

Wickman, Erik

From: Kent Undlin <kentundlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2023 2:23 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for commissioner amendments

Elk Amendment LPT 700-20, LPT 700-21 (increase tag quotas) – I do not support increased quotas for LPT 700-20 or 700-21. This proposal is from the outfitter/guide industry which privatizes a public resource and is purely driven by increased tags which translates to more dollars in the pockets of that industry. Currently the bull:cow ratio is below the bare minimum objective of 30:100 (bull:cow) and has been dropping steadily from the early 2000's. Increased either sex tags will ensure a continued downward trend in bull:cow ratio and age class of bulls. Age class is also needed to maintain good herd dynamics/genetics/viability which is also suffering in Unit 700. Cow harvest is a way to control or reach herd objectives. Currently 16% harvest success on antlerless elk comes from Unit 700. Obviously an either sex tag does not equate to more antlerless elk harvested as an either sex tag for Unit 700 is a bull-targeted tag. Unit 700 was listed as a "trophy district" in the 2005 management plan and is listed as a "special management bull district" in the 2023 elk management plan.

Proposed Amendment by Lane/MOGA – Split Antelope HD 007-200 – I do not support the "Splitting of Antelope hunting district 0700-20 into two districts." This proposal like others sets a dangerous precedent for special interest or advocate groups to submit proposals which has never previously been entertained by the commission. I find it ironic that at least 2 of the commissioners are licensed outfitters and the proposals came from MOGA. This proposal lack biological justification, could possibly create additional crowding (most likely in carter county) which is exactly what they are trying to prevent. The existing 40-year data for HD703 would also be essentially "ended" which is critical to inform management recommendations. The proposal would also complicate hunting regulations and hamper opportunity for those hunters currently utilizing units north and south of the Yellowstone River. I would support utilizing units for managed/limited doe harvest as in some units pronghorn populations are decent, with others having a larger decline, especially after the 2010/11 extreme winter. Sent from my iPhone

Wickman, Erik

From: Jess Wagner <jess_wagner2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2023 12:14 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Region 7 Antelope Amendment

Dear FWP Commission,

Although the proposed amendment doesn't provide any reasoning or justification for making the change, I think it is generally better to manage smaller areas than a region-wide area. The proposed boundary is the Yellowstone River, but I think it would make sense to use I94 as the boundary as it is more of a barrier for antelope than the river. The river and I94 parallel each other in an east/west direction until Miles City, where they turn and head northeast. The river and I94 split at Glendive, where the river continues to head northeast while I94 heads east. On years with bad winters, hundreds of antelope that are unable to cross I94 will often cross the river near Glendive. They typically don't make it back across the river. This means there will be years where hundreds of antelope will be moving from the southern portion of HD 007-20 to the northern portion. By using I94 as the boundary, biologists won't have to try to account for these big herds moving between HD's.

As a side note, I think it would be very beneficial to the public if reasons/justifications were provided with all amendments. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jess Wagner
Lewistown, MT

Wickman, Erik

From: Michael Kelly <mfkelly1776@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 6:22 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment on Amendment Proposed by Commissioner Lane

I oppose the amendment proposed by Commissioner William Lane to alter the antelope unit boundary.

I understand that our comments need to be “substantive” in order for our opinion to be considered by the Commission, but a substantive comment is difficult to make when the Proposed Motion is a single sentence without any substance or evidence of need.

I am curious if Commissioner Lane himself decided this was needed, or if any special interest groups bent his ear with it. His bio on the FWP website says he is a licensed outfitter, it isn't a stretch to question whether or not he was in touch with a group like Montana Outfitters & Guides Association (MOGA) or Land Trust. With that in mind, I am assuming that this motion was brought forward by private interests -- if I am wrong, please correct me. Regardless, having to take the time out of my day to write a rebuttal to a motion on a public resource that is being pushed by private interests – Not cool.

First and foremost, there is no biological need for doing this. Antelope numbers took a dive in the winter of 2011, but buck/doe ratios are solid and the population is rebounding. Currently, I don't see biological evidence supporting a need for this proposal. Conservation and resource management should be strictly science-based.

Second, if this proposal is to address crowding on public lands, I don't see how a group of private landowners profiting off a public resource find this to be the solution. If the goal is to reduce overcrowding, muddying the regulations with more complications is not the way to go about it.

Lastly, and arguably most important, is the very notion that proposals like this can be brought forth by private interest groups. It sets the dangerous precedent that private interest groups get to sway management of a public resource, regardless of whether the proposal is a good one. I understand outfitters are people too and in some way they need representation as well, but if the proposal is solely to benefit outfitters I'd prefer if you were just upfront and honest about it. It should then be no surprise that people like myself get upset when they perceive an official -- elected or not -- dismissing the common sportsman and sportswoman and pushing the agenda of private interests and private money instead.

I urge you to dismiss this proposal in its entirety, and to be more transparent about your motives and justifications moving forward.

Wickman, Erik

From: tricityinc@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, November 26, 2023 11:07 AM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 700 antelope district split

This is a great idea thanks Brad Lencioni

Wickman, Erik

From: Jack Austin <Jackfg71@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, November 24, 2023 9:58 AM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] commissioner Lane amendment to R7 antelope regulations

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners,

Please leave the Region 7 antelope hunting districts as they are where any R7 antelope permit can be used anywhere in R7. Approximately 80% of Region 7 is private property and those landowners control access to whomever they want. Those landowners also control the species they choose to allow to be hunted on their lands. Creating two antelope hunting units will have zero biological impact. When antelope numbers are low in certain areas, then hunters re-distribute themselves naturally to places where the populations are more robust. Creating two antelope hunting districts will remove flexibility and opportunity for hunters and landowners alike.

Thank you, Jack Austin, Miles City

Wickman, Erik

From: Brian Gibson <brijguy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 6:25 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 007-20 Antelope

Divide 700, 701, 702, 703, 704 & 705 antelope districts into their own individual districts.

Wickman, Erik

From: russ61hi@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 7:22 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Splitting Region & Antelope Tag

I absolutely DO NOT SUPPORT this amendment in any way shape or form.

I also think it's crooked and shady that amendments are being proposed so close to the commission meeting with little opportunity for public comment.

The entire commission is a bunch of amateurs that should immediately resign.

Wickman, Erik

From: cjtarinelli@aol.com
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 5:47 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] H.D. 700 Antelope proposal

I am IN FAVOR of the proposal to split H.D. 700 into a northern and southern district for antelope hunting.
Chuck Tarinelli - Belgrade, Montana

[Sent from AOL on Android \[play.google.com\]](#)

Wickman, Erik

From: Michael Murphy <mbmurphy3006@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 5:04 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Splitting area 700 antelope

I am a proponent for the proposal to split antelope area 700 into 2 area along the Yellowstone River and the number of tags as proposed.

MB Murphy
Dillon

Wickman, Erik

From: Jake Anderson <bigbird2533@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 6:07 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Stop making things harder

Leave Antelope hunting district 7 as is