

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

Establish (where possible) Localized Elk Working Groups

Division/Unit/Bureau	Staff Assessment
Accounting Bureau	No comment.
Comm Ed	The role of these working groups isn't clearly understood by the public or by many staff. Many of the current workgroups are relatively unknown outside of the people involved. Clear purpose behind these groups would be important if the department was to facilitate more of these across the state. If the groups have influence over department policy and/or hunting regulations, communicating what that influence is and why it's important with the general public would be critical.
Enforcement Division	No comment.
Legal Unit	These meetings should be strategically timed to flow into the reg season setting process. Also, need to ensure compliance with public notice/participation laws.
Licensing Bureau	No comment.
Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division	Headquarters and regional access program staff routinely interact with hunters and landowners. Elk management proposals affect access program workloads/activities. Division would seek to have access staff attend these work group meetings if implemented. Participation would have to be balanced and prioritized with current workloads and programs.
Technology Services Division	No comment
Wildlife Division	Elk working groups, where established, have typically been very effective at bringing together FWP, landowners, and sportspersons. To be successful, they need to be driven by landowners with FWP participating, rather than being directed by FWP with hopes that landowners will come along. FWP could bring resources such as facilitation, but this has to be something landowners want and participate in. Successful examples include Devils Kitchen Work Group, Missouri River Breaks Elk Working Group, Sun River Working Group, and Sweetgrass Wildlife Working Group. This recommendation mentions incentivizing participation, but if the collaboration is driven by landowners (w/FWP participating rather than directing) perhaps no incentives would be necessary. Feasibility of implementation depends on the scale that each of these groups would include/represent, how many of these would this include statewide?