

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

Collaboration between FWP, USFS, BLM, & DNRC and Any Other Pertinent Local, State, or Federal Land Management Agencies

Division/Unit/Bureau	Staff Assessment
Accounting Bureau	No comment.
Comm Ed	Communication staff would develop an outreach plan with a clear objective of promoting and explaining FWP's working relationship with other land management agencies. This plan would include joint news releases on habitat projects, planning efforts, recreational opportunities and work, and any other kinds of collaboration already taking place. Additionally, as part of this outreach plan, we could consider an annual summit with leaders from the agencies to engage hunters, landowners, and other public members on questions and concerns they might have on fish and wildlife management and habitat.
Enforcement Division	No comment.
Legal Unit	No comment.
Licensing Bureau	No comment.
Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division	FWP is required to consult all public land agencies prior to approving relevant Block Management agreements and Public Access Land Agreements. Access program staff work closely with the BLM, USFS, and DNRC to facilitate and support access opportunities. In 2018, FWP organized a meeting of the Interagency Access Council and could formally establish that group again for regular meetings. Depending on time of year, schedule, and intended attendees, this recommendation could add to workload and division travel expenses.
Technology Services Division	Depending on how the agency implements this recommendation, there may be TSD involvement. If this suggestion would require an exchange of digital data or if there is an expectation that we import/consume data from other agencies for use in our systems or that we share information from our parks/lands/forestry databases more than we already are, then TSD will likely need to be involved.
Wildlife Division	Although FWP already cooperates regularly and consistently with other state and federal land management agencies, increasing this existing collaboration to ensure wildlife needs are known and considered is a good objective. FWP currently works closely with state and federal land managers at the local level and provides comments and information on proposed land management actions to ensure wildlife needs are considered, like coordinating with USFS in the development of forest plans and/or proposed timber harvests. FWP could probably do a better job of making this working relationship more overt. FWP has developed elk habitat guidelines that include provisions for elk cover and road density, and works with the USFS on implementation of the guidelines. An important point to keep in mind is that not all canopy cover is "bad" for elk; summer and transitional ranges often include relatively high canopy cover and yet are highly important for survival and recruitment success. FWP also must consider the big game habitat guidelines under which the USFS must work. One example of USFS habitat requirements involves big game protections like elk habitat security, which can include closing roads during hunting seasons. Habitat management on federal lands must also take into account multiple variables and species beyond elk, such as guidelines for federally

Division/Unit/Bureau	Staff Assessment
	listed grizzly bears and lynx, forest raptors, and other similar considerations; FWP works with the USFS on habitat guidelines for these species as well. While FWP can provide input on habitat management and travel guidelines, the land management agencies must take into account multiple other variables, including livestock management.