

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 12, 2022 12:53:09 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 12, 2022 12:54:03 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:53
IP Address: 199.96.16.11

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Jake Phillips
City	Havre
State	Mt
Email (optional)	jdp_7306@yahoo.com

Page 2: HD 600

Q2

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Yes, acceptable

Q3

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Acceptable

Q4

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Acceptable

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#2

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 7:20:46 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 7:20:54 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:07
IP Address: 69.144.179.218

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott
City	Havre

Page 2: HD 600

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#3

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 7:21:09 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 7:21:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:02
IP Address: 69.144.179.218

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott
City	Havre

Page 2: HD 600

Q2 **Respondent skipped this question**

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3 **Respondent skipped this question**

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4 **Respondent skipped this question**

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5 **Respondent skipped this question**

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#4

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:29:09 AM
Last Modified: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:30:52 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:43
IP Address: 96.31.23.65

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott Heidebrink
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	scott.heidebrink@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 600

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3 Respondent skipped this question

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#5

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, October 03, 2022 1:29:24 PM
Last Modified: Monday, October 03, 2022 1:30:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:19
IP Address: 174.213.244.237

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Ty Young
City	Sidney
State	MT
Email (optional)	tyky_young@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 600

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3 Respondent skipped this question

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#6

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 4:13:40 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 4:13:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:09
IP Address: 216.129.250.134

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Steve Schindler
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	SAS@NEMONT.NET

Page 2: HD 600

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3 Respondent skipped this question

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 13, 2022 11:23:02 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 13, 2022 11:25:38 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:36
IP Address: 216.228.36.135

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	richard tremblay
City	sidney
State	mt

Page 2: HD 600

Q2

There is currently no population objective in HD 600. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

not acceptable. 400 head

Q3

In HD 600, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

yes,, should be around 40%

Q4

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, make it a permit area

Q5

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

take it out of a general area

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 10:33:48 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 10:50:12 AM
Time Spent: 00:16:23
IP Address: 161.7.81.204

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Diana DeYoung
City	Nashua
State	MT
Email (optional)	dianadeyoung@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

keep the fixed range

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Use both

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

It should be determined on the carrying capacity of the environment

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, All the elk stay on private property that can't be accessed. I saw 18 bulls and 20 cow together on private property on one day hunt.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Elk for days!

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 12:42:10 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 12:53:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:10:49
IP Address: 174.204.9.172

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Joshua Keller
City	Havre
State	MT
Email (optional)	kellerjosh@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Alternative population objective forms, also revise the population objective for that region. Landownership has changed and educated guess is landowners will be open to an objective increase. Example APR

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Use individual surveys

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to 3200-3300, landownership has change since objective number was agreed upon.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Stay the same

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Numbers are down compared to early 2000s and you find elk where you find elk.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Increase in overall population objectives, which will increase hunter opportunities

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, July 15, 2022 3:07:50 PM
Last Modified: Friday, July 15, 2022 3:48:01 PM
Time Spent: 00:40:10
IP Address: 69.145.53.144

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Cody Mummey
City	Clancy
State	Montana
Email (optional)	FF7MM@YAHOO.COM

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Count the elk however you want.

The elk numbers were healthy for decades in these districts. New management plans from the FWP and increased hunting tags in these districts (as well as many others across the state) have decimated the elk populations. The FWP should care more about managing the quality of hunting and not overcrowding hunting areas than focusing on selling permits and generating revenue.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I think 5 year patterns will reveal fairly accurate elk population trends and results. These could be overlaid with the data of other big game animals and should also reflect accurate predator numbers in ALL districts.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Absolutely should be increased. In my opinion these districts can easily sustain 3000 - 3500 elk for a healthy population without overwhelming land owners.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

I think this objective is tragically low. Grass has been scarce for years north of the Missouri River, which makes it difficult for hunters and ranchers. Unlike livestock, the elk are free to roam and find food elsewhere. This spring has rejuvenated local grasslands and they can sustain much larger elk herds than these "bottom of the barrel numbers" - Let's aim a little higher with 300 bulls and 900 cows.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Distribution of elk is fairly even but numbers are extremely low. Elk will move to private ground to avoid public hunting traffic like they do everywhere statewide. A possible solution to this statewide problem is to work harder to create more or at least limited public access points or timelines to help move elk around after the seasons begin.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

You need to accurately manage predators and stop overselling and overcrowding hunting districts. Utilize traditional MT hunting values along with accurate biology to bring back healthy big game numbers STATEWIDE!

Make the political pressure and budget constraints a secondary issue and lower priority.

#4

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, July 18, 2022 1:23:14 PM
Last Modified: Monday, July 18, 2022 1:23:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:36
IP Address: 199.168.110.25

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kelly burke
City	Glasgow
State	Mt
Email (optional)	kjburke55@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4 **Respondent skipped this question**

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5 **Respondent skipped this question**

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6 **Respondent skipped this question**

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7 **Respondent skipped this question**

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, July 18, 2022 1:23:14 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 7:13:24 AM
Time Spent: 17:50:10
IP Address: 199.168.110.25

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kelly burke
City	Glasgow
State	Mt
Email (optional)	kjburke55@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Should remain fixed unless the number isn't working

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Individual surveys

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Should be increased. During the season 75-80 percent of the elk in the area are on private land inaccessible to the general public. If the number were increased to 2000 I think there would be more available statically

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

I think it's a good idea to maintain that objective

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

The current distribution is terrible. The main elk herd has been trained over generations to go to blue ridge and now the Arnott place when the pressure of season picks up. A large percentage of the population are on these two places during archery season primarily. The current operators of the Arnott place might agree to some sort of public hunting opportunity if there could be enough financial incentive in place. It would be worth meeting with the manager to discuss what it would take. If there can't be any ground made there tags need to be cut significantly in 622 to reduce the pressure on the elk herd. 1500 tags is to many for the area and actually reduces the harvest by concentrating the herd on private property where they are inaccessible by most hunters

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Someone that can help ranchers dealing with elk destroying hay and grain crops in the summer. A herding program that keeps elk pushed farther south and East that keeps the landowners from having conflicts. The herding should start before crops are being affected instead of when it becomes a problem. Drone technology is so good now it should be lots easier than in past years

#6

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, July 18, 2022 1:23:14 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 7:19:49 AM
Time Spent: 17:56:34
IP Address: 199.168.110.25

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kelly burke
City	Glasgow
State	Mt
Email (optional)	kjburke55@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2**Respondent skipped this question**

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6 Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7 Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#7

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, July 25, 2022 8:04:03 AM
Last Modified: Monday, July 25, 2022 8:04:15 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:11
IP Address: 174.242.234.29

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kevin Koss
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	coalmine1@itstriangle.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2**Respondent skipped this question**

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, July 25, 2022 8:15:56 AM
Last Modified: Monday, July 25, 2022 8:30:01 AM
Time Spent: 00:14:04
IP Address: 174.242.234.29

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kevin Koss
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	coalmine1@itstriangle.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

maintained

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

no, solutions are complicated, with roadless areas in the CMR, outfitters, and closed private land

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

I believe it's the 454 agreement. The tag we can apply for can only be used for immediate family. We need to be able to have the option to sell this tag, or give it to whomever we choose. The cost to the ranch is the greatest concern about the elk. If we could sell it, we could cover some of the costs related to elk. This might also open up more private land opportunities, if they could sell that tag for more than their current lease or outfitting agreement. If FWP is going to issue these tags anyway, It would be an easy way to compensate landowners who allow public access. I myself would possibly tolerate higher numbers if there was some relief from the financial burden. I could actually show you the numbers, that show, elk costs to the ranch. Those numbers are in excess of \$50000/year for 200 head of elk.

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 9:31:02 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 9:36:03 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:01
IP Address: 72.255.162.249

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	BUD MARTIN
City	zortman
State	MT
Email (optional)	redbone_outfitting@msn.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Predator control

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Predator control

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased by PREDATOR CONTROL

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

50 per 100

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

not satisfied, PREDATOR CONTROL

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Increase Mt. lion quotas by 200% in lion populated areas.

#10

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 10:32:13 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 10:33:52 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:39
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Lindsey Parsons TEST
City	HLN

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 4:45:06 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 5:01:46 PM
Time Spent: 00:16:40
IP Address: 174.215.22.22

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Nick trott
City	Glasgow
State	Mt
Email (optional)	trott_n@yahoo.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

3 year average sounds better then 5 but back in 2006-2008 we're there issues with to many elk? Could there habitat sustain that number? Seems like there is more habitat and less ag land. Definitely could hold more then what's there now.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Survey the elk every year there is a lot changing within this region and it wouldn't take much to drive the elk out because of all the hunting pressure

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to 3,000

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Keep bull to cow to bull ratios around the 3-10 4-10

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Not satisfied there is to much pressure on the resource and their safe havens are being open up more access is being granted but there are to many tags and elk are being killed off a lot quicker with the opened access

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The higher the percentage of access goes up the number of tags should go down or there is going to be a lot of elk unintentionally killed based off of hunter success. They will leave and not come back and find a safe haven somewhere else

#12

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 05, 2022 2:12:43 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 05, 2022 2:14:08 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:24
IP Address: 72.250.189.114

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Thomas McGary
City	Columbia Falls
State	Montana
Email (optional)	thomasmcgary888@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

4-5 years to put money else where in Montana.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to 2000-2400 elk.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

More bulls.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Continue to work on access to private lands.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

More elk.

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, August 11, 2022 6:15:50 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, August 11, 2022 6:21:34 AM
Time Spent: 00:05:43
IP Address: 216.129.250.134

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Steve Schindler
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	SAS@NEMONT.NET

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

the elk objective numbers absolutely need to be raised to 65 to 75 % of carrying capacity numbers,

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

the elk objective numbers absolutely need to be raised to 65 to 75 % of carrying capacity numbers,

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

the elk objective numbers absolutely need to be raised to 65 to 75 % of carrying capacity numbers,

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

the current bull cow ratio is good

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

satisfied

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

the elk objective numbers absolutely need to be raised to 65 to 75 % of carrying capacity numbers,

#14

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, August 11, 2022 4:09:10 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, August 11, 2022 4:14:31 PM
Time Spent: 00:05:20
IP Address: 72.250.159.153

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Eric Edwardson
City	Lewistown
State	AR
Email (optional)	eric-edwardson@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

+~20%

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to match Carrying Capacity

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

50% of the 30 bulls should be branched bulls

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Improve habitat the area is full of invasives, and cows

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

It has been over grazed and invasive plants are everywhere.

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 12, 2022 12:24:45 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 12, 2022 12:52:29 PM
Time Spent: 00:27:43
IP Address: 199.96.16.11

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Jake Phillips
City	Havre
State	Mt
Email (optional)	jdp_7306@yahoo.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

current population objective shall be kept at +/- 20%. This is sufficient to account for irregularities in population size due to outside influences such as disease, and natural phenomena that will influence population size. Having said that FWP needs to be vigilant to react if population goes above or below the 20%. Yearly counts should be conducted in some manner whether flying counts or hunter reporting counts are made ever year to better maintain a good idea of what populations are doing. If averages are used it needs to be no longer than a 2 year average as the populations can take large swings in the years between large interval averages.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

individual surveys, using a 2 year average to determine course of action

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

increase objective be approximately 20%. (1700-2000)

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

yes keep bull objective increase this also by 20% to 36 bulls per 100 cows

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

elk are on their wintering grounds generally during these surveys. the observed distribution does not properly show where the elk may be during the fall. Fwp may need to find other means to record elk distribution during the fall such as collaring.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Fwp needs to stop shoulder seasons, they need to implement damage hunts in smaller problem areas as these are generally more effective and do not impose undo pressure on elk. Fwp needs to also reform the damage hunt process to make the lives of private landowners less frustrating when trying to get rid of problem populations.

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, August 14, 2022 7:12:57 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, August 14, 2022 7:35:46 AM
Time Spent: 00:22:48
IP Address: 162.244.234.62

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Dirk Monson
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	waterboy@nemont.net

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Since the population has been much above the current objectives for much of the past 10 years without excessive game damage complaints and because it seems there is a little more tolerance for a higher population, a 10 year average would allow recent historical number of elk to continue.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Since the eastern boundary of 622 was changed, annual surveys should be conducted for at least a few years to see if the boundary adjustment removes some of the variability in the surveys.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

If an objective range is going to be used, 2200 + or - 20% would be a reasonable level.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Since the districts have been higher than 30 bulls per 100 cows, that objective should be raised to more closely match historic levels. Maybe at least 40 bulls per 100 cows.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Elk numbers are not the problem, elk distribution and hunter saturation are the problem. Unless something can be done to gain access to the large herds of elk on inaccessible land, the objective numbers should be raised in an attempt to populate the accessible land with elk. Distribution of elk would also improve if hunting pressure on accessible land were reduced.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

All comments above were regarding archery hunting based on 27 years of hunting 622 for elk. When hunting pressure was much less, the current objective numbers were enough to populate the entire district and allow an extremely high quality hunt. The combination of increased hunting pressure and the evolution of private land elk sanctuaries have created a situation where even above objective numbers leave few elk on accessible land and a lower quality hunt due to the intense competition with other hunters for the fewer accessible elk.

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, August 14, 2022 8:03:58 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, August 14, 2022 8:07:48 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:49
IP Address: 174.198.129.145

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Dirk Monson
City	Glasgow
State	MT
Email (optional)	waterboy@nemont.net

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Elk special permit hunts should be treated the same as mule deer special permit hunts in that the permit holder may only hunt elk in the district and season for which the special permit is valid. For example, if a person draws 620-21 that is the only district and season that may be hunted for bull elk.

#18

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 15, 2022 6:28:45 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 15, 2022 6:31:49 AM
Time Spent: 00:03:04
IP Address: 70.33.29.13

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Gary Bryson
City	Fort Peck
State	Montana
Email (optional)	gobryson87@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I personally would like this to be around 60 to 70 percent

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

increase to 60

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#19

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 3:26:45 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 3:27:00 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:15
IP Address: 184.167.56.233

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	z
City	Havre

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#20

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, August 20, 2022 11:52:55 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, August 20, 2022 11:53:02 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:06
IP Address: 174.198.141.39

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Collin Radakovich
City	Glasgow
State	MT
Email (optional)	cradakovich@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4 **Respondent skipped this question**

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5 **Respondent skipped this question**

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6 **Respondent skipped this question**

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7 **Respondent skipped this question**

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#21

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, August 22, 2022 8:39:22 AM
Last Modified: Monday, August 22, 2022 8:54:20 AM
Time Spent: 00:14:57
IP Address: 63.153.66.178

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	James T Carver
City	MALTA
State	MT
Email (optional)	fishon11@itstriangle.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Maintain current objective.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

The current system seems to be working. There are so many variables to take into consideration like weather and foliage that take their toll on the numbers.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Leave it the same

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Leave it the same

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Distribution ok

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Eliminate the shoulder season and authorize damage hunts if necessary and requested by the land owners. Limit the cow permits, by doing so it would give the permit holder a better chance of success because there would be less hunters in the area.

#22

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:28:01 AM
Last Modified: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:56:32 AM
Time Spent: 00:28:30
IP Address: 96.31.23.65

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott Heidebrink
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	scott.heidebrink@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

The most accurate methods for estimating populations should be used. Objectives should be set based on the publics desire for elk populations, land owner tolerance and ecological carrying capacity.

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to 2,000-3,000. Landownership has changed and tolerance has increased in the region. Landownership has changed and the large amount of public land would support more elk and tolerance has increased. The pressure put on the current herds has pushed them to private land and made access to them difficult.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

The bull to cow ratio should be increased to at least 50 bulls:100 cows. If the ratio was 1:1 it would make managing herd numbers easier and make the objectives easier to meet. If there are more bulls and less cows, the number of calves born each year will be less and allow FWP to meet objectives.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, There are large amounts of public land that have very few elk. Pressure needs to be increased on private land and decreased significantly on public land to distribute more elk onto public lands

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#23

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 11:11:09 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 11:34:50 AM
Time Spent: 00:23:41
IP Address: 72.255.148.239

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	David Rummel
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	davey2dogs@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Not sure.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Not sure.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

The current population objective is way too low. The objective should be at least 2500 - 2750. The CMR Refuge personnel have stated at numerous elk working group meetings that they would like more elk. At these same meetings the largest private land owner in these districts (American Prairie Reserve) have stated they would like more elk. The herd that resides in district 621 in the Slippery Ann no hunting zone is at its lowest population in 30 years. I am guessing around 200 head when 400 was the norm for years. As a hunter and wildlife observer I would like to see more elk.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Keep the bull objective the same.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

District 621 needs more elk, cut back on the cow tags. This district has very little game damage and is mostly public land.

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#24

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 01, 2022 10:06:51 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, September 01, 2022 10:17:07 AM
Time Spent: 00:10:15
IP Address: 104.28.116.191

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Pete Steinmetz
City	Havre
State	MT
Email (optional)	psteiny1946@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2**Respondent skipped this question**

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

You are reducing the herds far below necessary. Stop the shoulder hunts and reduce cow B tags. The bull to cow ratio has been going up in the past several years to where you see more bulls than cows in herds. When these bulls start dying off the total numbers will plummet with growing cows to replenish the herds.

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#25

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 01, 2022 10:38:07 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, September 01, 2022 10:47:47 AM
Time Spent: 00:09:39
IP Address: 174.198.136.88

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	John Earl Daggett
City	Glasgow
State	MT
Email (optional)	jdaggett435@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I believe the objectives are too low in the HD. I am basing this on what I used to see in this HD when I first moved here in 1991 and the following 10 years. I think a long term average might be better.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I think the 4-5 year average would be better.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

I think the current objective should be increased.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Yes, you should have a bull objective. It seems there should be a subobjective for mature bulls. The quality is not what it used to be for mature bulls I don't think.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, the large number of public land hunters have driven the elk more onto closed private lands.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The plan should look at ways to keep elk on public land where they can be hunted. Trying to reduce numbers by issuing more tags has only driven most the elk onto closed ranches.

#26

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, September 06, 2022 11:56:57 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, September 06, 2022 12:13:09 PM
Time Spent: 00:16:12
IP Address: 174.198.137.231

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Carter Clausen
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	clausenc52@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Use current

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Counts should be annual but on 2 year average

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Should be increased. I would think closer to 2500, but 622 and 621 should be separate areas as I feel they are not connected. 621 boundaries should be from fourchete bay to the west.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

I feel the bull to cow ratio is too high and should look into a spike only tag of some sort.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

I feel majority of the elk are on private areas in 622, till FWP can acquire access to the American Prairie this will not help with distribution.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

I feel counts should be coordinated with counts on south side of river

#27

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 7:18:51 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 7:21:17 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:26
IP Address: 107.77.221.18

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Sean Hoernke
City	Montgomery
State	Tx
Email (optional)	hoernke@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Keep objective the same

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

4-5 year average

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

maintained

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Keep the same

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Private land is the problem. More public access to private to move the elk onto public. If private land owners are genuinely concerned then that should be no problem. If not then they just want to sell tags and make money.

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#28

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, October 04, 2022 8:12:30 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 04, 2022 9:50:24 AM
Time Spent: 01:37:54
IP Address: 192.135.59.137

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kaden Bedwell
City	Glasgow
State	MT

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Id hate to see 5 bad years of drought & winter/predator kills lower the population objective and then have FWP manage these HD's to keep the elk population lower into the future.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

The setting of a population objective should not be based on 1 survey but the population and associated tag distribution should continue to be monitored and adjusted at least biannual to keep elk populations at or near the set objective range. I can safely say so far, this hunting season of 2022, i have not seen as many elk as in recent years. I am happy that FWP was able to lower the Elk B licenses based on the last survey data so we don't progressively lower the elk population.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

The current population objective should be increased. I'd like to see the new range +2,500/3,000. When the last objective range was set in 2005, American Prairie had just started acquiring land in 2004. Over that time they have purchased hundreds of thousands of acres from private land owners in this district for wildlife use and they likely will continue to grow over the next 17 years. That transition of acres from primarily cattle ranching to wildlife use should be considered when setting the objective range.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Yes.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No. From what I've witnessed hunting the districts and what I can see on the elk distribution map, a large percentage of the elk in these 3 districts are located in the Larb Hills. During archery season, the elk know the boundaries of the safe havens of the 3-4 primary owners of the Larb Hills region that either lease their land out or allow minimal hunting pressure. With access to those lands and elk being nearly impossible for the average hunter, the bulk of the tag holders hunt the rest of the regions which results in higher hunting pressure and fewer elk in those areas. I'd propose that region 6 be divided and treated as two separate elk populations as the distribution maps and hunting experience have shown to be the case. Treat 622 and the Larb Hills region with its own objective range based on the hunter expectations and acceptance of those land owners and then manage 621 completely different. It's obvious that this is somewhat already occurring with the rifle tags but yet we still treat these three all as one giant area and have the same objective across the entire region. I also would propose relocating the districts boundaries between 621 and 622. The current district boundary of the Midale road is frequently crossed by elk that travel from the Butte's, UL Bend and Pines in 622 to Karsten, Beauchamp and CK in 621 and vice versa as there is no natural boundary between those regions. Fourchette Bay and up Fourchette Creek to the Sun Prairie Rd is a much more natural boundary that is observed to be crossed less frequently by the elk.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The 699 tags need to stop. The added stress of two additional months of pushing elk in the winter months can not be helping in the calf/cow percentage after long summer droughts and cold winters. There are better ways of handling unwanted elk on a specific ranch than giving out tags for the entire approximately 1.8 million acre region.

Predators and the management of them should also at least be mentioned when discussing how to manage the elk population. Over the more recent years, there's been an increase in mountain lion sightings, kills, and tracks observed in my hunting party and others we've talked to.

#29

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, October 08, 2022 9:16:45 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, October 08, 2022 9:18:33 AM
Time Spent: 00:01:48
IP Address: 174.234.2.87

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Jacob Amerman
City	Park City
State	MT
Email (optional)	Jacob.amerman@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

5 year average

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

4 year average

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

The objective should be increased to 3500

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

The objective should be increased to 40 bulls: 100 cows

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Yes

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Na

#30

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 11:34:07 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 11:46:14 AM
Time Spent: 00:12:07
IP Address: 174.198.145.9

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Lars Anderson
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	lars.c.anderson@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I support the +/-20% range.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Use the average of at least 2 surveys to determine the objective status.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

The objective should be increased to 2475. See comment below about splitting this number so that each district has its own objective.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Yes there should be a bull objective. At least 40 bulls/100 cows.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No. The pressure needs to be reduced so that they can spread out on the prairie again.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The objectives should be for each HD, not for all 3. 620 has been over objective, but the high permit numbers to bring it down has resulted in essentially zero elk in 620. It would be good to get elk out on the prairie again, not just holed up in the breaks.

#31

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 4:14:05 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 4:17:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:34
IP Address: 216.129.250.134

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Steve Schindler
City	Glasgow
Email (optional)	SAS@NEMONT.NET

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

please consider raising the population objectives, 75% of the carrying capacity fo the HD would be acceptable

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

please consider raising the population objectives, 75% of the carrying capacity fo the HD would be acceptable

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

30 bulls to 100 cows is acceptable

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

increase populations

#32

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 5:17:37 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 13, 2022 11:14:03 AM
Time Spent: 17:56:26
IP Address: 216.228.36.135

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	richard tremblay
City	sidney
State	mt
Email (optional)	bonehead170@yahoo.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

keep the fixed range but the elk population should be counted annually and use a +/- of 10%. But this has to coincide with annual elk counts, otherwise leave it at 20%

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

the 2 year average approach works fine for objective numbers but annual elk counts should be done to catch abnormal harvest years or maybe poor cow calf recruitment. such as we are seeing currently

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

the current levels need raised, the objective needs to be changed to single district and not combined. However its done the new elk range for the 3 districts should be no more than 3000, no less than 2700

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

yes, there should be. no, it is to low its easier to maintain herd levels with a high bull to cow ratio. however it should be raised to at least 40% minimum

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

not satisfied at all with elk distribution way to few in 621, split them up to single district objectives, 620 could do 200 elk. 622 could do 1200 head of elk, 621 could do 1500 elk due to its huge expanse and low farmer/rancher conflict

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

it needs annual elk counts and mandatory reporting of harvests. Shoulder seasons need permanent removal due to their ineffectiveness and the option the more effective rates of localized damage hunts be utilized. The license drawing period needs to happen after all the annual or biannual elk counts are done and published so hunters have the correct info on the area they are putting in for.

#33

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:51:31 AM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:51:36 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:05
IP Address: 174.198.132.229

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Trevor Waarvik
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	trevor_99@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4 **Respondent skipped this question**

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5 **Respondent skipped this question**

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

Q6 **Respondent skipped this question**

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7 **Respondent skipped this question**

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#34

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 2:55:39 PM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 3:05:07 PM
Time Spent: 00:09:28
IP Address: 216.129.244.215

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Justin J Schaaf
City	Glasgow
State	MT
Email (optional)	jschaaf71@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I believe FWP should move towards a long term average of 10 years when figuring out the objective.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I believe in this unit, the actual biennial survey data is accurate enough to rely on when determining population levels. I would like to keep this as status quo.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

I believe the new objective for HD 620, 621, and 622 should be the long term average for the previous 10 years. Without actual numbers and judging off the graph, I believe the objective should fall at 2500 with the previously referenced 20% +/- into the objective range. The prior 10 years population level in these units seem to have struck a manageable balance between public acceptance and carrying capacity. The minuscule amount of game damage complaints and Region 6's ability to address those complaints in a timely manner are the best indicator of the balance Region 6 has found with the long term average of 2500 elk.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

I believe we should defer to the current long term average of the bull:cow ratio over the last 10 years. I don't see the data for the ratio on this platform but I believe the ratio has been closer to 40 or 50 bulls:100 Cows. I would like to see that be maintained in these units.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Yes.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Nothing comes to mind for these HD's specifically.

#35

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 5:00:09 PM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 5:02:27 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:17
IP Address: 72.250.159.99

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Daniel Kinka on behalf of American Prairie
City	Malta
State	Montana
Email (optional)	daniel@americanprairie.org

Page 2: HD 620, 621, 622

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

American Prairie questions the utility of "objectives" for elk and any other wildlife that are based solely on subjective and unscientific assumptions about tolerance made decades ago. If FWP and its constituents decide that managing populations solely based upon social carrying capacity is still desirable, the state should commission a scientific survey representative of all Montanans to determine what the true tolerance for elk abundance is amongst its trust beneficiaries under the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. Under these circumstances, FWP could maintain the current form of objective (+/-20%) but should strive to generate accurate calculations of elk abundance on an annual basis, and not rely on long-term averages. However, we feel that (re)focusing elk management on distribution over abundance would be a fruitful and mutually beneficial course of action for FWP. On public lands and wherever tolerance for elk is high, FWP should manage towards ecological carrying capacity. On private lands where tolerance is low and/or crop depredation/property damage is measurable and verifiable, appropriate and sufficient actions should be taken to redistribute elk to areas of higher tolerance.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

No, it would not be appropriate to use a 3-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this hunting district. Such averaging can only reduce the data available by which to make management decisions and reduce the speed with which the agency can and should respond to undesirable trends in wildlife populations (up or down). More and more frequent data should always be the goal, so we recommend using annual survey data to make management decisions.

Q4

The current population objective for HDs 620, 621 and 622 is 1,400-1,650. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

American Prairie believes the current population objective is too low and should be increased. It does not reflect current tolerance or demand in the region, let alone anything close to the ecological carrying capacity of the region. We question the utility of "objectives" for wildlife that are based solely on subjective and unscientific assumptions about tolerance. The state should commission a scientific survey representative of all Montanans in this hunting district to determine what the true tolerance for elk abundance is. Barring such a survey, we conservatively suggest that resetting the objective in this hunting district to the recent population high of > 3,000 is appropriate and would benefit the largest number of trust beneficiaries.

Q5

In HDs 620, 621, and 622, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it

American Prairie favors "natural" sex ratios in wildlife populations, but do not feel strongly one way or the other about the bull ratio in this hunting district.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, we at American Prairie are not satisfied with the current elk distribution in this hunting district. It does not reflect current tolerance or demand in the region, let alone anything close to the ecological carrying capacity of the public lands in the district, nor those private lands (e.g., American Prairie) with high tolerance for elk. We feel that (re)focusing elk management on distribution over abundance would be a fruitful and mutually beneficial course of action for FWP. On public lands and wherever tolerance for elk is high, FWP should manage towards ecological carrying capacity. On private lands where tolerance is low and/or crop depredation/property damage is measurable and verifiable, appropriate and sufficient actions should be taken to redistribute elk to areas of higher tolerance.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

As a general comment, and particularly in the area that American Prairie operates (throughout the Greater Upper Missouri River Breaks region), we question the utility of “objectives” for elk and any other wildlife that are based solely on subjective and unscientific assumptions about tolerance made decades ago. If FWP and its constituents decide that managing populations solely based upon social carrying capacity is still desirable, the state should commission a scientific survey representative of all Montanans to determine what the true tolerance for wildlife (i.e., elk) abundance is amongst its trust beneficiaries under the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. However, we feel that (re)focusing elk management on distribution over abundance would be a fruitful and mutually beneficial course of action for FWP. On public lands and wherever tolerance for elk is high, FWP should manage towards ecological carrying capacity. On private lands where tolerance is low and/or crop depredation/property damage is measurable and verifiable, appropriate and sufficient actions should be taken to redistribute elk to areas of higher tolerance.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 7:20:27 AM
Last Modified: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 7:43:13 AM
Time Spent: 00:22:46
IP Address: 199.168.110.25

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Kelly Burke
City	Glasgow
State	Mt
Email (optional)	kjburke55@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Fixed range

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Individual surveys

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

This number is low. This area has one of the highest landowner tolerances for elk anywhere. You rarely see elk in this area in the summer and hunting in the fall you can go days without even seeing an elk. The objective should be raised to at least 500. There is no crop or hay production in the main habitat area anymore so conflicts are minimal

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

This objective seems to be a good goal

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Elk distribution is ok but there are not many elk in this area during the season. With high hunter numbers and no place for the elk to take a refuge from pressure when the season starts so they get ran west into 622. When rifle season starts elk numbers in this area are so low that it's hard to find anything. For people that wait 20-40 years to draw a rifle bull tag this is very disappointing.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

I feel like a great fix for this area would be to completely change up the tag situation. If there were 80 tags available for either sex elk that were good for archery and rifle season and that were the only tags for either sex then pressure would greatly be reduced and the elk wouldn't flood out of the area in archery season. Harvest of mature bulls probably wouldn't be that much different. Pressure from hunting pressure is what keeps this area from being a truly great hunting district. With almost 100% public access it is a rare thing and should be a great place to have a limited draw tag rather than a disappointment due to all the elk being over hunted and ran off. A split season for archery might help out and be less of a drastic measure. Something that keeps less hunters off the landscape and spreads out the pressure. Instead of 200 tags good for the entire archery season 100 for an early season (the first half) and 100 for the last half. In my opinion this is still to many tags but it might help if no one wants to reduce tag numbers

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 8:15:21 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 8:49:20 AM
Time Spent: 00:33:58
IP Address: 70.33.47.250

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Richard Traeger
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	kurley_kahuna_rt@yahoo.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

If your plan is to eliminate the elk herd in this area keep the plan in place. The elk herd in this area has been decimated by the objective numbers and has to change. Area landowners are not opposed to elk in this area as the old elk management plan would suggest.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Some common sense needs to be used when making these surveys. In the past elk that wintered in the Timber Ck. area were counted against this area but these elk spent the major majority of their time in areas to the west. This caused an excessive amount of elk to be eliminated in this area.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

The current population objective has decimated the elk herd in this area. The herd can't take this kind of pressure. Elk have pretty much been eliminated in the former area 632. This number needs to be increased to at least 1200 head.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Current bull objective should be maintained

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Eliminate the objective numbers in the old elk management plan and go back to the biological management of elk.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The realization that elk need protection on public lands as well as private and that private interests shouldn't be picking a number out of the sky that we all have to live with. Let's go back to sound biological elk management practices that are not only good for the private landowner but also good for "we" the public landowners.

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, July 22, 2022 7:29:34 AM
Last Modified: Friday, July 22, 2022 7:49:18 AM
Time Spent: 00:19:43
IP Address: 162.244.234.105

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Emitt Northup
City	glasgow
State	Mt
Email (optional)	2teachinc@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

4-5 year average.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increase to 350-400.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Current bull:cow ratio is OK.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Not satisfied! Prep-Season elk seem to be well distributed, but when hunting season opens a great deal of the elk are chased over West of Timber Creek onto private ground where no hunting is allowed.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

We need a plan to allow public hunting on those private lands in South Phillips county.

#4

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Sunday, August 14, 2022 7:37:22 AM
Last Modified: Sunday, August 14, 2022 7:46:59 AM
Time Spent: 00:09:36
IP Address: 162.244.234.62

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Dirk Monson
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	waterboy@nemont.net

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

This district is vastly underpopulated with elk. Due to the lack of agriculture and the low probability of game damage complaints, the objective should be increase to at least 500 elk in the district.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Annual surveys should be continued for at least a few years since the western boundary of the district was changed. Hopefully the boundary change will remove some of the variability in the counts.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increase to at least 500.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Since historic bull numbers exceed 30 bulls per 100 cows, that should be raised to at least 40 bulls per 100 cows.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Since all but a very small portion of the district is accessible the overall distribution is adequate, there are just not enough elk to fill the available habitat. A higher number of elk would likely populate more of the habitat.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Since this district is so heavily roaded, and does not have any sort of sanctuary for the elk, hunting pressure should be reduced, or sanctuaries created by reducing road usage.

The above comments are related to archery hunting.

#5

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:21:11 AM
Last Modified: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:27:44 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:33
IP Address: 96.31.23.65

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott Heidebrink
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	scott.heidebrink@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

FWP should be using the most accurate and reliable ways to count wildlife but there should be more flexibility around the objectives. Landowner tolerance changes, hunting pressure changes, the public's desire for elk and distribution of elk can change over periods of time.

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

The objective should be increased to 800-1000.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Yes there should be a bull objective of at least 50 bulls:100 cows. A 1:1 ratio of bulls to cows would be the best case as it would slow population growth and allow easier management around the objective.

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Higher objectives

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 01, 2022 10:49:17 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, September 01, 2022 11:08:27 AM
Time Spent: 00:19:09
IP Address: 174.198.136.88

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	John Earl Daggett
City	Glasgow
State	MT
Email (optional)	jdaggett435@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I think a long term average would be better. Many of the elk in this HD have been force over into HD622 because of hunting pressure. The old HD632 does not have anywhere close to the number of elk it had in the past(2014 and before)

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Seems like a 4-5 year average might be better.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

I think it should be increased. Can it be doubled? I don't know but 350 is too low.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Yes, there should be a bull objective with a mature bull subobjective. Would 40 be achievable?

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, the old HD 632 has far fewer elk than it did in the past. Maybe a higher objective to HD630 would help.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Access is pretty good in this Hd but I think the objective is too low.

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 7:21:23 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 7:23:37 AM
Time Spent: 00:02:14
IP Address: 107.77.221.18

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Sean Hoernke
City	Montgomery
State	Tx
Email (optional)	hoernke@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Do not Change

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Do not Change

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

DO not change

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Elk on private land are the problem. More public access to private for herd distribution is the solution. If its a problem then ranchers should not have a problem allowing access to get them off their land. If they do have a problem then that because they just want more tag money for themselves. There is a give/take between public/private on this issue it needs to be balanced.

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#8

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, September 22, 2022 12:07:47 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, September 22, 2022 1:26:32 PM
Time Spent: 01:18:45
IP Address: 161.7.121.117

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Matt Poole
City	GLASGOW
State	MT

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, October 03, 2022 1:45:44 PM
Last Modified: Monday, October 03, 2022 1:53:24 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:40
IP Address: 174.213.244.237

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Ty Young
City	Sidney
State	MT
Email (optional)	tyky_young@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I think it should be evaluated every few years! This year with the boundary changes in 630 the elk numbers are extremely low and I would be shocked if there is over 100 Hd all together.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I think 630 needs looked at on how they gather their numbers because elk numbers are low and in my opinion no where near 300.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Decreased to 100.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

20 bulls per 100 cows

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No it needs management and a deeper look into the elk numbers vs tags given out.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Reverse the boundary changes to what they have been the past few years.

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, October 03, 2022 1:24:02 PM
Last Modified: Monday, October 03, 2022 6:16:33 PM
Time Spent: 04:52:31
IP Address: 158.26.2.172

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Shawn LeRoy
City	Sidney
State	MT
Email (optional)	Shawn.LeRoy@yahoo.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

In my option these animals are getting hit with Diseases and difficulties ever year, how could you not go by a year to year decision? Take your numbers a few times a year in the spring, summer, and winter for your HD units. Take an average of the numbers of male to female and adjust the numbers for the following year per season per species. Adjust tag number where needed and explain to the sportsman of the prior year's outcome.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I think if you took an annual survey from the sportsman's that have been in the area would be better than a 4-5 year average. Let's be honest some areas get over hunted and some missed or less pressure and then it gets a chance to get better or over hunted and then you see the decline.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

HD 630 objective is 300-350 elk for this unit, there are at least double if not triple that many domestic cows on that unit right now. I have a camp at the Cotton Woods sign in box with 4 families and have spent 18 day's myself looking for deer, elk, and Antelope also fishing some when it's 100 deg. and playing in the water. 5 guys in my group drew 630 and 5 guys drew in 622 that have been staying in camp and have been hunting hard. I can tell you that there are not a 100 elk on 630 today. I spent the first weekend before the hunt at the pines and the remainder of the time everywhere between and have seen a total of 12 to 18 bulls and about the same cows. Less deer and Antelope than I've seen in the last 6 years that I've hunted out there by far. I called the Biologist Thomas Sutton to voice my concern that's where I found a place to voice my option. To answer the question I wish there were 300-350 elk on the unit, I am sure it could handle it and more. I don't think they are anywhere close to those numbers today and I'm worried that the unit is hunted out, for the numbers and quality I like to see. Cut tags down and keep an eye on the cattle grazing, is my suggestion. There is plenty of food if you keep an eye on the cows so the wildlife has enough to get them through the winter, and I think there is.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Again I don't think the numbers are even close to 30 bulls: 100 cows. But would be good with that compared to the results of today.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Not happy with the elk distribution for 630 at all. I think for starters taking some of the better parts of 630 and adding it to 622 was a very bad idea and wish someone could explain it to me that would make sense. 630 has got a lot of acreage but less opportunity.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

I think all of timber creek drainage should be added to 630 and adjust the numbers to match more of 622.

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 4:17:50 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 4:20:01 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:10
IP Address: 216.129.250.134

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	steve schindler
City	GLASGOW
Email (optional)	sas@nemont.net

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

raise objective level to be maintained at 75% of the carrying capacity for the HD

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

raise objective level to be maintained at 75% of the carrying capacity for the HD

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

30 bulls per 100 cows is acceptable

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#12

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 13, 2022 1:15:30 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 13, 2022 1:15:51 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:20
IP Address: 72.255.132.66

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	test
City	Malta
State	MT

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#13

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:22:26 AM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:47:53 AM
Time Spent: 00:25:26
IP Address: 174.198.132.229

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Trevor Waarvik
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	trevor_99@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I agree with a fixed range and plus or minus 20% but would like to see the range number counted in the week between the end of archery season and the beginning of rifle season. I believe the numbers would be grossly different than when the counts are done in the spring with no pressure on the animals.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I would like to see individual surveys done in the timeline of the week between archery and rifle season.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

I would like to see the objective increased to 600-700 in HD 630. With a plus / minus factor of 15%.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Yes the bull objective is currently adequate.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No.... very very few elk have been observed in this hunting district this year. I would like to see more elk less hunters this next season.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

More elk less hunters.

#14

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:22:26 AM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:48:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:25:38
IP Address: 174.198.132.229

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Trevor Waarvik
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	trevor_99@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#15

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:24:36 AM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:49:55 AM
Time Spent: 00:25:18
IP Address: 76.75.23.123

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Gage Waarvik
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	gage.waarvik11114@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I agree with fixed range plus or minus 20. I would like to see the range counted between archery and rifle season for a better count.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I would like to see individual surveys.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

I would like to see the objective increase to 600-700

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Yes that is fine

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No not enough elk

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

More elk less hunters

#16

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 3:06:07 PM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 3:10:44 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:37
IP Address: 216.129.244.215

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Justin J Schaaf
City	Glasgow
State	MT
Email (optional)	jschaaf71@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I would like to see FWP Implement the 10 year long term average as the objective for this unit with the 20% +/- being considered within objective.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I believe the current biennial actual elk counted individual surveys provide sufficient data for determining population levels. Keep this as status quo.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

I believe the objective for HD 630 should be increased to 700 to reflect the change in landowner and public acceptance of elk populations in the area that has occurred over the last 10-15 years.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

I would like to see bull:cow ratio kept for HD 630. I would also like to see the objective ratio increased to 50:100 or 40:100.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Yes.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Nothing specific comes to mind for this HD.

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 5:02:33 PM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 5:04:27 PM
Time Spent: 00:01:54
IP Address: 72.250.159.99

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Daniel Kinka on behalf of American Prairie
City	Malta
State	Montana
Email (optional)	daniel@americanprairie.org

Page 2: HD 630

Q2

Current population objectives are typically expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

American Prairie questions the utility of "objectives" for elk and any other wildlife that are based solely on subjective and unscientific assumptions about tolerance made decades ago. If FWP and its constituents decide that managing populations solely based upon social carrying capacity is still desirable, the state should commission a scientific survey representative of all Montanans to determine what the true tolerance for elk abundance is amongst its trust beneficiaries under the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. Under these circumstances, FWP could maintain the current form of objective (+/-20%) but should strive to generate accurate calculations of elk abundance on an annual basis, and not rely on long-term averages. However, we feel that (re)focusing elk management on distribution over abundance would be a fruitful and mutually beneficial course of action for FWP. On public lands and wherever tolerance for elk is high, FWP should manage towards ecological carrying capacity. On private lands where tolerance is low and/or crop depredation/property damage is measurable and verifiable, appropriate and sufficient actions should be taken to redistribute elk to areas of higher tolerance.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

No, it would not be appropriate to use a 4-5 year average of surveys to determine objective status for this hunting district. Such averaging can only reduce the data available by which to make management decisions and reduce the speed with which the agency can and should respond to undesirable trends in wildlife populations (up or down). More and more frequent data should always be the goal, so we recommend using annual survey data to make management decisions.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 630 is 300-350. Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

American Prairie believes the current population objective is too low and should be increased. It does not reflect current tolerance or demand in the region, let alone anything close to the ecological carrying capacity of the region. We question the utility of "objectives" for wildlife that are based solely on subjective and unscientific assumptions about tolerance. The state should commission a scientific survey representative of all Montanans in this hunting district to determine what the true tolerance for elk abundance is. Barring such a survey, we conservatively suggest that resetting the objective in this hunting district to the recent population high of > 1,000 is appropriate and would benefit the largest number of trust beneficiaries.

Q5

In HD 630, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 30 bulls:100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

American Prairie favors "natural" sex ratios in wildlife populations, but do not feel strongly one way or the other about the bull ratio in this hunting district.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, we at American Prairie are not satisfied with the current elk distribution in this hunting district. It does not reflect current tolerance or demand in the region, let alone anything close to the ecological carrying capacity of the public lands in the district, nor those private lands (e.g., American Prairie) with high tolerance for elk. We feel that (re)focusing elk management on distribution over abundance would be a fruitful and mutually beneficial course of action for FWP. On public lands and wherever tolerance for elk is high, FWP should manage towards ecological carrying capacity. On private lands where tolerance is low and/or crop depredation/property damage is measurable and verifiable, appropriate and sufficient actions should be taken to redistribute elk to areas of higher tolerance.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

As a general comment, and particularly in the area that American Prairie operates (throughout the Greater Upper Missouri River Breaks region), we question the utility of “objectives” for elk and any other wildlife that are based solely on subjective and unscientific assumptions about tolerance made decades ago. If FWP and its constituents decide that managing populations solely based upon social carrying capacity is still desirable, the state should commission a scientific survey representative of all Montanans to determine what the true tolerance for wildlife (i.e., elk) abundance is amongst its trust beneficiaries under the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. However, we feel that (re)focusing elk management on distribution over abundance would be a fruitful and mutually beneficial course of action for FWP. On public lands and wherever tolerance for elk is high, FWP should manage towards ecological carrying capacity. On private lands where tolerance is low and/or crop depredation/property damage is measurable and verifiable, appropriate and sufficient actions should be taken to redistribute elk to areas of higher tolerance.

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:29:19 AM
Last Modified: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:59:04 AM
Time Spent: 00:29:44
IP Address: 96.31.23.65

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott Heidebrink
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	scott.heidebrink@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 652

Q2

There is currently no population objective in HD 652. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

No, the objective should be 100-200.

Q3

In HD 652, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

It should be a 1:1 bull to cow ratio. This unit could be a trophy unit allowing a high quality hunting experience.

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

A management objective higher than 0.

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, October 15, 2022 8:07:50 AM
Last Modified: Saturday, October 15, 2022 8:12:05 AM
Time Spent: 00:04:15
IP Address: 216.228.49.164

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Justin Schaaf
City	Glasgow
State	Montana
Email (optional)	jschaaf71@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 652

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

There is currently no population objective in HD 652. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3 Respondent skipped this question

In HD 652, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5
What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

I think the Elk Management Plan should include wording that strives to gain elk populations in historical elk range in HD's that have a large amount of public land. I think HD652 is one of the few prairie districts that fit that criteria.

#1

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:29:29 AM
Last Modified: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:30:23 AM
Time Spent: 00:00:54
IP Address: 96.31.23.65

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott Heidebrink
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	scott.heidebrink@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 670

Q2 Respondent skipped this question

There is currently no population objective in HD 670. Is this acceptable? If not, what should it be?

Q3 Respondent skipped this question

In HD 670, there is no bull objective. Is this appropriate in this HD? If you would like to have a bull objective, what should it be?

Q4 Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q5 Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 3:59:54 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 4:13:40 PM
Time Spent: 00:13:46
IP Address: 70.33.51.227

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Les Odegard
City	Havre
State	Montana
Email (optional)	iblodegard@hotmail.com

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The system is outdated. What is the current population? Guessing it is far above your range. Elk herds are concentrated in this district in places most hunters cannot access. Land owners complain about the damage they do to hay fields and fences but access to these areas are restricted due to outfitters leasing the ground or Block Management. Block Management is great but only for those who know the land owner and are provided certain privilege's. Until the access issue is fixed so the common hunter can hunt restricted lands the herd population will continue to grow uncontrolled. State Lands are not accessible due to Lessee restrictions or outfitters being designated to manage said lands for Lessee. Population of Elk in this district far out cedes your objective range. I have seen 10 bulls in one group over the winter and know of many ranches that carry 5 or more bulls throughout the year. Cow numbers are up significantly as well. Access to State Lands needs to be better with more parking areas easily accessible from county roads and commonly traveled roads.

#2

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, July 28, 2022 4:08:30 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, July 28, 2022 4:15:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:07:04
IP Address: 172.221.122.193

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Michael winchell
City	Havre
State	Montana
Email (optional)	mike@lodestarlandandhome.com

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

I think this is an acceptable approach however there should be more exact counts and "desirability" be re-established.

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased. There has been NO significant changes made to increase access and the desirability of elk is ever growing. MANY landowners appreciate the elk much more than they consider them a burden. The ones that do want lower objectives need to make greater attempts at harvesting whats there.

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

I am only displeased with the concentrations of unhuntable or very difficult to gain permission herds.

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

I believe the biggest issue is that we need to establish new objectives based on landowner tolerance and compatibility. I also believe a more specific monetary reward for landowners be based off of "SUCCESSFUL ACCESS"... Not just allowing a couple people to hunt the less desirable locations and harboring the majority of the animals for only close friends or family.

#3

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 05, 2022 2:50:49 PM
Last Modified: Friday, August 05, 2022 3:22:50 PM
Time Spent: 00:32:01
IP Address: 161.7.103.150

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Aaron Peterson
City	Helena
State	MT

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Use an average of 5 years survey data. This unit is huge and elk can be easily missed.

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Consider using a combination of 1) average of last 5 years 2) max of last three years and 3) average cow-calf ratio of last three years. Those metrics indicate stable/increasing/decreasing populations.

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Current objective of 250 is woefully low considering the size of unit and the amount of quality habitat available. Habitat could likely support ten times that many elk (2500). Balance will be found with landowner tolerance. Seems like there are not many concerns with too many elk on private except when they are moving through and tearing up fences. A compromise might be found in the middle, closer to where they are now - so around 1000.

Q5

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

690 is a premiere bull elk unit and should be treated with the same bull elk objective as other high quality areas (30:100). Increase objective.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Elk move around a lot and can be hard to find / access. When they are found, it's usually in large herds. Would be nice if there were more elk distributed in the breaks areas (Bullwacker). Objective might be to maintain at least 30% of herd in the Missouri River in the Breaks during winter surveys - which would require BLM land to have quality grass /habitat to support them

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Provide incentives for elk to stay in the Breaks area and on publicly accessible parcels - improve habitat quality on public lands.
Improve access to elk on private

#4

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 4:22:09 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 4:22:16 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:07
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott
City	Havre

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#5

INCOMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 7:21:34 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, August 16, 2022 7:21:41 PM
Time Spent: 00:00:06
IP Address: 69.144.179.218

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scogtt
City	Havre

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#6

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 9:18:02 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 9:22:46 PM
Time Spent: 00:04:44
IP Address: 47.37.11.163

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	jason hoerning
City	Dillon
State	MT

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

dont let landowners sell tags.dont hand landowner tags out for the rich to come swoop in and buy.becoming rich man sport.this will come back to bite our governor

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

50 animals on public.the rest behind faber landlocked leased properties.pay a trespass or bottleneck into the public and fight over the same bulls others are hunting too

Q5

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

20.at least you get to see a bull over 320 and 5 yrs old there.most mt average age is 2 1/2 then dead

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#7

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, August 25, 2022 5:30:10 PM
Last Modified: Thursday, August 25, 2022 5:36:55 PM
Time Spent: 00:06:45
IP Address: 153.90.151.49

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Samuel T Koeshal
City	Bozeman
State	MT
Email (optional)	skoeshal@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

keep the same method

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

I would support using 3 year average

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased. Given that the elk herd in HD 690 seems to be organically growing over time, it does not seem appropriate to keep the objective at 250. A more appropriate objective may be in the ~ 800 range. Given that this is a "top 5" elk hunt unit be many residents, mostly for the trophy potential, I think we should allow this herd to grow some, possibly allowing for more LE archery or rifle permits to be issued in the future for bulls and maybe allow limited cow harvest.

Q5

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

At least maintain the 10:100 ratio. If anything, the ratio should be increased to reflect the "trophy" nature of this unit, as many people apply for many years before getting the chance to hunt 690 for a bull elk.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

unfamiliar so I will not comment on the distribution

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

NA

#8

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:29:39 AM
Last Modified: Friday, August 26, 2022 8:56:35 AM
Time Spent: 00:26:56
IP Address: 96.31.23.65

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Scott Heidebrink
City	Malta
State	MT
Email (optional)	scott.heidebrink@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

The most accurate methods for estimating populations should be used. Objectives should be set based on the publics desire for elk populations, land owner tolerance and ecological carrying capacity.

Q3**Respondent skipped this question**

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to 1,000-1,200. Landownership has changed and tolerance has increased in the region. The population is already well above objective and therefore the region can support more elk than the current objective states. Landownership has changed and the large amount of public land would support more elk and tolerance has increased.

Q5

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

The bull to cow ratio should be increased to at least 50 bulls:100 cows. If the ratio was 1:1 it would make managing herd numbers easier and make the objectives easier to meet. If there are more bulls and less cows, the number of calves born each year will be less and allow FWP to meet objectives.

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No, There are large amounts of public land that have very few elk. Pressure needs to be increased on private land and decreased significantly on public land to distribute more elk onto public lands. If 690 was divided in half, north and south it may help redistribute more elk onto public lands.

The southern portion is primary public land. If pressure was decreased i.e. fewer tags it would give more low pressure for elk to go to and take them off of private land. If pressure could be increased in the north and focused on the private land elk would move south.

Not dividing the unit allows too many hunters to hunt the public land and therefore doesn't give elk the security they need.

Q7

Respondent skipped this question

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

#9

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:20:38 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:23:11 PM
Time Spent: 00:02:32
IP Address: 158.68.66.254

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Craig Miller
City	Havre
State	Montana
Email (optional)	mt.craigmiller@gmail.com

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Respondent skipped this question

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Q3

Respondent skipped this question

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

The current management objective for HD 690 is 250 +/-10%. At the Havre public meeting it was stated that there are currently “not enough tools in the toolbox” to reduce numbers to 2005 objectives. It was mentioned the bull ratio could be resolved, but I would disagree for the same reason. There may be an elk issue in 690, but it is an elk access issue. This could be changed to an OTC bull tag and there would be the same outcome, private land harboring. Obviously, this is no surprise to FWP, Scott Thompson presented this information at the 2016 Wildlife Society Meeting in Missoula. While the study was conducted in HD 621, 622, 631, and 632; the same issue persists in 680 that borders to the west.

<https://wildlife.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jwmg.21122>

While there are issues with the 2005 Elk Management Plan, this topic was discussed specifically on pg. 55.

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

At the Have meeting it was pointed out that “may” was an important to the conversation and that few, if any HDs did not include inaccessible elk during counts. I understand this is good wiggle room for some areas and may be required, but in 690, I think this is exactly the issue. Kudos to whomever included this. Unfortunately, according to FWP biologists and managers, 690 decided not to follow this consideration.

So here we are, elk are expanding, and numbers are increasing. Here are the numbers from the Havre meeting.

2001 – 2021 average 450
2011 – 2021 average 522
2016 – 2021 average 564
2018 – 2021 average 621
2021 1,026

The last two season (IIRC) have been very liberal, allowing cow/calf with general tag. Yet, we still are observing an increase in visible elk during aerial surveys.

It was also brought up at the meeting by FWP staff that 690 was never intended to be a trophy HD. Well, here we are, one of the most coveted permits in the state and one that garners Governor’s tag opportunities in many years. “Don’t look a gift horse in the mouth”.

I have a couple suggestions and I do appreciate the opportunity to provide comments.

1. The current objective of 250 is too low and from the local biologist’s own opinion, not attainable with current “tools”. Let us be honest, this was not a well thought out number when it was included in the 2005 EMP. From what I could find from surveys prior the 2005 EMP, total elk counted were between 230 and 260 from 2001 – 2004. It appears it was decided that was a good number based on social tolerance I assume. I believe that the social tolerance would be a larger number at this point based on the monetary value big bull elk in 690 currently possess and the expansion of elk to new habitat in the HD.

I work with a landowner that supports elk on his ranch during the archery season and some of the rifle season. He believes 1,026 (counted) is “probably” too many, but 250 is too low. I asked his opinion and he thought more in the 600-700 range.

2. The 2005 EMP pointed out that in portions of some EMUs elk would be inaccessible to hunters or accessible to only a few hunters and that inaccessible elk "may" not be included for objective numbers. I understand "may" allows FWP to not follow that consideration, but it also very apparent that it can be used, and from FWP's own research, it is an issue. In 690, it is the issue.

I would love for access to be improved, but let us be honest, most of the new, non-traditional landowners in this area do not have a financial interest to allow the public to shoot elk on their private or inaccessible public land. Outfitting on private lands will continue to trump what FWP is able to pay, and the future of non-traditional landowners and expanded leasing of private lands will not decline in the future.

My suggestions.

- Increase HD 690 objectives to 800 elk with +/-20% of the three-year average.
 - Current EMP is 10:100 bulls and 2021 was 61:100. I think managing for 30:100 post season would be a better ratio.
 - Use "consideration" #5 on page 55 of the 2005 EMP. Not sure why this is a bad thing when we understand it is an issue in HD 690.
-

#10

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Thursday, October 13, 2022 11:16:05 AM
Last Modified: Thursday, October 13, 2022 11:22:17 AM
Time Spent: 00:06:11
IP Address: 216.228.36.135

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	richard tremblay
City	sidney
State	mt

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

use the same approach

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

a 2 year approach seems to work well in other areas

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

raise it dramatically, 1200/1500

Q5

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

yes there should be. no its inappropriate it needs raised to 40%

Q6

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

No there should be way more elk down toward the river and east side of district

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

annual elk survey, mandatory report of harvest

#11

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Friday, October 14, 2022 11:59:52 AM
Last Modified: Friday, October 14, 2022 12:03:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:03:43
IP Address: 161.7.39.7

Page 1

Q1

Contact Information

Name	Cory Calnan
City	Havre
State	MT

Page 2: HD 690

Q2

Current population objectives are expressed as a desired number of elk counted, and typically include a range around that value (+/-20%). The range accounts for anticipated variability in elk counts among years. In this HD, should FWP maintain the current form of objective (point value with fixed range) or should FWP consider alternative population objective forms, like using the long-term average (5 years, 10 years) +/- 20%, or some other approach to establish a population objective?

Consider alternative approach based

Q3

Elk populations are classified into objective status using annual or biennial survey data. Because there is often variation among surveys, would it be more appropriate to use individual surveys or a 3-year average of surveys to determine objective status for this HD or would you recommend some other approach?

3 year survey

Q4

The current population objective for HD 690 is 250 (range 225-275). Do you think the current population objective level should be maintained, increased, or decreased? If increased or decreased, what should the new range be?

Increased to 500

Q5

In HD 690, there is a bull objective to maintain at least 10 bulls: 100 cows observed during post-season aerial trend surveys. Should there be a bull objective in this HD? If so, is the current bull objective appropriate? If not, what should it be?

Bull objective is appropriate

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Are you satisfied with the current elk distribution in this HD? If not, would you suggest any specific objectives to address the distribution?

Q7

What else does the Elk Management Plan need to include for this HD?

Most elk in the Unit are unaccessible given private lands otherwise leased

Comment Card

-Glasgow Elk
Meeting 8-11-22



Your opinion matters to us. Please let us know what you think.

Be as detailed as possible.

I think a reduction in permits is needed, especially
archery. The pressure has become a huge problem
the elk are very acclimated to pressure & finding the
private land. No more shoulder season, not significant
harvest to warrant more pressure for longer months.
A 15 year old fawn should be 100% draw to try & recruit
young hunters, the harvest success is minimal to affect
anything.

If you'd like to hear back from us, please print your email address or phone number.

Comment Card

Have Elk
Meeting 8-16-22



Your opinion matters to us. Please let us know what you think.

Be as detailed as possible.

Re 6701680 elk cow
harvest, it's seems to me the department is
doing what it can to negotiate private
land access. I urge some action to
improve access to public land in the
district, including maximizing easement
in access agreements, and legal
action to open roads.

If you'd like to hear back from us, please print your email address or phone number.

willraven@mad.com

Comment Card - Malta Meeting

EIK

8-9-22



Your opinion matters to us. Please let us know what you think.

Be as detailed as possible.

*Don't change something that is working
fairly well
Howard Pippin*

If you'd like to hear back from us, please print your email address or phone number.

P.PIPPINKOWARD@GMAIL.COM