nonresidents to 10% of the tags. As your own biologist have said having unlimited tags will limit cause more land to be leased up and decrease access. By doing this you are almost guaranteed a tag, non residents are limited to 10% and would would still be able to apply for a limited entry either sex tag.

#172

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:10:29 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:18:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:28
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brian Robbins
City/Town: Anaconda
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Opposed to changes until a new EMP is in place. Reasons are as follows if you choose to read further. As a lifelong Montana Resident with 40 years of hunting, every year for the last several years seems to get just a little worse when it comes to hunting public land. Elk numbers on Public land have been on a dramatic downward spiral in recent years and these proposals do nothing to reverse that trend. I would argue the majority of these elk proposals will only further the decline of elk on public lands. While I've struggled to find the right words to express my comments, I've read Helena Hunters and Anglers Comments as well as Montana Wildlife Federation. I believe they are spot on and I agree with them regarding elk management in Montana.

#173

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:16:33 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:23:36 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:02
IP Address: 66.109.128.10

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Eric Midtlyng**
City/Town: **Missoula**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to this proposal. Unbundling the 900-20 permit is very likely to result in intense public land pressure in each of the 'unbundled' HD's, which is why the 900-20 tag was created in the first place. I believe this will result in a lower quality experience for resident public land hunters, like myself.

#174

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:34:13 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 4:40:41 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:27
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brian Robbins
City/Town: Anaconda
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Mule Deer Hunting. Mule Deer in western Montana are hurting (except in cities). If I understand correctly, moving much of western Montana to a three week season is a good step and more needs done. We shouldn't be harvesting antlerless mule deer where populations are so low.

One concern is that if the western part of the State is only three weeks, yet the eastern part of the state is still 5 weeks. The pressure on eastern Montana will become too much for the herds to sustain. I believe mule deer hunting in Montana should be three weeks only to allow some animals to live.

I recently read the flights from 319, 340 and 341 and it's astonishing how there's still a mule deer season there. 9 bucks per 100 does with 4 spikes and 5 two points. If that isn't a WOW moment, I don't know what is.

#175

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:09:58 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:16:42 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:43
IP Address: 4.4.123.193

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ronald G Schott
City/Town: Ennis
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Redo the elk plans before you mske these proposals. The current elk plan is so out of date it needs to be redone by hunt unit. Do not unbundle the fraw units. It will result in the same overcrowded conditions thst made it necessary in the first place!!!

#176

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:28:14 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:38:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:32
IP Address: 69.145.137.110

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Justin
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The 900-20 is a great tag to have. It allows for multiple options to hunt the early archery season when issues such as fire and drought can effect a persons opportunity to harvest and animal and provide food for his/her family. Please maintain the 900-20 tag to allow flexibility for hard working families.

#177

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 6:09:40 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 6:11:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:00
IP Address: 174.45.171.125

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Samuel Fisher
City/Town:	Missoula
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support the changes. Leave it as it is.

#178

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 6:22:35 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 6:36:43 PM
Time Spent: 00:14:07
IP Address: 174.45.107.3

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Garr eckley**
City/Town: **Bozeman**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

By making the archery only permits unlimited will only put more pressure on public lands, pushing elk onto private lands. This will make the public land hunting worse. If you have access to private land this is great! More tags more money. What about the public land! Don't privatice are wildlife. Leave special permits special!! This only hurts the public land hunters. (leave it alone!!)

#179

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 5:31:58 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 6:44:41 PM
Time Spent: 01:12:42
IP Address: 71.15.212.167

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Jim Mogen
City/Town:	Bozeman
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the proposal the ELK Permit Proposal that states “permits for either-sex elk or brow-tined bull-antlerless elk will limit the holder to hunting for antlered elk within the designated HD for the period identified on the permit.”

Reason: Resident Montana public-land hunters are already facing increased hunting pressure and overcrowding from non-residents and an overall increase in hunters. Having an abundance of public land opportunities available to general tag holders is a big part of what makes Montana unique and special, at least for resident hunters – having the option to pack up and move to another spot if the current area is overcrowded is extremely important to most of us. A quality hunting experience is important to a lot of us and some of us are willing to move around to get that.

Another point - Montana is a really big state and most of western Montana is a general license area, meaning we don't need “permits” to hunt there, just general licenses. Many resident hunters enjoy weekend outings to local general-license hunting spots while still planning longer hunting trips to distant permit areas, areas where distance, time and money may limit us to a single hunting trip per season. By making us choose, this proposal would eliminate weekend opportunities for many permit holders and substantially diminish inflow to local economies that benefit from local weekend hunters - Ennis, MT being a good example. I've hunted elk for more than 30 consecutive years in the mountains around Ennis while still holding an archery permit for eastern MT. I can't afford to travel east more than once or twice a season, nor do I have the time to, but I can hunt near my home every weekend and when I do, I stop in Ennis every time to fill up and buy snacks or grab some dinner or supplies or whatever. Multiply that times the thousands of permit holders in western Montana and I think that should be an eye-opener. This proposal would deprive local economies, take weekend opportunities away, and essentially shorten our season from six weeks to 10 days or so.

Finally, hunting and sharing a hunting camp with friends and family, getting to share those moments in the outdoors, has always been a huge part of what makes hunting so special. However, most permits are awarded under a limited draw system, meaning your chance of drawing is not guaranteed and often very low, and the chance of a partner, let alone several friends or family members, also drawing the permit is much lower if possible at all. Again, not only would this proposal eliminate weekend outings on large tracks of general-license public land for permit holders, but it would also eliminate opportunities to hunt with friends and family.

I suggest limiting this proposal to non-resident hunters. This would give FWP better-control of the annual wave of non-resident hunters while still allowing residents to roam. Most non-resident hunters are destination hunters anyway, with no desire to waste their valuable hunting time running around a state they're unfamiliar with.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jim Mogen

#180

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:03:33 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:08:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:27
IP Address: 47.186.182.46

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **William Morrison**
City/Town: **San Angelo**
State/Province: **TX**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor for the unlimited archery permit in area 411. I am booked with an outfitter for the 2022 season and are hoping to hunt the 411 area without the luck of being drawn. I am also glad that this is area specific.

Thanks

William Morrison

San Angelo, TX.

wdmorrison66@gmail.com

#181

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:45:53 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:48:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:17
IP Address: 50.46.6.33

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Lance Hamel
City/Town: Libby
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I like it, spread people out more

#182

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 7:47:57 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 8:01:25 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:27
IP Address: 174.247.151.100

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Mitchell Thompson
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

This will make it easier to read the regulations but more difficult to manage elk beards in this units.

#183

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:53:58 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, January 20, 2022 9:55:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:21
IP Address: 140.186.34.22

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Kyle Mlynar**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

More tags is not the answer. There's already too many hunters. Please bring back quality hunts with fewer people.

#184

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:30:33 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:40:39 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:05
IP Address: 208.104.210.248

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Nate Kunde
City/Town:	Rock Hill
State/Province:	SC

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

If the unlimited Archery only units are to encourage hunter numbers and ultimately help keep elk populations at objective then these units should be treated as OTC and not part of the general license draw. If overcrowding in these units becomes a concern for residents then perhaps set aside a week in September where only residents can hunt these unlimited units.

#185

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 5:32:47 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 5:34:42 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:54
IP Address: 174.247.149.85

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Colton Kaspar
City/Town: Big Timber
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Disagree with removal of the permit.

#186

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:00:04 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:02:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:48
IP Address: 69.145.167.209

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Justin Pritchard
City/Town: Kalispell
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support the stance of Montana BHA on this issue:
https://www.backcountryhunters.org/2022_2023_season_setting_montana_bha_comments_on_statewide_elk_proposals

#187

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:06:08 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:23:47 AM
Time Spent: 00:17:38
IP Address: 192.230.169.14

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Nathan Jones
City/Town: Simms
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not approve or support the decision to add bull elk tags to manage over objective elk herds. Don't allow Montana to become a rich man's game for hunting.

#188

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:32:16 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:33:11 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:54
IP Address: 72.175.57.172

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Wesley
City/Town: Stevensville
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am strongly opposed to the idea of unlimited permits and/or use of a general license for the unbundled 900-20 permits. It is unclear what issues this proposal is targeting to resolve other than creating issues. The following are my biological and social reasons for opposing:

Biological:

- There has been no biological, or science-based data provided to the public to allow for issuing unlimited permits and the use of a general license for “either-sex” elk in these units. It is noted that much of these if not all the units listed are above objective per the outdated Elk Management Plan, although this proposal does not target reducing herd size as harvesting bull elk is not a management tool for reducing herd size.

Social:

- The 900-20 permits have been popular among resident and non-resident hunters since the introduction of the permits because of the relatively decent draw odds and the opportunity to hunt trophy bull elk. It is of my opinion and observation the 900-20 permits as well as the 410 and 417 archery permits created overcrowding and lessened the quality and quantity of mature bull elk as once observed. Unbundling the units making you choose your unit in theory would lessen the overcrowding but making them general or unlimited reverses that theory. This proposal as written provides no solution to overcrowding or quality issues.

#189

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:27:21 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:36:23 AM
Time Spent: 00:09:02
IP Address: 174.45.82.31

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Chris McCarthy
City/Town: BELGRADE
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Unbundling the 900-20 archery permit is going to cause undue pressure on public land in those areas.

#190

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:33:21 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:47:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:13:42
IP Address: 98.125.90.185

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Shawn Moody
City/Town: Kalispell
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Opposed, leave it at it is so people have multiple hunting district options and opportunity

#191

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:45:19 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 7:56:41 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:22
IP Address: 65.141.87.178

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Chase McQuillen
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The issue that I see with this proposal is that it limits archery hunting to one specific district during archery should a hunter draw that tag. Hunting traffic, access, weather, animal activity, etc all play a part in a hunter's decision to hunt a particular area. These items are constantly changing and relegating someone to one particular area for their archery reduces the flexibility of a hunter to modify his hunting plans based on the myriad of parameters that I listed above.

#192

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:24:39 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:27:46 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:07
IP Address: 216.166.169.13

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Mac Minard**
City/Town: **Clancy**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

1. Move from limited permits to unlimited or general permits

- The current system is resulting in massive losses in resident and non-resident opportunity in the face of significant surpluses
- Will provide an economic benefit to rural local communities
- Unlimited permits allow for the collection and analysis of important participation information on which to evaluate the efficacy of changes in the future.

2. Move to first and second choice as consideration to landowners

- Currently many landowners have no opportunity to hunt their own property which serves as a disincentive to open property for others to hunt.
 - First and Second Choice provides an opportunity for a landowner (or anyone else) who applies for a first-choice rifle permit but is unsuccessful to have the option of applying for an unlimited archery permit – allowing them to hunt their own land.
 - I believe this is an incentive to allow others to hunt as well.
-

#193

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:44:13 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:52:18 AM
Time Spent: 00:08:05
IP Address: 66.62.204.66

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Michael Kubas
City/Town: Great Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am in favor of the idea to unbundle the 900-20 permits. I like having hunters commit to a unit and hunting it for the season. I feel like the 900-20 permits were not utilized effectively by a large portion of permit holders. I think it is very important to track the pressure in the new unlimited archery units to make sure it is not over hunted. If we get to a point where some of the units are getting a material increase in pressure, a draw should be instated for those popular units.

#194

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 9:48:54 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 9:55:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:20
IP Address: 71.15.194.3

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Hunter Stier
City/Town: Belgrade
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

The archery only permit bundle is getting closer to a simple and effective management scheme for big game in Montana. I fail to grasp how we are simplifying management in other units by combining units and maintain regulations is those units. In contrast, these archery permits are close to unit, sex, weapon, and season specific permits that make for simple, effective management and hunting opportunity.

although I am generally in support of this proposal, I would like to see all districts on a district specific permit system, and a more conservative number of male permits issued.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider public comment.

#195

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 9:59:55 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:06:12 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:16
IP Address: 63.153.95.29

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Steven Rea**
City/Town: **Victor**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Dear FWP,

Thank you for your hard work on what is a very challenging job. We all appreciate our opportunity to spend time in the great outdoors and Montana mountains.

It's been rather difficult to find biological and scientific reasons for the proposed changes, but rather it seems that there has been a push by wealthy landowners to influence public policy to simply increase their ability to hunt bulls on this private property.

Very simply if there was truly an issue with elk, then cow hunts on private property combined with increasing access or hunting pressure of those cows on private property seems to have the most biological backing. If private landowners are not allowing more access or not making ways to utilize additional cow elk permits, then it is really their own responsibility that there are elk on their properties.

It's hard to use Elk Objectives as a hard and fast goal when they're 15 years old, so it seems that no major changes should be made until that can be addressed asap.

Regarding having to hunt a specific unit when drawing a limited tag, I'm open to that. I don't know what will actually happen, but it does seem that it might lessen crowding a little bit in the general units, though you probably will get an earful from the folks who draw the limited tags. I'm open either way on this, but lean towards limiting it.

Thank you,

Steve

#196

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:00:54 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:12:41 AM
Time Spent: 00:11:46
IP Address: 70.33.12.99

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ty Traxler
City/Town: Big Sky
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree with unbundling these units. However, I don't think any of these units should be open for the general season. They should all be limited draw.

#197

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:19:38 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:25:09 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:31
IP Address: 209.200.195.28

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Sean
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree with unbundling the 900-20 either sex permits. This will allow for hunters to spread out and better harvest data.
I am extremely opposed to having these permits go unlimited archery or general license. There should be permits for archery and general season. Increasing pressure on public land will not solve over objective issues.

#198

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:04:41 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:26:45 AM
Time Spent: 00:22:04
IP Address: 216.240.113.254

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Ron Kruger**
City/Town: **Helena**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I have been hunting here now for 12 years and have seen many changes. The biggest change is the land owner/outfitter and how FWP and hunters have had to work around the result of that union. Outfitters pay big money to the ranch but only harvest trophy animals. Over the years this caused large herds onto the fields. Your fix to help the rancher was shoulder hunts outside the hunting season to decrease the herd size. Now I have talked to several hunters who held shoulder season tags and the land owners want to charge a "trespass fee" for them to hunt. I guess its really about the money and not about the herds on the fields. We need to protect the Rancher, Hunter and animals by only helping Ranchers that allow access through your Block Management program. If they allow access the hunters will take care of the removal and you only have to change quotas. Those ranchers that cater to the outfitters, don't allow block management and then charge trespass fees need to be on their own.

#199

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:26:09 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:35:29 AM
Time Spent: 00:09:19
IP Address: 184.166.66.97

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Kevin Farron
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Please reject the proposals to remove and unbundle the 900-20 archery permits. These permits were put in place in 2008 due to the overcrowding our public lands were experiencing, which was diminishing the hunt quality AND driving far too many public lands elk onto private sanctuaries. Since then, public land hunting demand has only increased, and opening these permits to any resident hunter and potentially some 18,500 non-resident hunters is a recipe for disaster (keep in mind that the districts going to unlimited permits and/or general would mean the non-resident 10% cap would not apply). Additionally, considering the justification for this proposal (too many elk, specifically on private lands), this seems like yet another example of the proposed solution not at all matching the stated problem. In reality, this 'solution' will make the stated problem worse and drive more elk onto private using a less than effective management tool (archers combined with the fact that they're typically targeted bulls). A more sound approach to address the stated problem would be aggressive private-lands cow harvests using rifles. And finally, all of this is predicated on severely outdated elk management objectives; let's pause this conversation until new objectives are discussed and outlined. Please reject this proposal to remove and unbundle the 900-20 permits. Thank you, -Kevin Farron

#200

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, January 03, 2022 5:59:36 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:38:05 AM
Time Spent: Over a week
IP Address: 73.62.49.135

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: D.J. Zor
City/Town: Columbia Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support this proposal. It will only increase pressure on elk on public land which will drive them onto private lands. The commission says they are trying to mitigate elk impacts on hardworking ranchers, but they are proposing regulation changes that will result in increased conflicts. This along with offering some landowner tags and moving towards privatization of our wildlife resources causes me serious distrust with the majority of the current commissioners and director of FWP.

#201

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:05:22 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:46:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:41:31
IP Address: 184.167.219.37

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Cole Dallaserra
City/Town: Butte
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Regarding unbundling the 900 series archery permit for either sex elk, I do not support moving those districts to an unlimited permit type. I think there are some potential negative consequences that could result depending on how the other statewide proposal of limiting permit holders to that hunting district only during periods of when the permit is valid plays out. I am concerned that if these areas are unlimited draw and you are limited to that HD, it could potentially promote congregation of hunters resulting in user conflicts. Specifically, non-resident hunters. Most of these areas are managed for older-aged class bulls. With the amount of information out there today such as On-X and Gohunt, there is the potential for there to be a big draw to these areas and with it being an unlimited draw a NR is guaranteed the permit as long as they draw the combination as well. At least with the 900 series, or a limited quota for that matter, NR are limited to 10% of the quota and with NR and residents the distribution is spread across several districts in the 900 series permit. Its more of a function of who draws that permit on specific year and where they intend to hunt. It almost seems that these HD would be better off general archery than unlimited, though I do feel in order to adequately manage use and provide good opportunities, these should be limited entry. I think the original quota ranges outlined in the scoping period that are based on historic use are good starting points for each specific HD. I would encourage the commission to consider limited entry draws for the archery only permits in these HD that are being unbundled from the 900 series archery bundle.

#202

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:22:59 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:50:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:27:03
IP Address: 184.167.51.75

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Molly VandeVoort
City/Town: Columbia Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Please do not unbundle and remove the 900-20 archery-only either-sex permits in HDs 401, 403, 411, 412, 426, 447, 450, 455, 500, 502, 510, 511, 520, 530, 570, 575, 580, 590, 701, 702, 704, and 705. If the aim is to decrease overcrowding and shift pressure, I believe this proposed solution will have the consequence of causing more of the problem.

I am strongly opposed to changing 900-20 archery permit tags to either general archery season or unlimited entry archery permits by district. We have no updated elk management plan; and no reasonable data for which to base this proposal on.

#203

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:38:25 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:51:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:12:49
IP Address: 76.75.53.57

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brian Scott
City/Town: GLEN
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am not in favor of unlimited archery tags in districts such as 447. I was around to watch the rise in popularity of archery in this district forty years ago and it was basically untenable. This adversely affects rifle hunters who are fortunate enough to draw this permit as well. There is so much quality Elk country for archers throughout the state that I would prefer to keep a few areas limited.

#204

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:41:39 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:52:05 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:26
IP Address: 192.161.70.253

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Simon Gribben
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Giving unlimited archery permits to the 702, 704, and 705 hunting districts will have a major negative effect on the quality of game taken from those districts. It will also make the districts even more overrun than they already are

#205

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:11:31 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:12:41 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:09
IP Address: 75.143.209.107

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Jerrin Uecker**
City/Town: **Great Falls**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I will try to keep this as short and concise as I can. But please understand the conciseness of this is only to respect your time, and does not represent my full and absolute opinion on the current proposals.

1. Please do not move forward with the current proposal.

2. Please listen to our biologists. I have talked with biologists, and I have seen email threads that other people had with biologists in the past month. All of the replies I have seen from biologists vilify your committee... You(the committee) are not listening to them. They are not happy.

3. Please wait to make any radical changes to the landscape that is hunting in Montana. At least until we have more up to date data.

4. Please consider, "A man will always feed his domain first." Part of your duty as the commission is to decide what men get to feed their domains and what men don't get to... That's not an easy task, you as the wildlife commission are put between a rock and a hard place. But at the end of the day you must realize that your duty is not to one man or another, your duty is to the food. Your duty is to make sure that there is food for the future, and that all men are equal and deserve a fair and equal amount of food.

Some men are landowners, some men are hunters, some men are wildlife enthusiasts... The food is our wildlife.

Publicly it has been portrayed as landowners vs hunters when talking about this proposal. But when you talk with the less radicals you realize it's not one party vs another. Every man is for himself. Every man will feed his domain first. It is purely human nature and the natural will to survive. It is fight or flight... I understand why landowners want more tags, they want that benefit. I understand why hunters want to hunt private land, they want that benefit. I understand why landowners want wildlife crop damage funding, they want that benefit... and so on for all parties.

At the end of the day we are almost all in this for ourselves. We want what is best for ourselves. However, it is YOUR job to decide what is best for the wildlife.

5. Please consider the scientific effects of killing bulls vs cows, bucks vs does, rams vs ewes, billies vs nannies. If overpopulation of elk was the problem, than how did you get to the solution of killing bulls????

6. Please consider that the "problem" may not be as big as it sounds. Are there really too many elk? Or are men just trying to feed their domains first. Are there really not enough elk on public land or are they just a little harder to kill than the ones you drove by on private land to get to your public spot?

7. Please consider NOT moving forward with "choose your unit" (where you can only hunt one unit). I have positioned myself in life to be able to spend an above average amount of time hunting. I spend well over 100 days in the field scouting and hunting a year. I move around through different units spreading out my pressure across most of region 4. If I had to spend 100 days in a unit I personally would create a relatively significant impact on the number of hunter days in a unit.

8. Please consider moving forward with "choose your region." As much as I don't want to say that because I want to be able to hunt anywhere... I believe that is a tool that would likely help manage hunting pressure and harvest pressure. BUT before moving forward with my opinion that has little to no relevant data or facts behind it... Please look at the hunter days and hunter harvest data. Is one region of Montana being over hunted on a general tag? OR is one unit?

9. Please consider the laws of nature. Nature is pretty good at sorting itself out. Politics aren't.

10. Lastly, please consider no decision you will make will be perfect, and in that case... maybe less decisions is better... The more decisions you make, the more you will enrich some, and the more you will starve others. After this record breaking debate of wildlife policy im sure you feel a lot of pressure. I urge you to see through the clouds of landowners and hunters to see the forest for what it is. The forest is something with no voice. No matter how many people tell you they speak for the forest... they don't.

Thank you for your time.

#206

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:14:38 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:17:20 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:41
IP Address: 174.45.253.88

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Paul Dinkins
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Dear FWP commissioners,

Please vote no on the proposed archery only permit changes. This is just one example of vast proposed changes which are a complete re-imagining of elk hunting in Montana are incredibly ill conceived. There has been a lack of opportunity for public engagement, and lack of input from and time for consideration by the FWP department's professional wildlife managers. With the stated aim of "simplifying hunting regulations" in Montana, what has been proposed only makes elk hunting regulations more confusing and further removed from sound science and social input. Based on outdated population standards and no foundation in biology, the proposals seem like they will massively decrease the quality of elk hunting in Montana, especially on public land and do nothing to decrease elk populations in over objective areas. In fact, the proposals will likely drive elk onto private land. These proposals are great for outfitters and horrible for montanans and land owners who actually want to decrease the number of elk on their valuable range land. Specifically I object to the increase of either-sex bull permits in many areas, changing the 900-20 permits, the failed experiment of cow elk shoulder seasons, and the "pick your district" limitations on Montana residents. Please go back to the drawing board and reject the unprofessional and irresponsible "try it and see" approach to regulating this species. Please consider getting back to the long overdue revision of our Elk Management Plan with a diverse group of stakeholders before hastily overhauling elk hunting in Montana. Please vote no, and thank you for your service

#207

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:01:10 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:22:56 AM
Time Spent: 00:21:45
IP Address: 69.145.226.87

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Brian Barbaree
City/Town: Columbia Falls
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to unbundling 900-20 archery permit tags to create more general archery season permits. I believe that opening these areas to general hunting during archery season will push elk off of public lands, and onto private land due to increased pressure. I draw a 900-20 tag every year and am thankful for the opportunity to archery hunt in different districts around the state. I understand that this will help increase hunting opportunities and special tag options for hunters but I think the effect on wildlife of increased pressure is not worth the benefit. If disbanding the 900-20 tag would create more unlimited tags instead of general tags, I would be more agreeable. Please leave the 900-20 permits as-is.

#208

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:18:56 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:32:36 AM
Time Spent: 00:13:40
IP Address: 73.169.172.59

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Randy Bronson
City/Town: Spokane
State/Province: WA

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Grew up in Montana and hunt and fish every year. Just a couple General Comments:

With Hunting Districts being Combined, Harvest Information needs to be more specific to gather best information. Ideas like leave old districts very lightly shaded on new maps, questions like North, South, East or West as to location of hunt etc.

Also does the State offer Private land owners and incentive to open lands to hunting. Tax incentives, grants exc. maybe for just the Archery Hunting season or partial seasons to help move Heard off lands for all to hunt. I understand the Private Guide lands not opening up but a lot of just land locked and Corporate lands out there.

#209

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 10:24:15 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:42:28 AM
Time Spent: 01:18:12
IP Address: 71.15.194.3

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Hunter Stier
City/Town: Belgrade
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Hello,

Thank you all for providing the public with an opportunity to participate in proposed changes to hunting regulations. I concur that simplification of complex hunting regulations is a worthwhile pursuit and the use of biology to guide these changes is just. In recent years conflict between stakeholders and the FWP regarding wildlife management has been on the rise. This is particularly true regarding elk management. Arguments centered around over objective elk populations and how to drive change in the harvest of elk in specific areas of concern often take center stage.

It is my opinion that there is a conspicuously simple approach to this problem. Manage game and predator species at the unit scale, to population, sex and age demographic objectives with unit specific tags. In this approach each tag would have clearly printed, season dates, a single unit, weapon restrictions, species, and sex eliminating confusion for hunters. The implementation of this system would also allow biologists to adjust harvest of females to influence abundance at the unit scale. Additionally, allowing biologists to adjust harvest of males to influence age structure in a way that balances trophy opportunity with harvest opportunity. I am not aware of an instance where the commission has used the tool of male license allocation restriction to influence the harvest of females. This approach would put that tool directly in the hands of biologists and the commission. The ability of FWP and the people of Montana to target hunter harvest in areas where wildlife changes are desired is currently handcuffed by complex, multi-unit and flexible hunting regulations.

An important consideration in adopting a unit and sex specific tag approach is that a few difficult questions will still remain. We will still need to come to agreements on who is allotted tags and how, and how many elk are we managing for. It is my opinion that tag allocation should be a random draw with 100% equal opportunity for all Montana residents.

As a hunter, I would hate to see the flexibility of liberal tag use go; however, human population growth and rising wildlife tension between stakeholder groups will only push us towards the simplicity of managing at the unit scale via unit and sex specific tags in the future. We should have the foresight to adapt now, restrict our own opportunity for the benefit of our wildlife, the quality of our neighbor's hunting, and our own.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Hunter Stier

#210

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:18:15 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:53:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:34:49
IP Address: 63.153.107.166

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: THOMAS PUCHLERZ
City/Town: Stevensville
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the unbundling and removal of the 900-20 archery only either sex permits. This permit opportunity was developed collaboratively with input from the resident hunters and landowners and is supported by our current elk plan. Removing this permit will increase pressure on elk and push them onto private land where they will become increasingly unavailable to Montana hunters not willing to pay access or outfitter fees. A huge change like this should be driven by science and all the Departments constituents and not what appears to be a desire of some landowners and outfitters. I would certainly suggest you wait until we have a new elk mgmt. plan in place before making this change.

#211

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:02:03 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:57:17 AM
Time Spent: 03:55:13
IP Address: 71.32.59.127

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Travis Hall
City/Town:	Stevensville
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

An unbundling of the 900-20 permits will undo something that hunters and conservationists worked very hard to institute. It will work counter to the aims that FWP claims it wants to achieve by substantially increasing pressure on public land in these famed elk units, thereby forcing more elk onto private lands where they are already said to be over-objective and problematic.

In a 2008 article in Montana Outdoors Quentin Kujala said: prior to limited entry 900-20 permit installation, growing hunting pressure on public land in the Missouri Breaks pushed elk onto inaccessible portions of private land.

While this type of situation may benefit private outfitters and land owners in these units, it would be detrimental to both the age structure of the carefully managed elk herds and the opportunity of the DIY public land hunters who pursue them.

That is why so many Montana hunters oppose the elimination of the 900-20 permits. Please keep these permits intact for the sake of Montana's unrivaled prairie elk herds and its world-renowned hunting heritage.

#212

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:07:20 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:09:58 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:38
IP Address: 184.166.163.104

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Jim Forseth
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Why restrict someone to only 411 for example?? The success rate for archery is so minimal it is ridiculous to do that especially where public access is about zero. So now without the 900 I have to choose only 411 to hunt archery and not another area such as 590? Screwing the average guy.

#213

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:11:33 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:36:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:25:17
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

As a Montana resident hunter I agree with the proposed unbundling of the 900-20 archery permit. I do not agree with increasing either sex permits- this will make access more difficult since people who drew these permits will pay for access; it also will not help with elk numbers since more cows need to be harvested not bulls. I do agree with unlimited elk B licenses, hopefully landowners will take advantage of the additional hunters and not just to the people looking to buy access. I agree with "Permits for either-sex elk or brow-tined bull-antlerless elk will limit the holder to hunting for antlered elk within only the designated HD for the period identified on the permit. Antlerless elk hunting will not be limited by the permit". As far as the individual HD changes there are too many changes to learn about. It seems you're trying to change stuff just for the fun of it. If you want to make changes it should be done on a smaller scale over a few years. This shows again this is driven by politics and not science. This is too many changes for people to go over especially when the regulations don't get posted until right before the deadline. You give people a few weeks to read and try to understand all this new information before they have to make a decision on drawings that they're not allowed to change.

#214

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:40:13 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:47:59 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:45
IP Address: 184.166.147.182

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Gary Ingman
City/Town: Helena
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I do not support unbundling and removing the 900-20 archery permits. This will lead to overcrowding of the subject HDs and a return to the conditions that lead to creation of the 900-20 permits. This increased pressure will also push public lands elk onto adjacent private lands causing potential depredation issues and favoring private lands outfitting. It will also not significantly help to reduce elk numbers overall, especially on private lands where the problems are centered. Please retain the current management approach.

#215

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:49:47 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:53:13 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:26
IP Address: 162.211.130.129

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Bob Hayes
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I'm FOR unbundling the archery permits but am AGAINST making them unlimited in the areas noted. I believe that a limited number of permits should exist in all of those areas requiring a draw.

#216

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:58:43 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:06:01 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:17
IP Address: 63.153.87.53

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Randy Hodges
City/Town: Stevensville
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support the unbundling of the 900 permits to unlimited permits, but I oppose turning units 401 and 403 to general license. I believe if these go general the elk will be quickly moved off of public land, compounding the private land issues.

#217

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 11:51:15 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:18:30 PM
Time Spent: 01:27:15
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Dan Frazer
City/Town: Choteau
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

First and foremost, I DO support any district and regulation changes that were proposed by the biologist of the area. I DO NOT support a single proposal brought forward without the input of the area biologist. Helena should not circumvent the highly educated biologist whose job it is to come up with the district and regulation change proposals using data and science. No rule changes should be brought forward without sound science to back them up regardless of public pressure. It has been brought up time and time again that the current elk management plan is outdated and needs to be updated. This should happen before any major changes are made. The director has said that social tolerance should be the standard and not scientific tolerance. The major problem with this thought process is whose social tolerance are we going to follow? I guarantee your average Montana hunter has a way different tolerance for animals on the landscape than a private landowner. Therefore, we should let the science tell us how many elk the landscape can handle. Without the science we are letting one group dictate how many elk are acceptable in a district and the current leadership seems to strongly favor private landowners. If the science backs the landowner's opinion, then so be it. If it opposes their opinion we should not go against the science to appease a few people.

As far as other proposals go, I do support breaking up the 900 archery tag as long as biologist agree that it should happen. The tag covers a very broad range of districts in many regions. It could be refined to eliminate districts that shouldn't be covered under one tag. I do not support forcing people to only hunt one district with a bow if they draw the permit. Killing an elk with a bow is a very hard task and bow hunting does very little in general to alter populations. Not being able to move around to find rutting elk greatly reduces a bow hunter's success. It was brought up that as much as 40% of permits for a district do not get used. If you tell hunters that they can only hunt an area they drew a permit for, you can guarantee that hunter will hunt that district. That would actually cause an increase in pressure for many permit areas. It could lower pressure on general areas, or it will cause hunters that hunt permit areas to abandon that district and only hunt general areas just so they have more options. This could increase the pressure on general areas. Again, there is no science backing this decision. I do not think bull permits should be increased by 50% in over objective areas. Killing bulls does not decrease elk numbers so it would not have the effect the department is after. As mentioned earlier, the objectives are outdated. The 50% increase is another example of uninformed people attempting to alter our populations without biologist input. The statewide elk B tag is another example of not having biologist input. The statewide elk B tag is another proposal not based in science and appeared to be thought up the morning of the commission meeting.

Without having biologist input, current data and sound science no major changes should happen to Montana's elk hunting. Please do not listen to appointed people. Instead listen to the people hired to do the job of managing Montana's incredible resources. Thank you.

#218

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:17:12 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:19:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:28
IP Address: 174.204.6.123

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Justin C Burdett
City/Town: Victor
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Statewide Elk

Permits:

Permits for either-sex elk or brow-tined bull-antlerless elk will limit the holder to hunting for antlered elk within only the designated HD for the period identified on the permit. Antlerless elk hunting will not be limited by the permit. A general license may be used to hunt in any open district during dates outside of that identified on the permit. MOGA Supports.

Late Season Antlerless Elk Options:

Late antlerless elk hunting as proposed in the master list for individual hunting districts that run as late as February 15 on private and some public lands; add a late season in HDs 702/704/705 through February 15 on private lands. This shall be applied to all HDs that had late antlerless elk hunting opportunities in License Year (LY) 2021 and any additional HDs that might be added by the commission because they are over objective for 2022–2023. This option is incorporated in the specific HD descriptions below where they differ from LY 2021. Where there is no proposed difference from LY 2021 identified in the master list, the late antlerless elk hunting in specific HDs is proposed under this option as no change from LY 2021. MOGA Supports

V. Regional Elk Recommendations

Region 4

HD 401: Add general license opportunity for either-sex elk during the archery season. Retain either-sex elk permit 401-20 (current quota of 50) during the general season. MOGA Supports.

HD 403: Add general license opportunity for Either-sex during the archery and general seasons.

Remove this HD from the Either-Sex elk permit 401-20 (current quota of 50). MOGA Supports.

HD 410: Adjust either-Sex Elk Permit 410-21 quota to 1500 (range 1,000-1,900). Comment outside the Published Proposals- MOGA Supports this action but recommends that this permit be first and only choice would allow both resident and nonresident archery hunters to draw on their 1st Choice with any left-over permits going on sale in August as surplus.

HD 411: Add antlerless opportunity on the general license from Aug 15 to the day before archery season (private land only), maintain antlerless opportunity on the general for archery and general seasons, add antlerless opportunity on the general from the day after general season ends to Feb 15 (not valid on National Forest lands after the general season). MOGA Supports

Add Elk B Licenses 411-00 and 004-00 to be valid on private land only from Aug 15 to the day before the start of archery season, maintain current validity for archery and general seasons, add antlerless opportunity beginning the day after general season ends to Feb 15. From the end of the general season to Feb 15, the 004-00 License would not be valid on National Forest land; the 411-00 would be. There will be no district split in HD 411 at Red Hill Road. MOGA Supports

Increase quota of Either-Sex permit 411-20 from 300 to 450 (range 50-450), license would be valid in HD 411 and 535. MOGA Supports

Increase quota of Antlerless Elk B License 411-00 from 800 to 1200 (range 100-1200). Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

HDs 411 & 412: Add Archery Only Either-Sex permit 411-21 with an unlimited license quota. Valid in HDs 411 and 412. MOGA Supports

HD 412: Remove “dead week” Antlerless opportunities from the general license and the Antlerless Elk B License 004-00. MOGA Supports

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

HD 412 & 419: Boundary change- Adjust boundary between HD 412 and 419 so the portion of HD 412 south of Hanover Road to Highway 200 would be included in HD 419. See boundary changes master list. MOGA Supports

HD 413 & 432: Boundary change- Combine HD 413 with HD 432. New HD will be named HD 413. See boundary changes master list. MOGA Supports

HD 416 & 454: Boundary change- Combine HD 416 and HD 454. New HD will be named HD 416. See boundary changes master list. MOGA Supports

HDs 413, 415, 416, 417, 418, 420, 432, 448, 450, 452, 454: Change general license opportunity from either-Sex to Brow-tined Bull/Antlerless. MOGA Supports

HD 417 & HD 426: Boundary change- Adjust boundary between HDs 417 and 426 so the portion of HD 426 north and east of PN Bridge Road to Stafford Ferry would be included in HD 417. See boundary changes master list. MOGA Supports

Add Archery Only Either-Sex Elk Permit 417-21 with an unlimited license quota. Valid in HDs 417 and 426. MOGA Supports

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

HD 417: Remove Archery Only Either-Sex permit 410-21 (current quota of 1900). MOGA Supports
Remove Antlerless Elk B License 410-01 (current quota of 300). Extend shoulder season for 004- 00 and general license from January 15 to February 15. These licenses are only valid south of Knox Ridge Road/D-Y Trail during all seasons. MOGA Supports

Increase 417-20 permits from 225 to 340. MOGA Supports

HD 420: Change Either-Sex Elk Permit 420-20 to be Brow-tined Bull/Antlerless elk Permit. MOGA Supports

HD 421 & 445: Boundary change- Adjust boundary between HD 421 and HD 445 to follow I-15. See boundary changes master list.

HD 421 & 423: Boundary change- Combine HD 423 with HD 421. New HD will be named HD 421.
General elk license will be valid for Either-Sex elk. See boundary changes master list.

HD 422 & 444: Boundary change- Adjust the east boundary of HD 422 (west boundary of HD 444) to be US Hwy 287. See boundary changes master list.

HD 426: Increase 426-20 permit from 60 to 90.
Add Archery Only Either-Sex Elk Permit 417-21 with an unlimited license quota. Valid in HDs 417 and 426 MOGA Supports

HD 441: Change general license opportunity within the Bob Marshall Wilderness portion of HD from Either-Sex to Brow-tined Bull/Antlerless

HD 442 & 450: Boundary change- Adjust the east boundary of HD 442 (west boundary of HD 450) from the Bellview/Battle Creek/Pishkun Canal Road to the US Forest Service Boundary. See boundary changes master list.

HD 444: Remove general license antlerless opportunity from Aug 15 to day before archery season and from Jan 1 to Feb 15.
Remove antlerless opportunity on Elk B License 004-00 from Aug 15 to day before archery season and from Jan 1 to Feb 15.

HD 445 & 455: Boundary change- Move the Whitetail Prairie Addition of the Beartooth WMA from HD 445 to HD 455, so the entire Beartooth WMA is in one hunting district (HD 455). See boundary changes master list.

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

HD 445: Adjust dates when Either-Sex elk permit 445-20 is valid; remove archery only dates so that start date is Nov 7 for the 445-20 permit.

HD 447: Add Archery Only Either-Sex Elk Permit 447-21 with an unlimited license quota. MOGA Supports

HD 450: Remove elk permit 450-20 (current quota of 5). General elk license would become valid for Brow-tined bull/antlerless elk opportunity during archery and general rifle seasons. MOGA Supports.

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705.

HD 455: Add Archery Only Either-Sex Elk permit 455-21 with an unlimited license quota. MOGA Supports

Region 5

HDs 515,502,525,540,555,575,580,590 (All R5)

Remove 595-00 Antlerless Elk B License

Remove 900-20 Elk Archery Permit from HD 530, HD 580 south of Sweetgrass Ck., HD 590, HD 511, HD 502, HD 520 south and east of West Fork of Rock Creek, HD570, HD575, HD500. MOGA Supports

HD 500 & 570 (new HD 515): Boundary Change – Combine HD 500 and HD 570. New HD will be named HD 515. See boundary changes master list.

Remove 500-20 and 570-20 either-sex elk permits MOGA Supports

Add Antlerless opportunity to the general license for Aug 15 to the day before archery season (Only valid on private land) and late season (day after general season to Feb 15). MOGA Supports

Add Antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid during Aug 15 to the day before archery season (Only valid on private land), during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15) MOGA Supports

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

HD 502:

Add Antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid from Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (only on private land), during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15)

Add antlerless opportunity on the general license from Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (only on private land), during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15)

Change General Elk License opportunity from Spike Bull or Antlerless Elk to Antlerless Elk for archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons.

MOGA Supports

HDs 502, 555: Add Either-Sex permit 502-20 with a license quota of 30 (range 5-50) valid during archery and general seasons.

HDs 502, 535, 555, and 590 and portion of HD701 north of the Yellowstone River, south of Hwy 12, and west of Sumatra-Hysham Rd.: Add archery season only Either-Sex permit 595-21 with an unlimited license quota. MOGA Supports

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

HD 510, 520 & 560: Boundary change –The northern portion of HD 560 and a portion of 520 will be combined and named HD 525. HD 510 and a portion of 520 will be combined and named 555. The southern portion of HD 560 will be renamed HD 565. See boundary changes master list.

HD 510 & 520 (proposed to be HD 555): Add Antlerless Elk B License 555-00 with a license quota of 30 (range 5-50) valid archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons.

Remove antlerless elk B license 520-01

HDs 502, 555: Add Either-Sex permit 502-20 with a license quota of 30 (range 5-50) valid during archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons.

HD 511 & 530 (proposed to be HD 535): Boundary Change – Combine HD 511 and HD 530. New HD will be named HD 535. See boundary changes master list.

Add antlerless opportunity valid on general license from Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (only valid on private land). late season (day after general season to Feb 15) Add either sex opportunity on general license valid during archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons on private land only. MOGA Supports

Add Antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (only valid on private land), during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15) MOGA Supports

Increase quota of Antlerless Elk B License 411-00 from 800 to 1200 (range 100-1,200). (Valid in HDs 411 and 535) MOGA Supports

Add Antlerless Elk B License 411-00 valid Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (only valid on private land), during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15) MOGA Supports

Add Either-Sex Elk Permit 411-20 valid during archery, general, and muzzleloader.

Increase quota of Either-Sex permit 411-20 from 300 to 450 (range 50-450) valid in HDs 411 and 535. MOGA Supports

HD 520 & 560 (proposed to be HD 525): Add Either-sex opportunity on general license during archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons. MOGA Supports

Remove antlerless elk B licenses 520-00 and 560-00

Add antlerless opportunity to the general license for Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only) and late season (day after general season to Feb 15, not valid on National Forest lands)

Add antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid from Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only), during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15, not valid on National Forest lands)

HD 535: Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

HD 540: Add Antlerless B License 005-00 valid Aug15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only) during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15)

Remove Antlerless Elk B License 540-00 (current quota 100).

Add antlerless opportunity on general license valid Aug 15 to day before archery season begins (private land only) and late season (day after general season to Feb 15)

HD 560 (southern portion proposed to be HD 565): Add Either-Sex opportunity on the general license valid during archery season only. Add Antlered Bull opportunity on general license valid during the general and muzzleloader seasons.

HD 575: Add Either-Sex opportunity on the general license valid during archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons. MOGA Supports.

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

Add antlerless opportunity on the general license valid Aug 15 to day before archery season begins (private land only) and late season (day after general season to Feb 15)

Add Antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid Aug 15 to day before archery season begins (private land only) during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15)

Remove Either-Sex permit 575-20 (current quota of 20).

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705.

HD 580: Boundary change- Remove HD 580 portion, south of Sweet Grass Creek. See boundary changes master list.

Remove antlerless elk B license 580-00

Remove elk permit 580-20

Add Antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only) valid during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15)

Add antlerless opportunity on general license from Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only) and late season (day after general season to Feb 15)

Add either-sex opportunity on the general license valid during archery, general, and muzzleloader seasons. MOGA Supports

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

HD 590: Boundary change- Remove HD 590 portions, "north of Yellowstone River" and "south of Yellowstone River." See boundary changes master list.

Remove either-sex elk permit 590-21 MOGA Supports

Increase either sex elk permit 590-20 from 250 to 380. MOGA Supports

Add antlerless opportunity on general license valid Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only) and late season (day after general season to Feb 15) MOGA Supports

Add antlerless Elk B License 005-00 valid Aug 15 to the day before archery season begins (private land only) valid during archery, general, muzzleloader, and late seasons (day after general season to Feb 15). MOGA Supports

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

Region 6

HD 622 & 630: Boundary change- Adjust boundary between HD 622 and HD 630; add the land between Timber Creek, Burke Ranch Road and Ridge Road to HD 622. See boundary changes master list.

HDs 620, 621, 622:

Change Antlerless Elk Permit 698-00 to Elk B License 698-00 and maintain the quota of 300 (range 100-500).

Increase 620-20 ES permit from 60 to 70

Increase 622-20 ES permit from 50 to 60

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

Comment outside the Published Proposals

HD 620-21 HDs 620, 621 & 622 Archery Elk Permits.

Currently limited permit 1st, 2nd & 3rd Choice. Quota of 1400.

There were 87 Residents and 192 Nonresident hunters that didn't draw on their 1st Choice.

According to the FWP's Elk Archery Hunter Participation surveys which indicates that there were 1,044 hunters that hunted HD 620-21 in 2021.

Therefore 356 hunters that drew a permit and didn't use the permit to hunt. This is taking away opportunities for both Resident & Nonresident Hunters.

Let's consider if the 87 Resident and 192 Nonresident would have drawn a permit and came to these communities to hunt. According to the FWP's "Statewide Estimates of Resident and Nonresident Hunter & Angler Trip Related Expenditures" which estimates that Resident elk hunters spend 7 days elk hunting spending \$89.18 per day and Nonresident hunters hunting 7 days elk hunting and spending \$596.70 per day. Lost commerce equates to \$856,000.

Currently HD 620-21 is one of 2 Elk Permit HDs that do not have a Quota Range.

MOGA Recommendation: Establish a Quota Range of 1400 Minimum to 1900 Maximum.

Recommendations: Raise the quota to 1600 and go to 1st And Only Choice. This will allow both Resident and Nonresident to draw on their 1st Choice. Any left-over permits would go to surplus and go on sale 1st come in August.

HD 630, 631 & 632: Boundary change – Combine HDs 630, 631 and 632. New HD will be named HD 630.

See boundary changes master list.

HD 630: Remove Antlerless Elk B License 631-00 (current quota 65).

Add Antlerless Elk B License 630-00 with a license quota of 50 (range 1-200).

Remove Either-Sex Elk Permit 631-20 (current quota of 30). MOGA Supports

Remove Either-Sex Elk Permit 632-20 (current quota of 10). MOGA Supports

Add Either-Sex Elk Permit 630-20 with a license quota of 25 (range 25-75).

Remove Either-Sex Archery Only Permit 631-21 (current quota of 200).

Remove Either-Sex Archery Only Permit 632-21 (current quota of 100).

Add Either-Sex Archery Only Permit 630-21 with a license quota of 200 (range 100-300).

HD 690: Remove Antlerless Elk B-License 699-01 (current quota of 200).

Increase 690-20 ES permit from 35 to 50, and adjust quota range to 15 - 100 (current range 10-50).

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705. MOGA Supports

Region 7

HD 700: Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705.

HDs 702, 704, 705: Add Either-Sex archery only permit LPT 799-21 with an unlimited license quota. MOGA Supports

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

Change quota for 700-20 from 225 to 340 either sex elk permits.

Unlimited Antlerless Elk B Licenses 900-00 valid on private land during any open season in HDs 260, 411, 417, 426, 450, 515, 535, 575, 580, 590, 690, 700, 702, 704, and 705.

Add late season for antlerless elk in HD 702/704/705 through Feb. 15 on private land. (extend all valid B licenses in Region 7 to be eligible plus the new statewide license as well as a general license for antlerless elk only).

Comment outside the Published Proposals

HD 700-21 Archery Elk Permits. Currently limited permit 1st, 2nd & 3rd Choice and a quota of 705. There were 78 Residents and 208 Nonresident hunters that didn't draw on their 1st Choice. According to the FWP's Elk Archery Hunter Participation surveys which indicates that there were only 595 hunters that hunted HD 700-21 in 2021. This means that approximately 110 hunters that drew a permit and didn't use the permit to hunt. This is taking away opportunities for both Resident & Nonresident Hunters.

Economically the current management and quota is costing the state of Montana significantly is the face of large elk surplus. For example, if the 78 Resident and 208 Nonresident would have drawn a permit and came to these communities to hunt, based on FWP's "Statewide Estimates of Resident and Nonresident Hunter & Angler Trip Related Expenditures" which estimates that Resident elk hunters spend 7 days elk hunting spending \$89.18 per day and Nonresident hunters hunting 7 days elk hunting and spending \$596.70 per day, the estimated economic return would have been nearly \$1 million

#219

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:32:33 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:33:02 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:29
IP Address: 63.153.107.166

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: THOMAS PUCHLERZ
City/Town: Stevensville
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the unbundling and removal of the 900-20 archery only either sex permits. This permit opportunity was developed collaboratively with input from the resident hunters and landowners and is supported by our current elk plan. Removing this permit will increase pressure on elk and push them onto private land where they will become increasingly unavailable to Montana hunters not willing to pay access or outfitter fees. A huge change like this should be driven by science and all the Departments constituents and not what appears to be a desire of some landowners and outfitters. I would certainly suggest you wait until we have a new elk mgmt. plan in place before making this change.

#220

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:44:47 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:55:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:57
IP Address: 136.226.57.34

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Paul Johnson
City/Town: Whitefish
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Oppose unbundled permits:

The 900-20 permits came about due to overcrowding on our eastern public lands. Montana sportsmen asked for these units to be put onto a permit system, but now politicians seek to remove these limitations presumably to allow more NR guided sports to get tags. This increase in pressure from R & NR will further push the elk off public land. If we truly wanted to get elk off private land we should not harass them even more on the public.

#221

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:14:04 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:09:47 PM
Time Spent: 01:55:42
IP Address: 97.121.195.210

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Lennie Buhmann
City/Town:	Shepherd
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Proposed 2022–2023 Archery-only permit proposal

Dear Fish & Game Commission

This is my response to your elk and deer proposals for the upcoming 2022 hunting season and beyond. I understand that the original proposal recommended that many Eastern Montana hunting districts be open to general rifle either sex elk hunting. I understand that this was met with angry resistance as it was seen as an attempt to commercialize elk hunting. Well now to be honest, I and others feel that it was a ruse in order to get what top MT FWP officials really are after and that's unlimited either sex archery hunting in many Eastern Montana hunting districts. See we all, including the biologist, know you don't reduce elk numbers by increasing elk permits of any kind that are 90+% used on bull elk. It's simple, you reduce elk herds with rifle antlerless permits and as much access to elk habitat as you can get.

There is a very good reason why the 900 limited archery elk permit came about years ago, which you are possibly about to unravel. There were hunting pressure issues on public land and unlimited elk permits was recognized as a vehicle for commercial interest to lease private land and the "average joe" could not compete with that. Do you know how many more archery hunters there are in Montana now compared to how many there were when the 900 archery permit was created? Please get that info from FWP and share. Do you know how many tens of thousands of people have moved into the Bozeman, Kalispell, Missoula and Billings areas even over the last two years? Did you know that some in Bozeman are predicting that the Gallatin Valley will be as populated as Boise, ID in the next 15 years? I have been told by FWP employees that Montana has had a 30% increase in resident general deer and elk licenses in recent years. Is this true? Do you even know what this has done regarding the increased pressure on public land, Block Management and private lands that allow hunting? If you pass this proposal, you will be responsible for all the conflicts as archery elk hunters increase exponentially on public lands. This will also lead to more pressure on the elk as they are pushed to private lands where there are complaints about there being too many. Does this idea make any sense? You will also be responsible for the loss of any inroads FWP and hunters have made over the last few years getting access to elk on private lands as with your one action, you will make the bull elk extremely valuable to special interests who will market to the approximately 12,500 non-resident elk hunters who get licenses every year. Now, does it makes sense to have so many districts combined into one 900 archery permit, maybe not. If that is a major hiccup, then set the district by district permit numbers to be comparable to the overall 900 archery permit number now offered. If FWP Wildlife and its director want to reduce elk numbers, then quit insulting us with these proposals and work on getting access and increasing the antlerless permits or over the counter antlerless licenses as appropriate.

Now as it pertains to deer hunting, there isn't much to go over except the obvious, much of what I pointed out above. We have a population and hunter increase problem that MT FWP is ignoring and I hope you chose not to do the same. It is impossible to hunt in R-2 now without a permit for mule deer bucks. I understand that more proposals are coming to do more of the same, even more limited and I completely understand why. So I ask you this, where are all those deer hunters who don't draw the limited deer permit going? They still want to hunt and go somewhere. Has MT FWP ever provided data to the commission on how all the deer permit areas have displaced hunters and put more pressure on public and private lands open to hunting in Central and Eastern Montana? Does the Commission know how much pressure they put on hunting when they adopted splitting the Non-Resident Deer/Elk Combination licenses and putting two non-resident hunters in the field instead on one? I believe these are fair questions and my points here are only the beginning of the conversation that I hope the commission and Montana Sportsman Groups begin to discuss and address.

In summary, I hope the commission does not chose to go back to an unlimited hunter number archery elk season in any of the hunting districts proposed. If things continue down this road, I believe there may be ramifications in the upcoming 2024 gubernatorial election as well as possible state house and senate races. I believe that avid Montana resident hunters are found on both side of the political spectrum and nothing unites sportsman more than anger at what is perceived as proposals that are economically and politically, not biologically motivated.

Thanks for your time.

Lennie Buhmann
Big Sky Chapter Chair
Mule Deer Foundation

#222

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:32:35 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:13:31 PM
Time Spent: 01:40:56
IP Address: 67.44.224.177

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: ELIZABETH MCFARLAND
City/Town: OTTER
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Objective for proposed new 799-21: 702, 704 and 705 should be managed specifically to needs in 704 as other two HDs are mostly private. Increase quality archery hunting experience particularly on public land by LIMITING BULL TAKE until updated Elk Management Plan completed. Recognize the value of largest block of public land in eastern MT, the Ashland RD, as a unique and important element for public land hunters and strive to manage for a better experience and less pressure. HD-704 had 88% increase from 2014 to 2018 and should anticipate rapid continued growth and interest as bow hunters shift out of occupied griz bear habitat to the west, find easier archery hunting around gentler topography, limited water sources and tremendous access on public land from very high open road density. Add to this increased archery technological improvements as significant advantage for bow hunters.

YES, to unbundle 702,704 and 705 to provide for better mgt.

NO, NO, NO. NO UNLIMITED EITHER SEX (this does mean bulls). Limit by draw for bull archery in this proposed new 799-21 to provide for a quality hunt on BOTH public and private land while maintaining and improving bull/cow ratio. Cow elk can be unlimited on public and private land for archery.

Region 7 should not be a default for CMR.

#223

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:26:03 AM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:13:40 PM
Time Spent: 13:47:36
IP Address: 174.202.73.226

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Hunter Johnstone
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I think this proposal lacks clarity as to what changes to harvest rates and/or public-private land elk distribution could be expected. I do not support the change.

#224

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:09:36 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:16:43 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:07
IP Address: 72.250.159.41

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: SEAN STROHM
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to moving any of the above units to an unlimited archery only permit. That is a clear attempt to cater to outfitters and non-resident landowners and push the same agenda that was defeated in the legislature. The proposal will do absolutely nothing to reduce elk herds and will result in less elk kill because the increased pressure will run the elk off all of the public land very early in the archery season. Any change this significant should come out of the multi-stakeholder elk task force and not a reckless last minute change that has predictably negative implications. There were nearly 1,000 non-resident's who applied for the 900 tag and were not drawn. This change would result in several thousand more hunters in the unit.

It does not make sense to break the 900 tag into the units being described. The Little Snowies should be kept in tact with 411 being combined with the area in region 5 that makes up the natinal forest.

#225

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 1:58:10 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:29:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:31:37
IP Address: 70.33.9.184

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Jackson farr
City/Town: Nashua
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

We should not be making in changes to elk. We need an updated elk management plan. Turning draw districts to general or unlimited will create overcrowding on public land. Taking all enjoyment out of hunting and adding to elk being harbored on public lands. This does nothing to solve population issues only creating headaches for when we get a new management plan.

#226

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:26:13 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:32:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:37
IP Address: 35.131.34.18

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Randy Newberg
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose all general elk hunting proposals for HD 401, 403, 450, 515, 575, and 580.

I oppose unlimited archery-only elk permits for HD 411/412, 417/426, 447, 455, 502/535/555/590/701, and 702/704/705.

Montana has previously had unlimited archery-only permits in many units. It was removed due to overcrowding and the resulting concentration of elk on private lands as the elk responded to hunting pressure on public land. This proposal is doubling down on a past management policy that failed.

General elk tags in the proposed units will create intense pressure on public lands that pushes elk to private lands at a time when we are being told that private landowners already deal with too many elk.

These general and unlimited permit proposals should be replaced with limited-entry bull elk tags for both public/private and antlerless elk tags valid only on private lands.

#227

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:47:14 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:54:49 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:35
IP Address: 107.191.3.10

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Gene Bosley
City/Town: Cottonwood Heights
State/Province: UT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose unlimited archery-only hunting in all cases. In my own experience, and by simple common sense, this leads to crowding, conflicts, and degraded hunting quality on public lands while pushing big game animals onto adjacent private lands, and extended harassment of already-skittish animals due to the long seasons involved, combined with large hunter numbers. If population control is the goal, expanded rifle hunting for females of the species is the effective method, and could readily include split/phased seasons to alleviate hunter crowding.

#228

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 12:35:58 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:55:21 PM
Time Spent: 02:19:22
IP Address: 174.204.16.147

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Jim Rogers
City/Town:	Billings
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Biologist proposal. In support. Thank you

#229

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:03:27 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:04:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:43
IP Address: 97.121.246.71

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: KARSON ROSANDER
City/Town: BILLINGS
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the proposal. There should be a quota for every big game species in every area. These quotas should correspond to the studies by FWP employees classified as “biologists”. The reasons that is not current practice is to not make quota determinations that can be scrutinized and to maximize the number of nonresident tags.

#230

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 2:38:14 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:07:32 PM
Time Spent: 00:29:18
IP Address: 65.131.198.128

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Aaron Agosto
City/Town: Bigfork
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Dear fish and wildlife commissioners. I am writing to voice my opposition to the statewide archery elk permit proposal. I understand the need for looking into new options, but if the intended goal is to reduce the amount of elk on certain private parcels, then increasing either-sex hunting pressure on public lands will only serve to exacerbate the problem. With the recent influx of new residents, and new non-resident hunters finding interest in the state, allowing unlimited permits will also greatly increase hunter pressure, perhaps to a detrimental degree. For these reasons I am asking you to decline these proposals. Thank you for your service.

Aaron Agosto

#231

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:21:15 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:32:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:52
IP Address: 108.174.125.178

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Marcus Svee
City/Town: Corvallis
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I would support the unbundling of the 900-20 IF the individual units would have limited archery-only tags. The goal of unbundling the tag is to reduce the hunting pressure that is currently very high in certain Hunting District's where the 900-20 is valid. The thought of making hunters pick a district to hunt in would in theory reduce pressure, but the current allocation of 4000 900-20 tags is not being broken down throughout all of the hunting districts in the "unbundled proposal". If each hunting district had limited archery-only tags, the proposal does make sense - however - issuing unlimited archery tags in many of these units and opening the other units to just a General License DOES THE OPPOSITE. All of these Hunting District's will see increased pressure under this proposal.

The current 900-20 tag at least spreads 4000 archery hunters over all of the units. The Proposal will effectively allow an unlimited number of hunters through these units.

Hence, I do not support the current proposal of unbundling the 900-20 tags.

#232

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:25:54 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:32:47 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:52
IP Address: 158.222.38.73

Page 1

Q1 Respondent skipped this question

Please provide the following information:

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am commenting in support of splitting up the 900 tag into the specific units.

#233

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:27:05 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:35:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:02
IP Address: 72.174.6.45

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Gary Carter
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I support consolidating districts and simplifying the regs.

I would prefer to see more archery only options and more antlerless elk opportunities during rifle season on public lands.

I am opposed to any more antlerless tags for private land owners or expansion of existing shoulder seasons. This has been tried and shown it doesn't work. All that does is provide easy and profitable elk for the most fortunate land owners.

The claim that there are "too many elk" is a falsehood. Who says there's too many elk in MT? I've lived and hunted in MT my entire life and I've never heard anyone other than FWP and wealthy land owners say there are too many elk. I especially do not hear this from other hunters.

Here's some facts:

MT total area - 93,155,800 acres

MT public land - ~32,473,220 acres

MT elk according to FWP - ~ 170,000

vs.

CO total area - 66,387,200 acres

CO public land - ~ 26,458,890 acres

CO elk according to CWP 2019 - ~ 282,000

MT has more land and more public land than CO, yet only has only 61% of the number of elk. HOW IS THAT TOO MANY??

My guess is that FWP is taking its marching orders from a very small minority of land owners that are well connected and have deep pockets. They should be thankful they own land in MT and have the privilege of having elk on their property, but because they don't want to lose a little money, they're unwilling to deal with the problems of elk on their land with their own money. Wrong solution to a problem that isn't a problem for 99.99999% of MT citizens. If these land owners don't want elk on their land, they can spend their own money on fences to keep them out or allow easy public access for hunters. Or maybe FWP should stop all predator hunting on those private lands so that predators will naturally reduce the herds on those lands. That won't happen because the land owners don't like predators either.

This is not a problem to begin with and the proposed "solutions" are hand-outs to the most privileged. If FWP wants to continue to operate, they need to remember who they work for. FWP works for all the citizens of MT, not just a few well connected and wealthy land owners. I don't have any ill will against anyone for having wealth or owning a lot of land, but I do not like those that do using their wealth or status as land owners to make all other citizens of MT lose hunting opportunities.

#234

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:36:49 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:50:23 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:33
IP Address: 174.197.5.214

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Andrew Derickson
City/Town: Augusta
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to removing the 900-20 archery permits. This would increase the number of hunters and increase hunting pressure, especially in HDs close to population centers or with easy access.

#235

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:48:53 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:57:19 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:26
IP Address: 97.121.246.71

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: ARTHUR ROSANDER
City/Town: COLSTRIP
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I oppose the unlimited archery proposal for all districts but especially the 700 HD's.

#236

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 3:55:40 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:03:42 PM
Time Spent: 00:08:02
IP Address: 108.174.118.127

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: **Eric Glen Huleatt**
City/Town: **Stevensville**
State/Province: **MT**

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Unbundling the 900 series archery permit will allow for way to much pressure in each of the included units if they become general or unlimited permits. There is already to much pressure in these units and the experience of hunting one of the permitted units will diminish greatly. The elk population problems in these units will not be fixed by allowing more hunters to pursue elk. The problem is that many of the elk stay on private land where most or all hunters do not have access. Added hunting pressure will only push more elk onto private land because most of these hunters are DIY hunting on public land. The proper way to solve this problem is to find a way to allow more hunters onto private land to harvest elk and to push them onto and keep them on public ground so that the private land owners will not have a problem with the high populations.

#237

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:08:28 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:17:33 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:04
IP Address: 69.145.38.50

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Casey Hackathorn
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I request that the department hold off on making these wholesale changes to elk regulations in these districts until they have worked through a public process to revise the Elk Management Plan. Increasing hunters on public land in these districts will not increase harvest. In fact it will displace more elk onto private land, exacerbate the existing elk distribution problems, and result in reduced hunting quality and success on public lands.

#238

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:17:43 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:18:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:33
IP Address: 69.145.38.50

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Casey Hackathorn
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I request that the department hold off on making these wholesale changes to elk regulations in these districts until they have worked through a public process to revise the Elk Management Plan. Increasing hunters on public land in these districts will not increase harvest. In fact it will displace more elk onto private land, exacerbate the existing elk distribution problems, and result in reduced hunting quality and success on public lands.

#239

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:21:39 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:33:39 PM
Time Spent: 00:12:00
IP Address: 216.166.174.37

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Paul Ellis
City/Town: Bozeman
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Unbundle and remove the 900-20 archery-only either-sex permits in HDs 401, 403, 411, 412, 426, 447, 450, 455, 500, 502, 510, 511, 520, 530, 570, 575, 580, 590, 701, 702, 704, and 705. I support

Make those hunting districts or combination of hunting districts either general season or unlimited archery-only permits as follows (note, some of these hunting districts are new): I support

HD 401: general license I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

HD 403: general license I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

HDs 411/412: unlimited archery-only permits I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

HD s 417/426: unlimited archery-only permits I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

HD 447: unlimited archery-only permits--I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

HD 450: general license--I support

HD 455: unlimited archery-only permits--I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

New proposed HD 515: general license

HDs 502/new proposed 535/new proposed 555/590/existing portion of 701: unlimited archery-only permits --I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

HD 575: general license--I support

HD 580: general license--I support

HDs 702/704/705: unlimited archery-only permits--I support Make 1st & 2nd Choice

#240

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:30:34 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:35:37 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:02
IP Address: 174.204.6.137

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Mark Schwomeyer
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Good luck. All I ask is don't sell out to the wealthy ranching for wildlife. Don't turn Montana into Utah! If reducing numbers is your priority then harvesting females should be mandatory. All the tools are there just use them!

#241

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:31:00 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:35:41 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:40
IP Address: 72.250.159.41

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Garrett Strohm
City/Town: Lewistown
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am opposed to going to an unlimited archery only permit. Overcrowding is a significant issue in these units and this change will make the pressure unbearable and will not result in any greater elk kill.

I am opposed to breaking up the 900 tag as proposed. Any breaking up of the tag should carefully consider the impact to hunting pressure set quotas accordingly. The little Snowies should be kept as a single unit 411 and the portion of region 5 making up the national forest.

#242

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:34:28 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:38:08 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:40
IP Address: 174.204.11.122

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Chris Pileski
City/Town: Miles City
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

- I would comment in general that there should be no large-scale changes to elk management in Montana without first updating the Statewide Elk Management plan. This plan is outdated and seems by all accounts to need updating. In Region specifically, the “objective” number for the elk population in HD’s 704 and 705 was established in the early 2000’s when the elk population was a very new population and according to R7 FWP staff, they had little to no data on the elk at that time. They now have much better trend data as to what a stable elk population in those districts are and that “objective” needs to be updated to reflect that scientific data.
 - The proposal in R7 to “un-bundle” districts 702, 704 and 705 from the 900-20 archery only hunting district is something that I fully support, however, I absolutely do not support making HD’s 702, 704 and 705 an unlimited draw for archery. HD’s 704 and 705 specifically contain the Custer National Forest and according to R7 FWP staff (and my personal experience) those HD’s have seen a more than 50% increase in hunter numbers in recent years. Overcrowding in these HD’s is a significant issue and was the primary rationale for R7 staff to originally propose to “un-bundle” those districts so that they could better and more effectively manage hunting pressure. Somewhere between Miles City and Helena it seems that science and the perspective of those actually on the ground was thrown out the window and instead, it is now proposed that those archery tags are unlimited which will only further fuel the overcrowding issue and will do nothing for the ability to manage the elk population other than push more elk onto surrounding private land. This proposal does not seem to be based on any logical science and is counter to what the local FWP staff have proposed and make no sense to those of us that live and hunt in these districts.
-

#243

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 4:43:38 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 5:01:54 PM
Time Spent: 00:18:16
IP Address: 184.166.84.243

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Tavis P Campbell
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am not okay with unlimited archery permits or general license for archery from the unbundling of the 900 series permit.

I would have supported unbundling the 900 series into single unit permits with a high quota and first choice only

#244

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 5:02:39 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 5:18:17 PM
Time Spent: 00:15:38
IP Address: 47.5.92.57

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Ryan Lienemann
City/Town: Billings
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I am absolutely 100% against the privatization and commercialization of hunting opportunities in Montana, which many of the proposed changes are quite obviously aimed towards. I wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Thomas Baumeister's article "FWP needs realistic solutions on elk" that was published in the opinion section of the Billings Gazette on January 12, 2022. I challenge the FWP and the Fish & Wildlife commission to take Mr. Baumeister's statements to heart and stand up for the average hunter's rights in the state of Montana. The real problem is a lack of access to elk for the average hunter, not how many elk there are. Do not turn hunting in Montana into an opportunity for only the rich and well connected elite!!!! Thank you.

#245

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 6:53:56 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 6:55:32 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:36
IP Address: 107.77.198.100

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Andrew Lepore
City/Town: Missoula
State/Province: MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I strongly oppose the proposed Changes to elk management which is based on old science and serves to commercialize our wildlife

#246

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:24:42 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:29:53 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:10
IP Address: 184.97.155.214

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name: Steve Frith
City/Town: Omaha
State/Province: NE

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

Why have unlimited permits when that just means more public hunters pushing elk to the “over populated” private land. More pressure on I’ll only make the current “issue” worse. Also why have unlimited when there’s not an unlimited resource.

#247

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:57:27 PM
Last Modified: Friday, January 21, 2022 9:23:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:26:13
IP Address: 47.45.141.120

Page 1

Q1

Please provide the following information:

Name:	Stephen Johnson
City/Town:	Helena
State/Province:	MT

Q2

Please comment on the proposed 2022–2023 archery-only permit proposal:

I agree and support the changes in this proposal.
