

Wickman, Erik

From: Wickman, Erik
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2023 7:25 AM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: Comment 11/20

Mr. Lencioni called the Director's Office and stated that he is in full support of the proposed changes to HD 410.

~E

Erik Wickman

Commission Coordinator

Assistant to the Director

Director's Office | Headquarters Division

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

P.O. Box 200701

Helena, MT 59620-0701

Ph: (406) 444-7826 | C: (406) 594-8921

[Montana FWP](#) | [Montana Outdoors Magazine](#) | [Montana WILD](#)



THE OUTSIDE IS IN US ALL.



Wickman, Erik

From: FWP Parks
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 4:12 PM
To: Wickman, Erik
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] EHA ARM

Good afternoon, Erik,

This topic was on the agenda during the October Commission meeting.
Is there a platform where I should send representative's comments after each meeting, or can this be filed for reference?
Please let me know and I will follow up as needed.

Thank you,

Ellie Youde
Administrative Assistant
Fisheries Division
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

P.O. Box 200701
Helena, MT 59620-0701
Ph: (406) 444-7815
[Montana FWP](#) | [Montana Outdoors Magazine](#) | [Montana WILD](#)



THE OUTSIDE IS IN US ALL.



From: Denley Loge <denleylogehd14@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 4:04 PM
To: FWP Parks <fwpprk@mt.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] EHA ARM

I would agree with the proposed changes. Thank you, Rep. Denley Loge

Wickman, Erik

From: Parsons, Lindsey
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 11:28 AM
To: Wickman, Erik
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT: FW: [EXTERNAL] Unit 600 deer population

From: Benson, Pam <Pam.Benson@mt.gov> **On Behalf Of** FWP Wildlife
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 8:23 AM
To: FWP Region 6 <fwprg62@mt.gov>; Parsons, Lindsey <Lindsey.Parsons@mt.gov>; Wakeling, Brian <Brian.Wakeling@mt.gov>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Unit 600 deer population

Good morning,
Just passing along this one from the general email box.

Pam Benson
Administrative Assistant
Wildlife Division
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

P.O. Box 200701
Helena, MT 59620-0701
Ph: (406) 444-2612
[Montana FWP](#) | [Montana Outdoors Magazine](#) | [Montana WILD](#)



THE OUTSIDE IS IN US ALL.



From: Austin Skoog <atsko178@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 11, 2023 1:31 PM
To: FWP Wildlife <fwpwld@mt.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Unit 600 deer population

Quit selling B tags in unit 600 population seems to have declined massively since 2022. Tha ks

Wickman, Erik

From: Hansen, Warren
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 3:59 PM
To: Kyle Ball; FWP Commission
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Email for Public Comment

Hi Kyle,
The email address for the FWP Commission is FWComm@mt.gov

I looked up harvest success for the 339-20 permit. Last year it was 51%. The three year average is 49%.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can do for you.

Warren Hansen
Wildlife Manager
Wildlife Division
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Region 3

1400 S 19th Ave
Bozeman, MT 59718
O: (406) 577-7864



THE **OUTSIDE** IS IN US ALL.

From: Kyle Ball <highlinesupply@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 3:02 PM
To: Hansen, Warren <Warren.Hansen@mt.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Email for Public Comment

Hi Warren,

I tried to submit my public comment like you mentioned but i must have written down the address wrong. I had "fwp.comm@mt.gov" but that email got rejected. Can you provide me with the correct email for submitting that (besides on the website)?

Thank,
Kyle Ball
406-670-1727

Wickman, Erik

From: Skip Sterner <mcsterner@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2023 4:11 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL]

I have worked with CWD in Nebraska and Wisconsin mostly but did some consulting for other states. In changing the regs in those HD there are several questions that come to mind:

1. What effect is that going to have on the deer population over time? If the presence of CWD is still there you have not gained anything. You are right back where you started. The percent will climb higher than the 5% you are targeting.
2. Is the percent infected 5% or less. If not you may want to hold off for a year or so.
3. As far as I know there is still no cure for CWD. Keeping the contaminated area under control is very important, as you know, by keeping deer numbers down reducing chance for spreading CWD to other HD. If there is a cure then it is much easier to treat in a finite area than huge expanses.
4. There can be a financial issue to consider as well. If CWD spreads throughout the state out of state hunters may not want to hunt a state in where there is a good chance of harvesting a CWD infected deer.

I respectfully submit these thoughts to be considered when making your final decisions on this matter.

Sincerely,
Skip Sterner
mcsterner@gmail.com

Wickman, Erik

From: Robbins <robbins@midrivers.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 9:53 AM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 2023 proposed changes to HD 417

FWP has 417 under the most limited of permits for elk despite a population glut of 1000% over objective, and is now proposing doing the same for mule deer. As a landowner in 417 in production agriculture with a small outfitting operation as a supplement, this is the most punitive and burdensome measure FWP could take for wildlife management. The Lewistown biologist cites as justification a flight count she did over Lower Two Calf. Lower Two Calf is the far north of 417, on the river, public land, and not where you would look for mule deer if you honestly wanted to assess the district. This is the same biologist that several years ago reported mature bucks in 410 at a ridiculously low number, found laughable by those who hunt 410. As one of our friends who regularly hunts 410 said, "we apparently killed half the mature bucks in one morning." Mule deer numbers have been lower in the past few years, but this is a cycle we have witnessed in our 50 years living and ranching here.

When elk numbers are up FWP limits ES permits, and when mule deer numbers are down they propose limiting ES permits? If the mule deer numbers were in true distress it would only make sense to stop harvesting does. Maybe this Commission and department heads should wake up to what the department biologists really want to manage for, which is limited ES permits to grow big antlers. That type of management results in a costly burden to the landowners in production agriculture in those districts, something Montana law directs FWP to manage against.

We are adamantly against implementing limited antlered mule deer permits in HD 417, and continue to implore you to stop using our land as a costly growing ground for trophy elk by ending the arbitrary limited ES archery elk permit.

Mark and Deanna Robbins
Lonesome Ridge Ranch LLC
Roy, MT 59471

Sent from [Mail \[go.microsoft.com\]](mailto:robbins@midrivers.com) for Windows

Wickman, Erik

From: Rich McFate <mcfater@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 20, 2023 5:55 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on proposed and continued Elk regulations in HD 515

Thank you for your efforts in managing wildlife and the hunters who harvest wildlife on both public and private lands.

My comment is in regard to the continued offering of general either sex elk licenses in HD 515. It is my observation that the number and quality of the bull elk has been adversely affected by the offering of this fairly recent change to the regulations. I primarily hunt archery. The bulls have been more difficult to find and the ones I encounter are not close to the trophy class I once could occasionally harvest in this district. Fewer are likely to reach maturity due to an increase in both pressure and harvest during the rifle season.

Would you please consider changing this regulation to allow either sex harvest only during archery season and then use a draw permit (50 permits?) to allow the harvest of some bulls during the rifle and muzzleloader season. By allowing general antlerless or spike harvest, the numbers of bulls and cows should still remain controlled, but will allow a better number of bulls to reach full maturity and increase opportunities to harvest a larger bull.

This is a compromise of what I would really like to see which is elk numbers increase a little [more.in \[more.in\]](#) the area. In the roughly 15,000 acres of private and public elk land I hunt, the numbers have really seemed to decline over the last few years making the harvest of any elk less likely.

I agree with the adjustments you made to mule deer as they address my concerns for mule deer.

Thank you for your consideration of my suggestions!

Rich McFate ALS# 12/22/1964-24
1305 Beartooth Dr.
Laurel, MT 59044
406 697-3912

Wickman, Erik

From: Kyle Ball <highlinesupply@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 2:53 PM
To: Wickman, Erik; fw.comm@mt.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment for proposed boundary change to Deer/Elk District 339 and 421

I am against the proposed boundary change to Deer/Elk District 339 and 421. I do not believe that the proposed change would accomplish the stated goal due to the fact that elk in that area are quite transient and frequently traffic north of the hydrological divide. Further, the proposed change creates an enforcement issue due to the remoteness of the hydrological divide. As personally witnessed in districts with similar boundaries to the one proposed, the divide is far less distinctive of a boundary when compared to Lyons Creek, creating both confusion for sportsmen as well as a temptation to illegally harvest an animal due to the low probability of getting caught. This is exacerbated due to the fact that Game Wardens have very large areas to patrol and the likelihood of a warden being in one particular area at the time of the infraction is quite low, while a much higher public presence along the road is an effective added deterrent to those looking to illegally fill a tag in a given unit.

Wickman, Erik

From: Kyle Ball <highlinesupply@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 16, 2023 3:04 PM
To: FWP Commission
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public comment for proposed boundary change to Deer/Elk District 339 and 421

Dear Commission,

I am against the proposed boundary change to Deer/Elk District 339 and 421.

I do not believe that the proposed change would accomplish the stated goal due to the fact that elk in that area are quite transient and frequently traffic north of the hydrological divide/suggested boundary change.

Further, the proposed change creates an enforcement issue due to the remoteness of the hydrological divide. As personally witnessed in districts with similar boundaries to the one proposed, the divide is far less distinctive of a boundary when compared to Lyons Creek, creating both confusion for sportsmen as well as a temptation to illegally harvest an animal due to the low probability of getting caught. This is exacerbated due to the fact that Game Wardens have very large areas to patrol and the likelihood of a warden being in one particular area at the time of the infraction is quite low, while a much higher public presence along the road is an effective added deterrent to those looking to illegally fill a tag in a given unit.

Thank you,
Kyle Ball
(406) 670-1727