

**From:** [Furthmyre, Coleen](#)  
**To:** [Kujala, Quentin](#)  
**Cc:** [Hayes, Merissa](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public comment in opposition to shoulder hunts.  
**Date:** Friday, November 06, 2015 8:12:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Printed list of Land owner signatures.pdf](#)

---

Quentin,  
Please see Mr. Brozovich signed petition attached (per conversation yesterday)

Merissa,  
Will you please include the attachments with the elk shoulder season public comments.

Thanks you Coleen

---

**From:** jdd2909@mt.net [mailto:jdd2909@mt.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 05, 2015 7:57 PM  
**To:** Furthmyre, Coleen  
**Subject:** Public comment in opposition to shoulder hunts.

Coleen, here are the opposition signatures from all the rancher I contacted in area 391, 392 and 446 who are not willing to comply with the proposed shoulder hunt. Please see that this gets to those on the board and whoever else you feel should see this. I will also send it to a few I feel need to see it and try to submit it as comment too.

Thank you so much for your help.

Jeff Brozovich

G/T Ranch Manager

Sent from Windows Mail

Printed list of Land owner signatures

Jim Thompson Area 391

Vince Thompson Area 391

Peggy Thompson Area 391

Charles Plymale Area 391 and 392

Huber Plymale Land Co Area 446 -Charles Plymale – Manager

Greg Field Area 392

David Greytak, G/T Ranch Area 392 –

Jeff Brozovich – Manager for G/T Ranch

Mark Abegglen Area 392

Daryl South South Ranch Area 392

Thomas F. O'Donnell Area 392

Tanya Dundas, Dundas Ranch Area 392

Boyd K. Iverson Cattle Co by Shelly Richtmyer Area 391

Red Basin Ranch by Shelly Richtmyer Area 391

New Moon Ranch by Shelly Richtmyer Area 391

Nancy Davis Area 391 and 392

June B. Hensley Area 392

Kelly Ingalls Round Grove Ranch Area 391

To Whom It May Concern:

We do not support the proposed plan for the shoulder hunt for 2015-2016.

We will not grant access or participate in the proposed program.

B Thompson 391

Vin Moore AREA 391

Begory Thompson + 391

Charles Fleguale AREA 391 & 392

Hubert Fleguale Land Co. AREA 446

Charles Fleguale - manager

Greg Field Area 392 TRIMOUNTAIN ANGUS RANCH

David & Synth } SIT Ranch AREA 392

Jeff Dyer G/T Ranch

Mark Lytle AREA 392

South Ranch  
AREA 392

Thomas F. O'Donnell area 392

Tanya Dundas Dundas Ranch AREA 392

Boud K. Iverson Cattle Co. by Shelly Ricketmyer 391

Red Basin Ranch by Shelly Ricketmyer AREA 391

New Moon Ranch by Shelly Ricketmyer AREA 391

Nancy Davis -391, 392  
James B. Newby 392

Kelly Ayalls Round Grove Ranch 391



*Protecting  
Montana's wildlife,  
land, waters,  
hunting and fishing  
heritage since 1936*

November 6, 2015

Montana Fish and Wildlife Commission  
1420 E. Sixth Ave.  
P.O. Box 200701  
Helena, MT 59620-0701

RE: Pilot Shoulder Season-Comments

Dear Commissioners,

The Montana Wildlife Federation (MWF) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks proposals for several Elk Shoulder Season Pilot projects to be conducted between October 30, 2015 and February 15, 2016.

MWF supported the proposed Guidelines for Elk Shoulder Seasons after several recommended adjustments were made to the draft proposal. The large number of comments on the guidelines was a reflection of the intense public interest in the management of the public's wildlife in Montana. The bottom line is that the public recognizes the need to harvest more elk in many hunting districts across the state using public hunting as the primary tool to do so. They also value deeply the hunting opportunity, not to mention outstanding table-fare that, for some, will accompany the opportunities to participate in the harvests of the prized elk. At the same time, Montana hunters want wildlife managers to stand vigilant in defense of the public trust by ensuring that any shoulder season proposals are only employed when absolutely necessary.

As anticipated, each proposed Pilot Shoulder Season involves a site-specific proposal to address an over objective elk population. In each of the proposed hunting districts, wildlife managers have prescribed liberal license and permit based hunting season structures for several years in an effort to use the six week archery season and five week general firearm season to move toward population objectives, yet, the populations are still on the increase.

Fair chase public hunting has proven to be the best tool to harvest elk and achieve population objectives in all hunting districts. We are guardedly optimistic that the Elk Season Guidelines approved by the Commission during your meeting on October 8, 2015 will provide a combination of incentives, tools, metrics and accountability measures to help move management of elk populations in the needed direction. Population objectives will not be reached quickly or without course corrections based on learning from experiences. The flexibility built into the Guidelines is no doubt there in recognition of adjustments that will be needed and made to address specific situations in specific locations at specific times.

With this in mind, we recommend the Commission's approval of the pilot projects that the Department says are ready to go forward with strong likelihood of successful outcomes. During the short time frame available, they have continued to work with biologists, landowners and public hunters to share the latest information and assess whether or not the requisite support is present. The Department is in the best position to advise us if a pilot project is ready to be implemented, and we are extending our trust that they are acting on the basis of the best science and documented public involvement. The Department has the primary role of engaging and working with landowners and hunters; part of this engagement can best come from real life pilot projects where everyone has "skin in the game."

We have expressed serious reservations about how shoulder seasons could be manipulated to limit public access. However, we believe the potential significance of what can be learned through implementing these pilot projects is worth the risk. These are pilot projects; all eyes need to be wide open. We encourage you to direct the Department to provide the highest degree of transparency with the results of these pilot projects in order to build trust with the public and identify the source of big game concentration problems.

If we had to choose one pilot project to support, it would be in HD 445. The formation and operation of the Devils Kitchen Working Group stands out as a strong example of coordination and cooperation among stakeholders. They have accomplished a great deal to address this issue in a way that respects the interests of both landowners and public hunters. If they are to the point where they say they must have more hunter days in order to move toward achieving population objective, then this pilot project is worth advancing.

On the other end of the spectrum, based on the information available to us, the pilots proposed in HDs 391 and 392 appear to be less prepared in terms of landowner and hunter support. While we trust that FWP personnel are in the best position to make recommendations, we caution that pilots in these areas are unlikely to see the success that can result from more thorough advance collaboration among landowners, sportsmen, and other affected interests.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue. MWF looks forward to continuing to provide constructive input to the Commission and Department in the management of the public's wildlife.

Sincerely,



Dave Chadwick  
Executive Director

## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
A Richter	Great Falls	MT	Undecided	Area 410 I know has a lot of Big Bulls , cows only?catering to the land owners so they can keep on selling those big ones for Big \$\$\$\$
Aaron Hansemann	Helena	MT	Disagree	We already have a large season. Maybe if you lowered tag fees for nonresidents you would sell more tags and harvers more elk.
Adam Cassel	St. Charles	IL	Undecided	In think elk are a very sought after species with a low success rate. Any extra time or season at a reasonable cost would be very helpful to all hunters and conservationist alike.
Amber Sherman	Winston	MT	Agree	Winston area has had elk year round in the ranchers fields. The elk don't even leave this ground from most of the year. They are eating the ranchers winter pastures to nothing. At least make it a late season for cow elk in this area.
Andrew aures	Great falls	MT	Agree	Let's lower the elk numbers where there over populated
Andrew Kinter	Missoula	MT	Disagree	I strongly oppose a rifle shoulder season before the general season as it will conflict with archery season, spooking animals early.
Andrew Veis	Billings	MT	Agree	I am not sure why this is offered for out-of-stater comments, isn't this a Montana Issue. If this is like the last season late season damage hunts, I am not in favor as it really was a lottery system. I found that disgusting, as it really reward the lucky not the efficient. But as always the Montana Fish and Game will do as it wishes. And I am not sure that it did little more than more elk from one side of the fence to the other and back again. Take care. Bud Veis
anthony branecky	mocksville	NC	Disagree	Will conflict with archery hunters who want to do preseason scouting. Just lengthen archery season by starting early
Anthony Smith	Helena	MT	Disagree	I do not like the shoulder season idea period but for this pilot proposal I will offer the following suggestion: The proposal reads "licenses would not be valid on National Forest lands or FWP WMAs;". This definition needs to be refined better. As I read this, I can shoot an elk in my front yard because it is within this definition. Ambiguity like this is too rife for abuse, will undoubtedly lead to unsafe, unethical behavior, and defeats part of the purpose of the shoulder seasons-limiting damage to private land. An elk eating someones yard can hardly be considered part of that damage.
Arlo Manfull	Billings	MT	Disagree	If the landowners want them off the land so bad, they can open it up to hunters during the regular season. Maybe we should make the out of state season 3 weeks long. That way they can open it up after the outfitters get out off their land.
Arnold Hatling	Helena	MT	Agree	working with land owners to benefit them and the hunters is a win,win.
Art Burns	Livingston	MT	Agree	Excellent concept. As a both a landowner with elk issues and hunter I am in favor of giving shoulder seasons every opportunity to succeed. I did not get drawn for a cow permit in 317 this year and am therefore looking forward to helping address the elk over-quota issues in 393. Hope this program works!
Austin Wargo	Columbia Falls	MT	Disagree	This shoulder season will turn into the privatization of big game and will be bad for montana's hunting overall. we already have the most liberal seasons of any state and landowners have including bow season nearly 3 months for people to hunt and manage the game herds. if landowners are not taking advantage of that what makes the commission think that an extra few months will. it seems to me that ranchers want this so they can sell hunts all for 6 months out of the year.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Barry Robinson	Bozeman	MT	Disagree	<p>what a croc of shit lets reward the rich landowners in this state by giving there out of state pals longer seasons.way to go fwp right on par with youre wolf decision.</p> <p>i have yet to talk to or here from one person in my hunting group of friends who support this season,and now days with social media those circles are large.alot like youre bank accounts are getting off this bullsit season. back in the late 80's and early 90's in the bitterroot valley fwp used to tell us there was no wolves,turns out there was and they knew it.now theres to many elk?what's youre end game here trying to make this a super elitist sport like some other countrys.what about the common hunter who doesnt get on those ranches?there freezers will just have to be empty i guess.good job fwp way to stick up for the folks who dont have land.public servants my ass.lobbyists is more like it.</p> <p>very strongly disagree.youre doing a piss poor job.</p> <p>were's the box for disagree strongly?weres the box for getting rid of the corrupt fwp officials.</p> <p>i suggest we lower the cost of tags get rid of half of the fwp employees, including commisioners and leave the elk alone.seems to me the fish cops are all driving brand new rigs this year i wonder were they got the money for that,being that tag sales are so low now.</p> <p>why not move the elk to some of those 19 percent(false number)areas or yellowstone to help the heard get back to were it was.imagine how much money you could have if all those out of staters came back at the price of tags today.wierd you still have the same (or larger)staff but the tag sales are way down according to youre statements,i wonder were the money is coming from?????</p> <p>dr sais i need to watch my blood preasure and your not helping.first the whole wolf bullshit now its the rich whats next two bull tags for everyone with a big bank account</p> <p>shame on you nwhy dont you just sell all our elk to another state and get it over with stop dragging this out youre just hurting the average joe in mt.shoulder season or not the elk are still going to hang out on private were the unconnected or commen hunter cant get to them and the rich landowners buddys can come and kill them at there own leisure.piss poor ob of managing our animals you libs.</p> <p>I was wondering,if this is a season to help control the number of elk on private property why then is the hunt being held on public property?.what a bunch of crap,using bull shit statistics to boost tag sales,SHAME ON YOU FWP.How bout you stop kissing asses and stand up to rediculous requests from these rich land owners and do the job we hired you to do.</p>
Ben Bouley	Butte	MT	Disagree	Changes not announced early enough to prepare
Bill Waldron	Townsend	MT	Disagree	<p>The elk are public property. This proposal extends and favors hunting opportunities for a small select number rather than the general public and depletes the elk population. Most of the elk in our 392 area stay on private land where they stay safer. We need to increase, not decrease, the numbers to give we, the public land hunters, an opportunity to harvest our meat supply.Thank you for the opportunity to comment and the good work by the wardens in our area.</p>
Blake Ezzell	Dothan	AL	Disagree	<p>Its hard enough to hunt elk on public land as it is. As non residents we pumps hundreds of thousands of dollars into the state because of large numbers of elk. If you reduce those numbers drastically non residents won't pay the already astronomically high tag prices to hunt non existent public land elk. All you are doing is allowing residents to kill cows on private land in the middle of winter. Its not helping anyone. Why not push those same private landowners to allow access during regular hunting season as a BMA? It would allow us non residents to kill more elk on private land- its a win win.</p>



### Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Brad Therriault	Great Falls	MT	Agree	I would like to see part of the season to be opened for disabled hunters and also first time youth hunters.
Bradley Ridgway	Pray	MT	Disagree	Regardless of the logic in the statement for adding this, it is not necessary or wanted. Elk population does not need to be Managed.
Brian	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposed shoulder season. This is only an attempt to make more money by the state in response to dwindling license sales on the back of the complete mismanagement and exploitation of the once thriving mule deer populations. Looking in the very recent past it is clear what happens when excessive harvest is used to manage populations to supposed population objectives. The only people this will benefit is the state in the short term, until the elk have been "managed" to the same levels as the mule deer herds have been managed to, and also to cater to the large landowners who only want cows shot and to have the bulls left for high paying clients. The states job is to manage the wildlife populations for the residents of the state of Montana as a renewable resource. If a shoulder season is to occur, it must be for both bulls and cows and for opportunities for the residents of this state, not others.
Brian Barrows	Havre	MT	Agree	This is a great opportunity for all of the parties involved. The Landowner gets herd reduction which is regulated by FWP and the hunter gets meat on the table. I wish we had done and extended season on some of the open herds instead of bringing back the wolves. I fully support this concept.
Brian Bramblett	Helena	MT	Disagree	As drafted the shoulder season pilot does not appear to provide any additional general public hunting opportunities. The shoulder seasons don't apply to most public lands, and there does not appear to be any commitment from private landowners to allow additional access during the shoulder seasons. The use of damage hunts provides an adequate mechanism for reaching population objectives if properly implemented by FWP.
Brian Martinez	Vaughn	MT	Disagree	I don't believe in this because most of the land owners allow a certain few on there property during the general hunting and profiting off the state resource by charging a trespass fee to the willing to spend a couple hundred dollars to even thousands of dollars to kill mature bulls and then have the FWP step in to control the cows that are left over. Every time I knock on doors to get permission and or try to cross private property to access state land and the land owner denies me, and then complain about being over ran by elk I don't feel sorry for them at all. My point is that if I'm not good enough or willing to spend my money to harvest our natural resource off there property then they can deal with the elk some other way. I am totally against the 2015 elk late shoulder season.
Brian McCullough	Helena	MT	Agree	I support the 2015 pilot shoulder hunts for cow elk only. Any bull permits for the regular rifle season should not be allow to be used for a hunt that is to reduce numbers of elk that are over objective. Measure of success should be compared to last three years with no shoulder hunt rather than the measures listed in the guidelines.
Brian Potton	Stevensville	MT	Agree	This is a tool that needs to be tested for effectiveness, as I see the probability of the incorporation of shoulder seasons in Ravalli Co., particularly around my ranch.
Brian Stewart	Libby	MT	Agree	It sounds like a great way to responsibly control elk herds while allowing hunters another opportunity to fill an elk tag while still protecting land owners property from unlimited hunters accessing their property. Permit only and not during the general season. That would give land owners more comfort about allowing hunting on their lands.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Agree, Disagree or Undecided</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Brooke Johnson	Dillon	MT	Disagree	I don't think any firearms should be used for elk before an archery season.
Burt B. Collins	Apple Valley	CA	Agree	I believe it gives the hunter more flexibility on time in which they may hunt. It also is taking place prior to the cow elk having been bred.
Byron Drake	stevensville	MT	Agree	Any opportunity to harvest an elk in an un-guided hunt should be celebrated. That will feed my family for a year.
Chad Colby	Helena	MT	Agree	If the correct amount of elk have not been harvested I agree there should be a shoulder season as proposed by the FWP.
Chad Smith	Kalispell	MT	Agree	Why not transplant these Elk to region one public lands to feed the wolves.
Charlene karger	Belgrade	MT	Agree	This is a great way to help reduce the numbers, now those landowners paired with people in the area would help us to secure private land hunting. Maybe get a list of people interested and sort by city and mile range from landowners, then do a drawing where the owners who agreed could contact hunters and that would be win win for everyone
Charles Miller	Hamilton	MT	Agree	Preference should go to those hunters with ages over 65, veterans, disabled, youth and length of residence in state of Montana
charles murtagh	bozeman	MT	Disagree	Too hard on the elk, too hard on young elk, the objective numbers are misleading, more privatizing of our elk, the whole project should be abandoned.
Charles Ondov	Missoula	MT	Agree	I am very much in favor of your project on private land. However, public land should not be included in the project. I would not want to arrive at my elk hunting spot on opening day only to find that all the elk have already been chased out of the area. Please keep the project on private land only!
Charles Palmer	Missoula	MT	Agree	I fully and completely agree with the proposed Shoulder Season project. This is a win/win. Ranchers have a way to mitigate some of the damage caused by these herds, and hunters have an opportunity to fill a tag that might otherwise go unfilled. I have a 12 year old, first year hunter, and this would also be a great way for him to potentially get an elk. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
charlie m brown	belgrade	MT	Agree	this is a great proposal that is proactive in dealing with the overpopulation of elk.
Cheryl McGee	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	I believe that if the land that is proposed for the shoulder season isn't open to the general public to hunt then the land owner shouldn't be awarded a prize or special hand picked season for culling the herd. Open their land to the general public not only to outfitters and guides if they want help controlling their herds. If they are opening their land for trophy bulls only to the outfitters that doesn't help with controlling the herd. I would hope we all know it only takes one bull to breed but we have to have a cow elk for a baby. Close the season for bulls and open your land for cows only for a few years and the numbers will tell you that is how nature works. Too much of our montana private land has been closed off to the general public and I believe we need to open it again to all of us that would like to hunt there. Animals aren't stupid, they are going to move where ever they feel safe and yes that is where no hunters or at least only a few hunters are allowed. I BELIEVE THERE SHOULDN'T BE A SHOULDER HUNT IF THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS BEING LOCKED OUT OF THESE AREAS DURING THE GENERAL SEASON....

## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Chris Casey	McAllister	MT	Agree	While these changes will not affect me, I can support the depts. Decision to seek lower population numbers. However to make the important public lands off limits is unfair to hunters who don't have a ranch. It seems this is just to satisfy private land owners. I say if they want the benefits of a balanced herd bought and paid for by taxpayer \$, then some of that land should be open to those paying.
Chris Eric Paulson	Gallatin Gateway	MT	Disagree	This is a bad idea based on bad and innaccurate science to favor Montana's cattle industry. How about no cattle on public land and then let's see if we have an elk problem!
Christian	Great falls	MT	Undecided	The real issue is, not having access to state and federal land within private land. Landowners get to use state and federal land to graze their cattle for free and keep the elk herds on private land to outfit. In 2014 I personally witnessed the Hughes ranch drive a herd of elk off national forests land back toward his land, and again this season they drove the roads between national forest and private to keep the herd on his land. Land owners get paid for land deprivation but use free land and deny access to state and federal land. It's bullshit and should be illegal, if the animals are damaging their property and eating their crops and they won't even allow access to state and federal land within their land then fuck'em.
Chuck Obler	Marshall	MN	Undecided	I think it should only be on private lands and only cows should be harvested.
Clay White	Helena	MT	Disagree	This project does not address the fact that elk are often concentrated on private land because the landowner has leased hunting rights on their property. These shoulder seasons only make such leasing a more profitable decision as the public is then bailing out the landowner's additional costs for having elk on their property. Crop and property damage from increased elk populations should be considered a business expense for their decision to make money from hunting on their property, and landowners should bear those costs like any other business. I assume elk population targets were set using winter crop damage as one of the decision criteria - perhaps that process should be revised in light of the current outfitter-leasing/no hunting environment that exists in many of these problem areas.
cliff	leonard	MT	Agree	If you want to get this harvest, then issue an unlimited supply of cow tags. The way you propose to do it has proven it does not work. You have heard the old saying that 10% of the hunters kill 90% of the elk. Give it a try, you may find out it will work. Again what you have done in the past is not working. Get on board and use public comment for a change.
clint	cascade	MT	Disagree	I don't think we should have one because most land owners don't have a low hunting
cody finch	kalispell	MT	Disagree	just another failed attempt dads fathers and uncles will fill 90%of the tags. the problem is the private hunting issues that need addressing
Craig McCarthy	Butte	MT	Undecided	If I understand correctly the land owners decide who receives the tags on the land owners property, is that correct? If so we are allowing land owners to control our (Montana residents) resources (ELK) our elk populations are in question as it is and to allow land owners to have that control isn't in the best interest of elk and the people of Montana. Please think this through before making a questionable decision that will effect elk populations for many years to come. Thanks.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Curtis Lord	LAUREL	MT	Undecided	I just spent 3 days hunting in this area and witnessed hundreds of elk on the private property. Ranch hands hunted and shot a few but had no luck pushing the elk to public land. As it is outfitted, the general public is not allowed to hunt to disperse the herds. The outfitters don't seem to hunt it because their high dollar clients don't want to shoot anything but large bulls. I appreciate the fact you are trying to do something but I feel if you go to an antler less only season where the elk numbers are out of hand that maybe it would discourage the outfitters and the general public would be able to get access to take care of the problem. It seems to me that Outfitters are tying up the majority of these surrounding properties and not doing anything except shooting 1 or 2 Bulls. Is anyone with an elk tag suppose to be able to participate in this or is it only B tag holders? And it seems like any land with elk on it should be available to hunt or the elk will just go sit on the forest or WMA where they are safe like they do now on the private. I want to thank all of you for what you do to manage wildlife and try to keep public hunting equally available to all.
Dacia English	Helena	MT	Disagree	I am very strongly opposed to the proposed Elk late season shoulder season. I have read the Final Elk Season Guidelines (10/08/2015) and believe I can generally agree with the intent; however, the implementation of the shoulder season (as it currently exists) is corrupt and wrong. I think we all can agree that one of the biggest issues is very large groups of elk concentrated on private lands that generally do not allow open public hunting. The elk continue to learn that these areas are safe havens and mass migrate to the private lands. The wildlife of Montana is owned by the people of Montana and allowing the shoulder season on private ground continues to rewards those individuals who profit and benefit from a public asset without compensation to the citizens of Montana. If the ground is not open to general elk harvest during the regular season in a way that applies sufficient pressure to redistribute elk herds, then a shoulder season should NOT be allowed. Isn't it interesting how just few wealthy landowners can dictate that an entire program be constructed wasting sportsman's funds and management resources? Want to solve the issue? Re-district those lands where the elk are concentrating to antlerless elk only (for all) and watch the problem solve its self.
Dale Longfellow	Hobson	MT	Disagree	Just not needed in our area of the State. Little Belts Mtns
Damon Songer	East Helena	MT	Disagree	I disagree with adding another category of hunting to the Hunt Roster. Beyond the regular seasons, there are currently four types of hunts (Game Damage, Management Season, Supplemental Game Damage Hunts, and Elk Management Removals) available for private land owners to 'manage' who hunts on their property. There is no need for an additional category. I clearly understand the need to manage the over population of elk; however, many private land owners—of which most, or much of the land within the districts in this proposal consists of—don't allow hunting on their property during the open season. Furthermore, they often don't take steps to push the elk herds from their land. These programs have allowed the private land owners the opportunity to be extremely selective of who hunts on their property and to conduct crop and property damage management at taxpayers' expense. And now a new category is being proposed that is, more or less, similar to the others? It's unnecessary. If the private landowners aren't happy with the crop and property damage received by wildlife than they need to take steps year-round to resolve these problems, not continue asking the FWP for help during the non-regular season. Provide access to hunters, through the block management program and the current Hunt Roster programs instead of adding new programs.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Dan Rader	White Sulphur Springs	MT	Disagree	Just like I figured observing what has been going on locally with the land owners and outfitters. Right next to me the land owner opened a small portion of treeless flat land for BMA hunting undoubtedly expecting the public to shoot cow elk off his property after the season. Meanwhile 300 head lived under his pivot for the entirety of bow season and the first week of rifle season (this was to allow the outfitter to cherry pick the big bulls), you can't say he really wants rid of the elk while he is collecting a fat outfitter check. At the other end of the valley I understand the people allowed to (or picked, LMAO) to participate in that damage hunt were all close family friends. Sure wouldn't want Joe Public to collect a big bull..... So NO, season is in place addiquate to controle the elk population, the land owners have to deside whether the elk are paying for the damage or not. I ask the FWP to grow a set and stand up to the board of outfitters and the Stock Growers Assn. Sincerly, Dan Rader
Dan Wildin	Billings	MT	Disagree	Are the Wilks brothers participating in the Shoulder season or is FWP pampering the Elite as is the BLM. this is the largest Elk herd in Montana and were suppose to be a public resource but are now harbored in the Kingdom of the Fracking brothers. Gee lets not make them mad!
Dana Rauser	Townsend	MT	Agree	In the early 80's we had similar elk issue in area 390. They had the late hunts and it did reduce numbers. They still come but it is normally later and they don't stay for to long. I feel for a couple years would be very good idea beings most of theses elk come and stay on private land where you can't get to them. Then when they do get to where you can get them,this is when the " big shootouts or massacres" come. I've seen this time after time but that is usually when big numbers go down but not like they should. I also support an either sex area for 391 & 392 after the shoulder program in a couple years. A lot of folks like my family are more than willing to take a cow. FWP has done a terrific job of keeping elk herds up in numbers but there are simply to many elk in certain areas. Thank you and hope this thing goes.
daniel c moody	Hot Springs	MT	Disagree	I think it will be like some other programs . " Only the family's , friends , and , folks with Money , will get to hunt on these places. " Why don't these land owners let us hunt on there place "in season ."
Darrin Ackerman	Manhattan	MT	Agree	I think this is not only going to help control Elk populations, it is also going to give more hunters the opportunity to get a Elk. How will hunters be picked for hunts?
Dave Bisch	Anaconda	MT	Disagree	I don't think landowners should be issued a special permit before the public license holder.
Dave Cole	Helena	MT	Agree	I have been a sportsman representative on Devil's Kitchen Working Group since it started in 1989. We have tried a variety of season types working in cooperation with private land owners in an effort to achieve an acceptable elk population. The landowners have provided excellent access for public hunters but it has still been difficult to control elk numbers. This is open country with limited hiding cover so just dumping a lot of hunters in the area is not the answer; we have learned that too much pressure just drives the elk to other areas where they cannot be hunted. We have good access for bulls and cows for the public in the majority of the landownership in HD 445. With the collaboration of the Devil's Kitchen group and FWP management of the neighboring Beartooth Wildlife Management Area, we believe that the "shoulder season" concept could give us the flexibility we need to develop a workable hunting season cooperatively between private landowners and sportsmen. The shoulder season would give us a longer hunting season to spread out the hunting pressure to try to reach our population goals.
Dave Gellner	Billings	MT	Disagree	An early shoulder season would devastate the archery season.... Bye Bye Montana as an archery destination for anyone.. Be smart!

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
David Girardot	Kalispell	MT	Agree	Having a drawing for the late season hunts would be a great idea. We used to go hunt the late season in Ennis. It is very hard to be able to do the depredation hunts with the short notice. We used to love having a late season hunt scheduled so we could have a last chance at an elk for the freezer. We are meat hunters and the good success for the late season hunts is awesome. Please do these again.
david kauffman	ronan	MT	Disagree/ Undecided	the more thought I give to the concept of hunting elk on aug. 15--the more I am reminded that in 1973 the comisson shut down the sept. bugling season for rifle hunters for two specific reason. 1.the spoilage of meat and 2. that it was disrupting the breeding. bow hunting was to be allowed, but their were fewer than 250 licensed bow hunters statewide. fast forward to 2015 and we are now hunting elk from sept. 1st to the end of November. the current proposal tostart on aug.15th is absurd--how many current fwp wm[loyes and commisioners have ever filled their nostrils with the putrid stench of rotting elk flesh ? the whole notion of a shoulder smells of a thinly veiled ruse to sell more licenses. the north American wildlife model has already cut out blue collar Montanans. no to the so called shoulder season. by-the-way who is the idiot that applied the term---shoulder---to an elk season?  in reading thru posted material---it is not clear how hunters will be selected to participate or what it will cost the hunter to participate
David Prindle	Kalispell	MT	Agree	How will one know when tags are available, or when to apply for them?
David Shimek	Billings	MT	Disagree	Shoulder seasons should not be open to any outfitting. All tags should be given through random draw. No shoulder seasons should be allowed on public land, including State land, BLM, and Forest Service. All elk population objectives should be current and up to date. I have never heard hunters say there are too many elk. Also, if a private landowner doesn't allow public hunting they should not be able to be included in the shoulder season hunts.
Deborah Ries	CONRAD	MT	Agree	I support the season
Dennis Elliot	Billings	MT	Agree	In theory I agree to the shoulder season, but with some clarification needed. I do have some concerns about how the tags will be distributed. The information blasts sent out by FWP do well in describing every aspect of the shoulder season projects, but gives no mention of HOW the tags will be purchased, distributed, or divied out. So, you use your general tag, great, how would a guy get on the 50 hunter roster? Seems like an open opportunity for nepotisim... Also, I do NOT agree with opening rifle season during the rut, we are not Wyoming. In my opinion, no shoulder season should open before the general season because you'll be backing into bird season, archery, antelope, and whatever else you kill before the snow flies. I love MT and the wildlife it holds, and even some of the people. ;) I appreciate that FWP is trying to manage the animal populations to some extent, but lets not turn MT into some piece of shit eastern state with 15 hunting seasons that all last 5 days long, each for a different weapon. I know, its a slippery slope argument meant in jest, but still: NOT HERE! Thanks for trying to get the average hunter some access. Now, can you do anything about elk hazing on donahoe (picket pin-520) and Lyons (575-560) ranch's? That's the stuff that just crushes the average hunter...get to the right spot, on the right morning...oh here they come...nevermind, jerk on horseback blowing bugles in middle of November along fencelines...or planes swooping in on herds; pure BS!. Sorry for the rant. Next time I'll complain through the appropriate channels, but it usually 'a little late' by then.

## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Dennis Sutherland	Corvallis	MT	Agree	Ranchers work very hard to maintain and manage there land. When elk move in they destroy alot of places they travel and sometimes it is very costly. I think if the elk are managed and the FW&P is provided the tools to do this, it is a win win situation.
Derek Ward	Billings	MT	Agree	Curious when this would take affect and would it be an additional tag to obtain an elk in the extended season. Also would you have to get landowner permission or will there be designated areas put out before the season
Derrick Olheiser	Clancy	MT	Agree	I have read through all of the information on the Shoulder season. I feel that starting with a pilot program is a good way to start. I would assume that the reporting requirements will be better outlined before the season starts. I also was wondering if the private lands that can be used will be defined or if we would use the general season rules?
Dewey Wolff	Billings	MT	Disagree	Hunting now for 25 years. I've seen and first hand encountered private land owners trying to charge people to hunt wild game on their land. As a archery hunter I've encountered private land owners hazing elk from public land to their land weeks before rifle season starts. Nothing has ever been done to fix this problem. In areas that hold a lot of elk on private land, the land owners believe that this game is theirs and for a price public can hunt them. Outfitters that lease the private will also let people hunt for a price. I'm a meat hunter and will not pay to hunt on private when land owners are getting tax free money by charging hunters to harvest wild game and then receive damage money from the fwp cause of the wild life is eating their crops and damaging fences. As an archery hunter this will mess everything up for us. What's wrong with the damage hunts that were put into place ? Private land owners will use this to benefit themselves or buddies.
Diane Brozovich	Townsend	MT	Disagree	Strongly disagree - land owners and residents of these areas are sick to death of the hunters, the endless string of trucks driving around and trash and debris they leave behind... This is NOT a good idea
Dick Shockley	Gallatin Gateway	MT	Disagree	Reportedly there are several landowners in Region 3 who are adamantly opposed to the Shoulder Season Pilot Project to the extent of intent to close public hunting and to withdraw from BMA program public hunting. From the outset, this project seems to be managment tool available to implement even prior to the legislation. Now it seems that FWP is going overboard to try to follow the "wants" of the legislature and a few parties. I am fearful that it will actually set back hunter / landowner relations and do little for positive elk management process. Reduce the pilot project significantly or delay implementation completely until thoroughly vetted and analyzed. Thank-you.
Dirk Niebaum	Kalispell	MT	Agree	Hunting is a good way to manage the elk numbers in areas that are over populated with elk. it allows more opportunity for responsible hunters to have success
Don Henson	Bozeman	MT	Agree	I believe the shoulder season should be earlier, when the rut is on. Easier to find the elk. I don't like the late seasons as the cold and snow puts too much stress on the elk. I believe this leads to more winter kill.
Don Nelson	Columbus	MT	Agree	Should help all concerned,Elk Ranchers and Farmers,and Hunters.If We All Do Our Part.
Dorian Culver	Blue Springs	MO	Agree	If this season is going to give more free access to private land I think that is great. I have always thought it was a joke how elk that spend the rest of the year on public land can go onto private land for sanctuary only to have the ranchers get reparation money for the hay the eat. Seems like double dipping to me. I hunted the Big Creek drainage this year near Pray. The hunting was pretty poor and I think it was largely due to a pack of wolves that had moved into the valley. These animals are a scourge on the entire Yellowstone area and need to be dealt with.

### Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Doug Engelhardt	Great Falls	MT	Agree	I'm really for future seasons (or even this one) that areas 421,422 and 423 can be included. I used to hunt in 423 before they went away (the permits) and it was a very successful thing for both our group (4 of us) and the landowner. Thanks.
Douglas Jones	Glasgow	MT	Agree	I think that these seasons would be helpful to the local landowners. I would like to see that the tags went to resident hunters rather than non-resident hunters. This should not be seen as an opportunity to make extra income, but rather to get the populations under control. If approached this way, I would not hesitate to support such seasons.
Douglas Merchant	Trout Creek	MT	Agree	I would love to see some preference to seniors for this project. It gets harder as we age to get to where the elk are. Many of us don't have many years left to hunt.
Drew Steinberger	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	Elk herds should be managed in the current established seasons. The problem isn't the amount of time sportsmen and sportswomen have to hunt. I feel FWP should look further into the underlying issues and build a plan of action that doesn't expand an already liberal season. Thank you Drew Steinberger
Duane Buchholz	Atascadero	CA	Agree	Will shoulder season tags only be offered during the draw? Will they be OTC? Will I have to have a general tag or even a limited entry tag in order to participate in getting a shoulder season tag? Are shoulder seasons always going to be pre-determined, or will some become available as situations change?
Duane hovelson	Hawley	MN	Agree	I think it would be great if non residents are include in these hunts
Dustin Ramoie	East Helena	MT	Disagree	I am opposed to the shoulder season concept and this pilot project. I have submitted comments to this effect but would like to add an additional comment that has evolved from recent new information as of 11/6/15. The vast majority of landowners in districts 391/392 will NOT allow public access for these hunts and do not wish to participate. These are ranches that currently allow some form of public access whether it be Block Management or privately granted access. It has been stated that if the shoulder seasons are approved in these areas that the landowners will stop allowing public access and some will remove themselves from the Block Management program. The Sportsmen are facing the permanent loss of 40 to 50 thousand acres of access. Please do not approve the shoulder season pilot project in districts 391/392, or preferably in any of the districts. It will only lead to a worsened state of landowner, FWP, and sportsmen relations. It is unfortunate that landowners and politicians are now the new game managers of the State of Montana. The decision to slaughter the citizens elk herds is not a biological one, but one being made politically. And for what gain? The flawed Elk management Plan with it's low objective numbers, is based on social tolerance by landowners. And now landowners that refuse access to the general public during hunting season have found a way to become the pseudo wildlife managers by dangling late season access for wintering elk herds to the average billy bob truck hunters looking for easy hayfield elk they can shoot from their truck window. The entire proposal is based on flawed science. The Elk Management Plan sets objectives artificially low and not at biological carrying capacity, there are NOT too many elk on the landscape, if landowners do not wish to have elk on their property they are more than welcome to fence their lands or allow public hunting at a larger scale to distribute elk herds. Stop slaughtering our elk herds!
Dustin Robertson	Fort Benton	MT	Agree	I cant hardly believe that those private land owners that let know one hunt unless they are paid or are outfitters are gonna allow access to the public without some means to profit from this shoulder season. Make a believer out of me fwp who really owns the heard out of state outfitters or the private sector.



## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Dwight Lamm	Bigfork	MT	Agree	I really appreciated the opportunity to participate in late shoulder season hunts in the past. Thank-you to the landowners who are considering this possibility again.
EasyPeas	Helena	MT	Agree	This is awesome, great work FWP! Finally making ground!
Ed Dustrude	Great Falls	MT	Undecided	I'm curious if there will be landowners names as well as phone numbers to contact or FWP website for this information. Where there be a preference with seniors, youth or myself who is a disabled vet from the armed services.
eric sutherland	columbia falls	MT	Agree	I support the elk shoulder season project. The name seems weird though.
Erik Resel	Belgrade	MT	Agree	Shoulder seasons will be a beneficial program provided early shoulder seasons are limited to archery only so as not to disrupt the ability of archerys during the regular archery season to harvest elk. I agree that greater cooperation between the state, landowners and hunters must take place to effectively manage elk populations in the state. Overall, a good idea so long as it is managed closely and increased efforts for land access are pursued.
Ernest M Ratzburg	Polson	MT	Agree	Although I don't live very close to the areas I think it is a very equitable solution to over populated areas of elk. I think the regulations and or restrictions you are proposing are excellent
Floyd W. Campbell	Troy	MT	Undecided	How will the early shoulder season affect archery hunting? It would not be safe to have rifle hunters and archery hunters in the same area at the same time.
Fred Jakubowski	Townsend	MT	Disagree	Do not agree with early season hunting with rifles during the archery only season. Do not believe we should be hunting elk for potentially 6 months of the year. Do not believe landowners will tolerate or allow additional access from an unlimited number of hunters. Most have a hard time dealing with hunters during the general season. Believe FWP will be creating chaos to an already chaotic (shoot outs) situations. Believe FWP will get negative feedback from selling unlimited licenses with very limited opportunity. Additional enforcement time will be required to respond to issues/conflicts/illegal activities as well as other FWP staff that is already overworked. Shoulder seasons on top of liberalized seasons will add to more congestion on areas a hunter can actually get access to. Need to maintain a quality hunt situation. FWP is bending over backwards for a few landowners that are vocal. Typically these landowners have created the high elk numbers where general hunting is not allowed, outfitted or very limited. Access, access, access.....
galen Haslid	Glendive	MT	Agree	Would be awesome I would definitely take part in
Garold Lazarowski	Conden	MT	Disagree	Late season hunts OK. No tags to landowners. The game belongs to us all. You keep expanding the hunting season, stop it.
Gary MacDonell	Corvallis	MT	Agree	If done equitably, not like the depredation hunt where the numbers never change (my experience anyway). Three years in a row, my numbers did not change for deer and Elk.
Gary Russell	Helena	MT	Agree	I strongly agree to this situation. I've hunted in district 392 for several years. I've seen a very strong growth trend of elk in that area. A lot on private land. The elk herds on private land seem to be moving off of them to find food. They are going down further to the lake to find food. In the past you did'nt see that many elk down low like that only in the winter months. When they are that low and go onto public hunting grounds that is when they get surrounded by hunters. As hunters we go were the animal go.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Gary T. Haas	Florence	MT	Agree	<p>I agree with the proposed late shoulder season. I will disagree with any early shoulder season, for the following reasons. I am a Taxidermist and a Wildlife Biologist. Putting both of those professions together, I am seeing quite an impact by bow hunters on the mature bull population. I see many large mature bulls being harvested during the bow season and smaller immature sub-adult bulls being harvested during the rifle season. I have seen a trend that lasts for 1-3 years after seeing a high numbers of mature bulls harvested during the bow season. I feel that this trend will be exacerbated by having an early rifle season. Hunters will have the advantage of hunting mature bulls during the rut when bulls are most vulnerable. I have scene fewer mature bulls harvested and more immature bulls harvested during the rifle season. Harvesting to many mature bulls during the bow season, and now possibly during an early rifle season, I feel this WILL leave fewer mature bull and more immature or inferior bulls to do all the breeding. If to many mature bulls are harvested, many cows will NOT be bred, if an early rifle season is implemented. These cows may have to cycle again or again until another mature, immature or even an inferior bull wanders into their breeding area. If these cows are bred to late in the fall, their calves will be born later and smaller and may not have enough time to grow to survive their first winter. I believe that if there is to be any shoulder season, it should occur after the general season, when most of the elk have come down to their wintering areas. They are herded up, there is snow on the ground to track them and quotas can be met more easily. Animals can be selectively removed to reach these management quotes! This is my opinion, and I am using my degrees acquired during my studies at the University of Montana in the Wildlife Biology Program.</p>
gayla skaw	hall	MT	Agree	<p>I am a ranching land owner of approximately 5 sections of elk habitat/cow pasture in hunting district 210. I am also an avid big game hunter. We do allow hunting on our ranch, particularly for cow tag hunters. We have said for years that we do not need more cow tag hunters. What we need is more time for the cow tag hunters to hunt. We have just completed taking part as landowners and as a hunter, in a 210 damage hunt which was very successful from the harvest standpoint. Thank you to the FWP powers that be for allowing the landowners to be completely in charge of the "who and when" part of this damage hunt. We were able to allow access to hunters with the reputation of being able to get the job done at a per hunter per day rate that helped their chances of success. This is the same way the shoulder seasons need to be run. I was not able to determine from reading the info describing the shoulder seasons, whether cow tag holders will be able hunt from the beginning of the shoulder season, thru the general season and on through the end of the shoulder season, but in my opinion, this is the way it should work. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my opinion. -- Upon re-reading this, I did not realize that my comments were supposed to be for a LATE shoulder season. What's up with that ? I definitely think that the late part of the season should not run more than a couple of weeks into Dec. One reason being that very few people have enough ambition to buck miserable weather. Another being the later it gets, the heavier the cows are with calf, the harder it is on the whole herd to struggle with hunter harassment on top of struggling for feed. The additional time for cow tag harvest should trend toward the front of the season rather than later.</p>

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Agree, Disagree or Undecided</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Geoffrey Solberg	Bozeman	MT	Disagree	I have lived and hunted in the 449 and 452 areas my entire life (46 years) and I would love someone to show me that elk numbers are up in those areas. As a hunter, the numbers seem to be at their all time low. This is due to the fact that more out of state land owners are locking their gates during the general season and outfitting or preserving it for them. Why in the world would I want to help a land owners that locks their gates during the general season? This shoulder season idea will flop because of this. Start be showing me that the numbers are indeed up and then show me the landowners willing to participate and you might swing me over. Until then, stop the either sex general season and get the numbers back up to where they were.
Glenn Jackson	Clancy	MT	Agree	If shoulder seasons give opportunity for the general public hunters to access private land to help reduce elk numbers then I feel it would be good, however, if this is just for landowners to additional permits to make more money then I am against it.
Gordon Sazama	Livingston	MT	Agree	The looks to laid out pretty well. Hope that is implemented correctly.
grant ostby	Cut bank	MT	Disagree	It seems to me like some the landowners are gaining more control over the elk population all the time. Elk populations aren't hard to control if you can gain access to hunt them. The problem is elk are pretty smart they find the pockets of land private or public that people can't get to. The general bow and rifle season is plenty enough time to harvest elk if hunters Have access to them. My concern is that many landowners would use there property for hunting large Bulls during the conventional seasons and then rely on the shoulder seasons to control the populations. I don't believe that any private property that isn't open to the public in the General seasons for all elk should have any specials seasons to control elk populations. I have the upmost respect private property however the wildlife isn't private. I say leave the seasons alone and let the chips fall where they may. I'm tired of asking landowners for permission to hunt and getting the only if you have a cow tag answer. The shoulder season is the first step in them getting to say come back in January if you have a cow tag! We need to draw a firm line if private property owners want to close up there land in hunting seeason for whatever reason that's fine with me but no special help for wildlife damages. If the elk eat all there hay and wreck there fences to bad. Maybe after a few years of feeding elk all winter some landowners would allow responsible hunters access like the old days .
Greg Avis	Palo Alto	CA	Disagree	As a longtime landowner in Clyde Park, I vehemently oppose the proposed shoulder season. The rationale for the hunt is that the elk population is too large. The FWP, which claims that this assessment is based on "science," has no justifiable evidence or rationale for its claims. Last year, FWP authorized a "damage hunt" in our neighborhood which resulted in the massacre of over 120 elk. This, combined with heavy hunting pressure during the 2014 rifle and archery seasons and FWP's refusal to corral rampant wolf poaching, has resulted in elk numbers going down dramatically. I
greg knetge	bozeman	MT	Agree	It sounds like it is worth a try.
Guy Edwards	Cedar Park	TX	Disagree	It will aid the FWP in the reduction process since it multiplies the number of harvesters by many more times the employee number of the FWP...

## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Harold Johns	Butte	MT	Disagree	This "late season" was proposed and promoted by legislators and those requesting an opportunity to sell Montana's wildlife. These have not worked in the past for a number of reasons that have been submitted hundreds of times. FWP has not paid any attention to thousands of comment submitted and will not pay any attention to these comments. This disastrous effort is being promoted by greedy politicians, outfitters and some landowners. Because of the greedy politicians FWP officials do not have the backbone to stand up for Montanans. Montana citizens are the only ones who can solve this problem. They are going to have to stop voting for politicians who have absolutely no concern for the average Montanan.
Herbert d zimmer	anaconda	MT	Undecided	Is this not the same as a game damage hunt? Except for the land owners does not get 25% of the tags to hand to whoever they want.
herbert ken mcfadden	whitefish	MT	Agree	strongly agree and would like to see it expanded to other areas (off the top of my head i was just hunting the blacktail by Dillon where a couple thousand elk hang out on a single private ranch for all of gun season.) STRONG WORK.
Hermes Lynn	Helena	MT	Undecided	I do not agree with the early rifle season which would conflict with archery season. The late season meat harvest on private land sounds effective as long as you can get access. For should put their efforts into obtaining more public land which is the real problem. The easiest way to do that is legalize corner crossing.
Jack D. Jones	Butte	MT	Disagree	I am 100% opposed to this season. The season is designed for landowner outfitters and those that close access to public lands many have state land leases for our public land. This season is no good for the average hunter. FWP should restore antlerless permits for seniors during the regular rifle season and disabled hunting from vehicle. FWP should issue permits and more hunting of antlerless elk during the regular hunting season and not appove this shoulder season. You could call it "FWP kick in the hind end for Montana hunters season". It's a stupid idea and should nort see the light of day. The landowner outfitters want the bulls as well. All for landowners and landower outfitters. Jack D. Jones
Jacob Bausch	Laurel	MT	Disagree	I am an avid hunter who promotes nearly everything hunting related. The issue here is that the big ranches should not be able to close down hunting on their property to guide the property and make money off the elk, then complain about the elk after season. I like the idea of helping the public fill their freezers, so long as the ranch allows hunting during season. If a ranch outfits the property I'm absolutely opposed. If the ranch allows hunting during general season to public then I'm in favor. I don't like the rich getting richer so to speak. If the ranches don't allow hunting to public they should not be eligible for and assistance of any kind or any damage hunts for elk eating the feed or ruining fences. Let the elk numbers get so big on the ranches that it forces them to either allow hunting or move elk to places which the average Joe can get access to.
Jacob Gleason	Helena	MT	Disagree	I feel that the FWP should increase the number of cow tags available during archery season and general rifle season in the area of concern. This method I feel will give the FWP a better control of the elk population.
James Olson	Helena	MT	Disagree	Unless these private land owners let people on during normal hunting season I do not believe this should happen. Why help them out before/after if they don't open it up during regular bow/rifle season?
Jared	Butte	MT	Undecided	It's okay if it's late season, but early season will not be fair for archery hunters. Stick with late season and game damage hunts please.
Jason	Martinsdale	MT	Agree	I think it's a good idea. Most ranch/farms in the area have an access of elk and need to thin the herds down.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Jason	Whitehall	MT	Undecided	I have property in the Devils Kitchen area and I am very aware of the elk herds as I watch them on private lands all hunting season. I have mixed feelings on the SHOULDER SEASON. If the private ranches are not allowing hunting, or allow cows only or lease the land to outfitters I have no problem with the elk blowing through the fences and eating the crops. The elk belong to the people of Montana not the ranches they graze. Everyone should have a chance to harvest a bull not just limited to cows. Most hunters get 2 tags, general and permit for cows. Why not let the hunter shoot a bull and a cow?? Large ranches and outfitters are the cause of the over population if they do not allow hunting how can an elk be harvested. The choice cannot be up to the landowner on what can and can't be shot... no one wants to manage the heard so some rancher or outfitter can get rich off the horns.. This needs to be equal harvest a cow and a bull.
Jason Gergen	Miles City	MT	Disagree	I am an avid archery hunter in the Missouri River Breaks district 410 area and have been for 18 years. I have harvested a number of elk in this district, through years of patterning elk, learning their behavior, hard work and dedication. Placing a shoulder hunt before or during archery season severely decreases any opportunity for archery hunters to hunt that area successfully and safely. It's difficult enough to harvest an elk with a bow & introducing rifles during archery season will make it even more difficult. Archery hunters in this district already face game damage hunts before the archery season; this alone upsets the dynamic of elk behavior. If elk numbers are over-populated, then allow more permits for general archery season and rifle season. If there is a vote on this shoulder hunt, it needs to be AFTER the archery season.
Jason Tabbert	Helena	MT	Agree	This sounds like a good plan. I think we should give it a try.
Jeb Bridges	Phenix City	AL	Disagree	We bowhunt in district 446 every year. Its not fair to allow a longer season for rifle hunters to kill elk for that long. Irreparable damage could be done to the herd. Let the season stay the same- I am sure rifle hunters can kill plenty of elk during the regular season.
Jeff	Valier	MT	Disagree	I think extending the season is ridiculous. I have found that it's not hunters can't get the elk. It's that hunters can't get to the elk. Landowners for one reason or another have been greedy with land access. Take the Rocky Mountain Front for example. Many of the landowners there say " No Hunting" to most but yet somehow game is still being taken from their property. I think that it's unfair that if you don't have a rancher buddy, you're stuck with public, over hunted land. I also would like to know where these " high quota" areas are. They don't seem to be highly publicized so hunters can plan ahead. I think you tell hunters where the elk are and landowners let us hunt, there should be absolutely no reason for a "shoulder season".

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Jeff Brozovich G bar T Ranch area 392	Townsend	MT	Disagree	<p>After meeting with the majority of large land owners in 391 and 392 I found none of them that will comply with the proposed shoulder hunts. I am submitting signed petition to Coleen Furthmyre with their statement and signatures. for comment. Thank you.</p> <p>Many of us that live in this area (392) and have seen first hand the hazards of too many hunters pursuing elk herds using vehicles, also using vehicles to block the elk natural migration and movement know very well of the real dangers that come with this activity. Real dangers to people, livestock and personal property. Yes there needs to be some reduction of the number of elk concentrated in certain areas. But more so there needs to be management of the dangerous situations we experience over and over. If the number of hunters and the use of their vehicles are not strictly limited this shoulder season will only serve as making matters worse and in my opinion eventually people will be hurt. Please realize we are participating in the early management hunt, and the amount of man hours we are providing at no charge in an effort to help the repeating annual situations. I will hope you will consider the requests from all land owners that are live in these chaotic areas and the safety of us and our personal properties.</p>
Jeff McMaster	Helena	MT	Agree	<p>Great idea for more targeted harvest. Also a great opportunity to increase public access to private lands. Using a lottery/draw system would be great.</p>
Jeffrey Scherr	Billings	MT	Undecided	<p>My issue is that the majority of hunters are respectful and are just wanting to provide a nice family time, with the reward of getting meat for their family. We only hunt as a family and get told NO when asking for permission, that it is now to the point that we feel like giving up hunting. We always bring a gift for the landowner, leave their land as we found it, even pick up garbage. I am tired of hearing of these landowners that allow NO access then claim game damage funds. All we want is to develop a relationship with good people. That what this all is - people helping people.</p>
Jenny Balcerzak	E. Helena	MT	Disagree	<p>I am very strongly opposed to the proposed Elk late season shoulder season. The wildlife of Montana is owned by the people of Montana and allowing the shoulder season on private ground continues to rewards those individuals who profit and benefit from a public asset without compensation to the citizens of Montana. If the ground is not open to general elk harvest during the regular season in a way that applies sufficient pressure to redistribute elk herds, then a shoulder season should NOT be allowed. Isn't it interesting how just few wealthy landowners can dictate that an entire program be constructed wasting sportsman's funds and management resources? Want to solve the issue? Re-district those lands where the elk are concentrating to antlerless elk only (for all) and watch the problem solve its self. The guidelines suggest this is an alternative...let's see it happen..</p>
Jere Ziegenhagen	Eureka	MT	Agree	<p>I agree with the shoulder season if the land owner doesn't receive a huge share of the tags as was done in the Eureka area this fall. They should receive no more than 1/4 of the tags.</p>
Jerry Landa	5 Landa Road	MT	Agree	<p>Just do it and stop the BS</p>
Jerry McGuire	Thompson Falls	MT	Disagree	<p>Please prove that you have accurate population number and carrying capacity by hunting district, before a shoulder season is approved.</p>

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Jesse Scott	Helena	MT	Undecided	Thank you for all of your efforts to balance the interests of sportsman and landowners. Please do not allow any harvest of antlered elk during the shoulder seasons. Harvesting bull elk does little to reduce populations and would continue to adversely affect bull/cow ratios. Allowing harvest of bull elk would also promote commercial interests, and not the interests of most sportsman. Also, it may be reasonable simply to extend the season for elk b license holders in units that are over "objective". Wyoming has a similar system for their cow/calf elk licenses which allows hunting until January. Please uphold the proposal to NOT allow harvest off of private property during any potential early season. Please allow for evaluation of the "objectives" via science/biology and not strictly by the loud input by select landowners. Please uphold the idea of not rewarding landowners that "harbor" during the general season. Please consider restricting landowners from application via landowner preference for antlered elk limited permits if they do not allow public hunting. It also might be nice for landowners to be guaranteed their own antlerless elk licenses if they allow public hunting on their property. Thank you again,
Jestina M Eriksen	Helena	MT	Agree	Would love to be considered for this hunt.
Jim Hillman	Livingston	MT	Agree	If you don't get more private land opened up it won't help a thing
Jim Burke	Butte	MT	Disagree	Why are elk populations up in these areas? Hmmm could it be lack of hunting access on private ground? How come in the past and I'm not the only hunter who feels this but all we heard was the word no!!! And now all of a sudden the land owners are feeling the impact of all the no's they've given out!! So now it's my turn to say no! I respectfully say I will not be participating in any shoulder season not now or in the future! I have found that with hard work and many miles on my boots I can be successful! I know when I'm done I've earned it!! So I will say the word NO one more time to helping the landowners out in the mess they've made!!
Jim Foster	Columbia Falls	MT	Agree	I appreciate the FWP submitting this plan forward to the legislature. I hope the governor supports this effort. The best conservation method for over populations of cow elk is through legitimate hunting opportunities. This gives hunters a great opportunity to fill their tags when the hunting pressure is off of the animals. Thank you for proposing this.
Jim Gappa	Billings	MT	Disagree	The real issue is "Access" and the unwillingness of private landowners to allow residents (and out of state) hunters to hunt the very elk causing issues on their land. Another BIG problem is the Elk Management Plan (EMP) low "target" elk populations. It states in the in the EMP that elk that are found on private land SHOULD NOT be considered in the overall population and thus should not be considered when thinking about a population objective. In a lot of instances . . . it's the landowner that has created the problem by not allowing hunters to hunt elk or scare them off the private land. These Elk Should seasons are all based on politics. It's too bad the MT FWP cannot just manage the elk populations based on science and not politics.
jim molenda	cut bank	MT	Agree	Looks like a win for everyone.
Joelle Selk - Montana Bowhunters Association	Helena	MT	Agree	We appreciate the Department's consideration of early archery seasons in its deliberations of the pilot project and support the proposal to conduct the pilots during the late season. We look forward to learning of the progress made toward achieving target elk objective numbers through the pilot project. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Joelle Selk MBA President

## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
John Wachsmuth	Bigfork	MT	Agree	I think something had to be done based on what I hear from landowner complaints that there are too many elk, but with that said a program like this wont work if FWP issues tags to hunt elk for cows only on private land and private landowners dont allow access. More access to private lands needs to made available to where the over objective elk reside.
john babnik	lockwood	MT	Agree	I think this might be a step in a positive direction. We will see at the end of the year and I hope there will also be a comment period then thanks !
John Lewis	Dothan	AL	Disagree	If the same private landowners allowed access to their land via BMA's, everyone would have a chance at harvesting more elk DURING the season. This way only residents shooting cow elk in the middle of winter will be benefiting. How many non residents are going to be in Montana hunting elk in February? Remember a non resident tag costs 846 dollars, a resident tag costs 20. Do the math and be smart about this.
John M Roylance	Whitehall	MT	Disagree	Elk numbers are too low as it is. The number of elk established as a threshold is ridiculous considering that most elk reside primarily on public ground and even more would stay on public grounds if they were managed right. There are ten to as much as fifty times more private livestock animals on those same public grounds. Two things to consider: If the mandate of multiple use is to really be considered then there should be an allowable number of elk equal to the private livestock that use public lands with regard to elk, being that both are utilizing the same kinds of forage ( grasses). And as I stated before, more public lands that are capable of wintering elk should be set aside for that specific purpose with no domestic livestock allowed. I'm a hunter but endless hunting seasons just drives more wildlife to private lands that are not and will never be open to the public thereby further privatizing pubic wildlife.
John Robbin	Great Falls	MT	Undecided	As stated in my previous comments I am unable to agree or disagree at this time. Perhaps I will be able to do so later. I doubt that enough landowners will work with FWP to make this proposal work and the only one who do will only allow antlerless elk to be taken. A couple examples which have lead to my thinking are. A week ago a hunting partner of mind who lives in Missoula and has a late season elk tag for the North Hills approached a landowner about using the tag. He was informed that he could as long as he paid a \$300.00 trespass fee. Also a few years ago in area 211 I had a antlerless elk tag I was told of two landowners who always complained about the elk on their land. I approached each to see if I could attempt to harvest a antlerless elk. Both declined permission but as soon as the season was over they were complaining again. I just do not see how this proposal will work any better
john williams	colstrip	MT	Disagree	Too much control by landowner/outfitter s.
Jon Airhart	Plains	MT	Agree	I agree that in some areas the elk need to be managed differently than others. I am in favor of only allowing this type of control on private lands. The one thing that concerns me is how early some of the hunts could potentially go and also how late they could go. August is entirely to early to take a cow/mother away from its calf, they just are not going to survive losing their mother that early. You might as well shoot them both and save them the suffering. On the flip side running a season into February is getting into mid term pregnancy.
Jon Duchon	Bozeman	MT	Agree	I think it is a great idea and helps the livestock owners.
Jon Schroeder	Gallatin Gateway	MT	Agree	I'm not sure how successful this will be unless landowners allow hunters to access the land where ALL the elk live.
Jonathan Foote	Darby	MT	Agree	Sounds to me to be a well thought out program that should increase hunting oportunities and help land owners manage wildlife damage.



**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Jorja H Munns	Townsend	MT	Disagree	As a rancher in Area 392, I see the need to reduce the overall elk population. I have often wished there could be a late season hunt. In August we were given the opportunity to sign up for a Management hunt. I commend the local FWP authorities for coordinating with local landowners to make this management season available. New doors were opened with my neighbors who hadn't been so willing to allow hunters on their private land. Historically, the elk don't come onto our property until the general season (sporadically) and post-season (to stay). I am disappointed that this shoulder season will override our original plan of having a Management hunt. A few of the drawbacks are: - A myriad of hunters will be knocking on our door rather than us calling for hunters when needed. -Since the elk will be down on our land, where they can get landlocked, there would be more opportunity for the "massacre" type hunt that none of us want to see. Jorja H Munns Hensley & Daughters LLC -Losing the cooperation of our neighboring landowners. FWP finally has their foot in the door with the management hunt and now are going to get it slammed in their face again! If the elk population has been over objective why haven't the general tags been good for shooting cow elk in Area 392?
Joseph Donohoe	Helena	MT	Agree	Hello FWP, The proposal sounds fine. However, I believe you're missing out on a great opportunity to provide some ecological education to the public. A major cause of too many elk, if not the major cause, is lack of predators, particularly apex predators like wolves and grizzly bears. This message ought to be brought forward anytime there's discussion of overabundance of deer/elk/etc. That message would also attract those non-hunting, but still outdoor-minded, folks that FWP tries so hard to connect with. Thanks, and keep up the great work. I really appreciated the sincerity your staff had during the 15 and forward meeting I went to in Helena. Joe
Josh Schaff	Billings	MT	Undecided	I do not hunt any of the areas you have the season proposed for, but I still feel I should weigh in my feelings. The fact that you need a season outside the general season to harvest elk tells me that the majority of the elk are on private lands. You say you have some private lands that are available because of the different dates but I am not sure how much. I think the time and money would be better spent trying to improve the Fish and Game relations with some private land owners. I know quite a few land owners that are very unhappy with the Fish and Game and have shut their places down completely to hunting because of it. I had one land owner tell me if I could prove I have never given and dime to the F&G he would gladly let me hunt. The more and more places I ask the more it has gone from other hunters ruining it to now the F&G messing up out hunting rights. I think this season will cause some bad relations between archery and rifle hunters which is not what we need. We have to stand together as hunters or we are going to lose it all.
Josh Zarate	Stevensville	MT	Agree	It seems like a good idea.
Joshua Wilson	Great Falls	MT	Disagree/ Undecided	After reading the criteria on the elk shoulder season I am now very against it. Total Montana elk numbers are and will continue to go down due to the wolves and I do not like the idea of helping them go down any faster. I love to hunt elk and I would like them to be around for awhile. Why don't we open a permanent shoulder season on wolves instead? Please don't allow more elk to be killed when. The snow is deep and the temperatures are cold and they are easy targets on private land. The elk go there to survive the winter and avoid the wolves.  Bull elk absolutely should NOT be allowed to be taken during any shoulder season. It is too easy to get them in that situation and people will be hunting for trophy's not for meat; which will hurt archery hunter and general season hunters chances at a bull the following year. That is my concern.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Julie Shotnokoff	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	This is so ridiculous I don't know why they make decisions so complicated!!! If you decide to lease, outfit, or make hunters pay to be on your land and not let the general public in during the regular season NO SHOULDER SEASON OPTION!!! If the landowner let's in the general public whether it's thru BMA, written permission, or just a simple ask and hand shake then a Shoulder Season would be an option for these landowners if there was still an overpopulation of elk on their land. Greedy landowners should not be rewarded or bailed out for their decisions!!!
Justin Auch	Missoula	MT	Disagree	As an avid bow hunter I know the effects of the firearms has to elk and especially bull elk. I feel that this is a great idea to thin the herds but feel that the early season should only be with a bow. Over the last 10 years it seems there as been plenty of bow hunters and feel we could all be more successful if we had access to private land. I think by doing this and extending the firearm into February will help to meet your goals. Thanks for your time
ken keierleber	billings	MT	Agree	I believe this would be a win/win situation for the people, and land owners. it would also benefit the elk herds in them areas, making them healthier and stronger through out the tough winter months , not having to compete for food.
Ken Lacquement	Terry, Montana	MT	Undecided	could this be aimed toward the lower income at a reduced rate so they can afford to travel to these areas?
ken mcfadden	Whitefish	MT	Agree	excellent idea whose time has long come. If i can further the idea you can contact me at drkenmontana@gmail.com
ken peiffer	kalispell	MT	Disagree	hunt elk 7 months of the year.some after making it thru most of winter,and carrying a calf. let some big land owner pick who can harvest. bait the elk over a hay bale. that should help elk populations.this should be against the law. we build fences to keep elk in, we can keep them off private land.
Kenneth Vargason	Montezuma	IA	Agree	Great idea and guidelines. But does this include non-resident elk tag holders?
Kent Brown	Big Sky	MT	Disagree	it would appear on the surface that the elk management dilemma stems directly from the harboring of elk on private property. Unless you shoot the elk during the night on the neighbors' fields, shoulder seasons are not likely to accomplish anything positive, but will still cause all the negative side effects of the shoulder season. This would also appear to benefit outfitted lands in that they can continue to profitably outfit during the regular season and then use the shoulder season to get rid of the excess unwanted cows.
Keven Heinle	Fairfield	MT	Disagree	I wonder how this is going to work with Block Management areas? Will the landowners get compensated for the extra 6 weeks of hunters and how is this going to work for the patrollers? I also wonder how these hunts are going to be implemented and if all properties will be treated the same?
Kevin miller	Billings	MT	Agree	We did this around Gardiner MT it worked great but the Fed's had other plans for our elk...I am more interested in access to the elk and what we are doing with these big ranches outfitted corralling elk to stay on their property so their rich friends and customers can come out and harvest a set of horns....

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Kipp Sjostrom	Malta	MT	Disagree	<p>The proposed shoulder season will not work because it becomes too specific in stature and not specific to problem areas geographically. For instance, in Phillips County there are a FEW ranches that want elk numbers reduced and they are justified for wanting this done. If shoulder seasons are approved the hunting areas will be larger than the specific "problem" areas. Also in Phillips County there has been a large economic change in fringe elk habitat areas. New landowners along with the CMR Wildlife Refuge want more elk on the landscape. A few ranchers who are deserving of having their pastureland free from overpopulated elk should not undermine a scientific approach to elk populations. In short, there is room for more elk in this area but there needs to be a tool for a landowner to keep too many elk off his crops, pasture and hay ground. Special permit elk areas are extremely varied from western to eastern Montana. Give the local biologist the authority to make SCIENTIFIC decisions regarding ungulate populations. The population goal for Phillips County elk is at least 15 years old. At the time this area had been in a drought for a prolonged time. Adjusting or increasing elk population goals is not a failure of the local biologists or FWP managers. Environmental science should not take a second seat to politicians or committee members opinions. Winter surveys should be taken every year and game management should be proactive not reactive. One more point to consider: Only allowing damage hunts to landowners who allow public access is a form of ranching for wildlife. It is also called extortion or blackmail and is unfair to landowners who prefer to not allow public access which is their right as landowners. Montana FWP could install a better system for hunter success data also. When Mark Sullivan, who is a region 6 manager, doubts the accuracy of the harvest data for an area the size of Phillips and Valley County then there is definitely a problem. There may be a more accurate way to retrieve harvest data which would help solve some problems regarding elk populations.</p>
Kraig Van Voast	Billings	MT	Agree	Great opportunity if landowners are allowing access.
Kris Keller	Wolf Point	MT	Disagree	I've watched the elk population decline in the 12 years I've hunted the Missouri Breaks. Seems like there is more hunters then elk.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Kris Kok	Missoula	MT	Agree	I agree with trying the pilot project but am undecided on the long term applicability of a shoulder season elk hunt to achieve management objectives (and thus that is why I assume you call it a pilot project). I suggest that FWP needs to design the pilot project to minimize the occurrence of a mass of hunters herd shooting elk similar to what happened a few times during the 2014 general season. This creates considerable damage to our MT hunting heritage by both hunters and non hunters alike. I suggest that this will continue to happen during the general season as long as the cow elk permits are too liberal (as they are in 2015 general season). I suggest that in some districts like 441, having liberal cow permits (can use an A tag along with liberal B tags) actually reduces the number of cows killed as they get hammered until they end up on property where there is no access - it also creates an opportunity for the herd shootings. As far as the Pilot shoulder season - this may be another tool for FWP to use successfully if managed appropriately. However - this is treating a symptom with the cause being elk populations that spend some time (during the hunting season) or most time on private property where there is limited to no public access. I do not feel the FWP needs to expend effort to solve landowner/elk conflicts on properties that do not work with FWP and allow reasonable access. That said, I encourage FWP to work with the land owners who do allow reasonable access and have elk/landowner conflicts (and are attempting to make a living on their ranch or farm) do in large part to neighboring property owners who do not allow reasonable public access. Good luck with your Pilot - Listen to your biologists and wardens - they have a good sense of what is working and what is not. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
Kristin Lehman	Fort Benton	MT	Disagree	I do not agree that this is OK, I believe if they are over populated then landowners should have to allow general public to harvest during rifle season, even buy a tag themselves. If problem is not take care of during rifle season then it should be up to FWP or law enforcement to harvest the elk, and donate the meat. Greedy land owners should NOT have the privledge to harvest themselves!!!
Krystal Krahn	Charlo	MT	Agree	krahn
Kurt	Rapid city	SD	Agree	You need to find the most ethical hunters possible or a few poor hunters will ruin this project. Good luck.
KYLE GAUSEN	BILLINGS	MT	Agree	I believe this would be a great opportunity for hunters and the state to achieve their goals on decreasing the elk herd in problem areas.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Kyle Tschetter	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	<p>The Late Shoulder Season Pilot Project Proposal, is a proposal that heavily favors the private land owner and there guides. It is an access issue that favors the land owners, instead of the general public. Outfitters are the disease that rapidly destroy what hunting is all about. The amount of "non-taxed" dollars that stimulate there life styles is outrageous. Outfitters and the landowners shouldn't dictate how the Fish Wildlife &amp; Parks manages a population. Private land hunting/management is completely different from non-private land hunting/management. For example, the population of elk that are well educated "biologist" survey and record are mostly, if not all a private land population. Hence the reason why, warden's and biologist are seen patrolling and observing private land more than public land. A simple random sample doesn't consist of just private land. Sure a sample size of that population migrates, but every year more and more elk are staying on private land. The reasons for this are simple. Female elk (cows), are being so heavily targeted on non-private land that the population that knows how to migrate is falling drastically. Therefore, more elk are staying of private land. You cannot target a population that is fixed. This will end similar to the reintroduction of wolves. It will become a mismanaged planned that will be; corrected, re-managed, and then destroyed. I wish the Fish Wildlife and Parks would pull there heads outs P.S.- How can a Game Warden manage a population in a certain district and then hunt it? Or retire and outfit? Is this the only profession where a conflict of interest doesn't exist?</p>
Laine McNeil	Bozeman	MT	Agree	<p>The proposal seems well thought-out. Personal observation of significant elk populations in the hunting districts near Bozeman show that there is a strong tendency for them to remain isolated on private property where hunting is not allowed. In order to achieve objectives, it may be necessary for FWP biologists to circulate among landowners to explain why population reduction is necessary / beneficial for elk as a whole. There is some percent of private land owners who reserve land for exclusive hunting by themselves and a select few hunters. This creates islands of overpopulation amidst a general dearth of access. If there are methods of encouraging private landowners to permit hunting by responsible parties that have proven to be successful, it would be beneficial to take advantage of this to achieve population objectives. As a former landowner, I appreciate the concern that they may have in permitting the public to have access to their land - as such it might be very beneficial to hold public meetings addressing the hunting public and stressing proper behavior, when shoulder seasons are planned in any specific area. General relations among landowners / hunters may be obtained through a survey to help ascertain whether additional education may be of benefit. I appreciate what is being done to ensure that hunting tradition continues in Montana.</p>
Larry R Johns	Helena	MT	Agree	<p>I know the legislature rejected special consideration for senior hunters, but I think that there should be consideration for us older hunters. I have harvested my share of Bull elk in my youth. Now age has crept up on me. My mind still thinks I am 20 years old but my 73 year body says hold up old timer you are not 20 years old anymore. I am a meat hunter now and a fat cow elk is just what I want to get. I have the big bull on the wall now. I would not compete with the head hunters. It would a good thing to accommodate those of us seasoned Hunters to just get one more chance at an elk in a fashion that would match our abilities. I would like to see a special time to hunt an " easy" elk for senior hunters. I realize the younger guys have objected to this but I don't think they are considering that they too will be a senior Hunter someday. That is what I think.</p>
Leland Krugerud	Wise River	MT	Disagree	<p>I believe this is too aggressive a herd management position. We are still trying to recover from the wolf impact in the SW part of Montana. I do not believe there is an over grazing issue. This is too quick to pull the trigger on reducing herd size..</p>

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Leo Pfendler	Drummond	MT	Undecided	To try and fail is better than to not try at all. An idea I had is to allow for a special either sex tag for large landowners who allow some public hunting on their land. The tag would be legal for the months of September and October and the landowner could possibly sell that tag to an outfitter or private person in order to recover some of the costs for the elk deprivation that they incur. This could be a good perk for landowners to want to allow hunting on their property so that they have a chance to get a big bull or some type of compensation. There is no quick fix but this could be another avenue to check out.
Linda Kirkpatrick	Billings	MT	Agree	I think this will be a fantastic opportunity for people who don't have a lot of time away from work. It will give them more opportunity to fill their tags before the season ends. Also giving access to private land will help land owners from property damage or crop loss from being over populated with elk. I am looking forward to this opportunity and hope that it is put in place.
LISA OLSON	MALTA	MT	Undecided	Assuming the shoulder season would be for the harvest of antlerless elk only, maybe FWP should decrease or or not give any outfitter licenses to the private landowners who won't participate in the program. Most of the elk in 622 hold up on the Carlson place who won't allow any hunting because he is an outfitter during bow season. He is also a known poacher and has been cited a couple of times. In my opinion he shouldn't be given any tags in Montana because of his law breaking ways.
Lloyd Goldston	Libby	MT	Agree	Great Idea. Will FWP tell us the hunter were these areas are, or at least a general area. Will this hunt have both cows and Bulls?
Luis M. Valdez	Hamilton	MT	Agree	I hope it is fair by having a lottery or another system that does not favor only a few hunters. Some states have an Advanced Hunter system for assisting with wildlife control, where the person takes a written test, shooting test, and assists with a wildlife project, then becomes a certified Advanced Hunter and is then eligible to participate in these additional hunting opportunities.
luke donaldson	missoula	MT	Agree	why not use the block management program with it
Lynn Carey	Seeley Lake	MT	Agree	As long as you can get the ranchers to open up to let hunters in.
Marlon Shortman	Vaughn	MT	Agree	This has the potential to work for hunters, if permits are Not issued to landowners for their own personal distribution or use. We still need access to the public state lands, corner jumping or as South Dakota does easement on section lines. Or start hunting season later and extend into December.
Martin Gutierrez	WHITEFISH	MT	Undecided	How will hunters be chosen for these hunts?
marvin mace	5117 bluebell road	MT	Undecided	I have lost my trust with fwp , I have been a resident for 62 years, I have seen a serious decline in opportunities, hunting is starting to become a rich mans sport, I warned the commission about this years ago, if I was a betting man , I would have to say we are going to see only people with deep pockets are going to hunt bulls, mostly non residents very few residents we will see, I'm for a shoulder season if is fair for everyone, I just don't like the idea that 5 good ol boys on the commission can make decisions for sportsman regardless of the majority of the public comment period. to much politics, I feel sorry for the up coming hunters in this state. we don,t have a hunting heritage any more the trust is gone all you see is dollar signs.the re are other ways and I don't think you thought this one thru enough.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Matt Kemp	Helena	MT	Agree	I feel this could be an effective tool to help manage over populated areas. I hope this isn't another opportunity for FWP to collect more money from the average hunter by selling a special 'shoulder season' tag or permit. I'm also concerned with the program will be managed from the hunter perspective. Will all hunters be able to participate? Will this be similar to the damage hunt, where if you forget to sign up during the month of sign-ups, it's 'tough luck'? Will youth be given first option? Will disable veterans be given some sort of priority status? How will the notification process work? I ask that FWP keep this process fair for the little guy that doesn't have excess time or money. Outfitters and guide businesses shouldn't be offered this opportunity either. Another option to consider, if land owners have any grazing leases i.e. Forest Service, BLM, State Trust (and I get it, some are federal, it'd take some sort of coalition to accomplish) then they automatically have to open their lands to public hunting, whether through block management or shoulder season. Ranchers get to graze down the areas where elk live. Limited food supplies cause elk to move to areas to eat, oftentimes private land. Please consider these thoughts and ideas when deciding how the program should be administered.
michael j diangelis	cascade	MT	Agree	Only agree if the permit you have includes a bull tag that that can be used as well, Land owners should have no right to determine what sex of animals can be taken, these animals are the peoples animals I would like to throw my support for the shoulder season for Elk and Deer permitted hunters only, those that were not succesful in the regular season as priority
Michael Winn	Black Eagle	MT	Disagree	The shoulder season is not a good fit for Montana. The ranchers are not allowing public hunting, it is either pay trespass fees or they have an outfitter. If you read the great Falls Tribune article on Sunday October 25, take a good look at the comment by Kendra Lane. The Lane ranch does not let the public hunt their property. They allow one family to hunt it during archery and then have an outfitter outfit it during general season and then let that same family back in the last week to hunt. So how can they complain that they are not raising elk, they only raise cattle. There is so much cash changing hands in almost all of these big ranch companies hands that it is not funny. I can sure bet you they do not report this on their taxes, nor do they report all the cash that comes in from the shed horns on their property. The only way to solve the issue is to allow hunting and push the elk back onto public land. Shoulder hunts are only going to make it worse. Its like the Gault ranch, come shoot my cow elk the last week but boy don't shoot that \$7,500 bull. The FWP region 4 head of the Biologist Mr. Taylor has been mismanaging our herds for years. His idea to kill more elk is to give everyone a chance to kill a cow. This is crazy and there is no Biology to back this up, he does not even listen to his Biologist that are doing all the work. It is really simple, if you want more elk killed you need to have the cow tags for private land only, not forest service, BLM or State. The poor little belts get hit so hard that pretty soon there will no longer be a migrating herd. Once you kill all the cow elk off the forest service land who will teach the calves to migrate? The dead cows sure cant. I know this would all be taken care of if the head of the FWP was an elected official. Being appointed by the Governor that is elected by the high paying ranchers is only hindering the problem. Please do not allow Late shoulder seasons.
Michelle Ream	Condon	MT	Agree	Land owners should not get any special privileges if they are having problems with elk they should open their land up to hunters and join the Block Management Program.
mike cannizzaro	Bozeman	MT	Agree	I think its a good way to reduce cow populations, but will only be successful if private landowners give access to their land

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Mike Craddock	Dillon	MT	Agree	I love the idea of shoulder seasons. I would love to see them not have a rifle shoulder season prior to the regular archery season. However, extending archery season would be terrific! Please do not introduce the use of firearms to hunt elk prior to archery season and the rut. Thank you.
Mike Crowley	Helena	MT	Agree	I like the idea of allowing late hunts for the purpose of reducing elk populations. I would like to see the area 416 included as there is a lot of elk in this area also but any hunting will be great as I feed my family with wild meat thru the winter.
Mike Gollaher	Cascade	MT	Disagree	As I have grown up in area 445 I have seen all the ins and outs of what really is going on in this area. The only way I see to fix this problem is to change the regulations to either sex for the entire general season for a general over the counter elk tag. This will show which ranches are really interested in harvesting elk and which ranches are using the general public to clean up their mess. Thank you for a chance to express my opinion
Mike hickethier	Billings	MT	Agree	I think it is a great idea!
mike kakalecik	great falls	MT	Agree	please try to make this happen. I know outfitting is a very big business, but let's see if we can work with land owners I am willing to do my part.
Mike Maclay	Stevensville	MT	Agree	To many elk on private properties
Mike Rhynard	Marinsdale	MT	Undecided	1. The statement that "all parties are interested in fewer elk" is incorrect. I'm a landowner who leases each hunting week to do-it-yourself hunters. When these folks are successful, they return to hunt again, which makes for good business and use of the land. Meanwhile, the impact of elk grazing on our available annual cattle AUM's is negligible. I do not want to reduce elk numbers on my ranch, because the Castle Mountains are so accessible to the public, they're overrun with people on ATV's driving wherever they want and trespassing at will. 2. Having a rifle shoulder season before or during the archery season will destroy the archery season by changing traditional elk flow patterns and impose further economic hardship to do-it-yourself hunting operations such as ours. 3. For high ground (e.g., above 6000'), the late shoulder season is a waste, because snow depth usually causes elk herds to depart the mountains for winter pastures right after Thanksgiving. 4. This proposal needs more thought.
Mike Suiter	Billings	MT	Agree	It would be awesome if the landowners would open up their land in order to alleviate the problem of over population.
Morgan Cooney	Lolo	MT	Agree	I with the idea of the shoulder season as I myself have witnessed massive amounts of elk that are not able to be hunted by hunters. I believe there are several areas in the Breaks that have way to many elk on private land with no access.
Naomi Gwin	Butte	MT	Disagree	What about the migration they would not be able to do this



## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Nate Messer	Helena	MT	Disagree	As outlined in the current shoulder season guidelines, I disagree. No hunting should be allowed on public land outside of normal hunting season dates. If the PRIVATE landowner needs assistance to manage game animals then I agree assistance should be granted, ONLY as long as the PRIVATE land owner allows suitable and reasonable access to the same game during the regular hunting season. If they do not allow hunting or simply use outfitters on their private property then they should NOT be able to use the PUBLIC sportsman for a problem THEY created. Why is the average PUBLIC hunter always being asked to bail out the big PRIVATE landowner. FWP needs to be more transparent as to how the shoulder season will work, is it by permit, unused general elk tag, or those who applied for a permit (410) in that specific area and were not drawn. I was shocked to see district 410 included in the proposed shoulder season. FWP has failed to properly manage this district over the years. There are thousands of elk in this district yet FWP only allows 100 special permits. 4000+ hunters apply each year for this district and you have obviously failed to be proactive and match the elk population with the correct amount of permits. FWP needs to rethink this shoulder season and not rush to try to stop the bleeding with a band-aid approach, but rather come up with a common sense approach to managing the high elk population in a handful of districts. EX, have a special youth only seasons (early or late) on PRIVATE land, provide PRIVATE land only special permits which will allow hunting only on PRIVATE land within those districts which are above long term average. This will engage the PRIVATE land owner to allow suitable access to help management. FWP has done a great job with the BMP over the years but needs to work with those landowners who have not and do not allow PUBLIC access to their PRIVATE lands. If the PRIVATE landowner has a problem with too many elk on their land then shame on them for not allowing the public to hunt. Its a very simple process.
Nathan Olson	Missoula	MT	Undecided	FWP and the Fish and Game commission should include two additional restriction in the guidelines and administration of shoulder seasons 1) No bulls with 6 points or greater on one side should be taken during a shoulder season. 2) It should be illegal to pay or accept payment of "trespass access fees" during shoulder seasons.
Nicholas Viola	Plevna	MT	Agree	Extra opportunity to hunt and less hunters out with an extended season. Everyone rushes in one month of a season, this will make it safer.
Nick Wallace	Fort Benton	MT	Undecided	The thing that bothers me is why do we keep going earlier? If the months of Aug, and Sep are seemingly always now in the 80's and 90's it is foolish to even think about taking an animal for the very real risk of spoilage. It also does seem that the powers that be are against hunting as well as bowhunting in general. Later not earlier.
Nikolas Grosfield	Big Timber	MT	Agree	With the huge reported and observed increase in the elk population in the Crazy Mountains -- up to 200% -- and the even larger official overpopulation in that area -- up to 400% -- I definitely support a longer hunting season to control the elk population. Whether we as a state decide to do this for a limited time, and / or in limited areas, the damage such a large population does to agriculture seems rather untenable. I also would support continued or expanded local (non-government) initiatives to foster food programs for hungry or low-income Montanans in our communities, and using the booming elk population to that end would be an effect means to that end. Thank you, and God bless!
nikolas kisch	laurel	MT	Agree	any time a landowner has damage by game he should be willing to let hunters in to help stop the damage.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Agree, Disagree or Undecided</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Norman	Superior	MT	Disagree	This is about as clear and mud. It also is coming off smelling vaguely of stupid. It would help if you eliminate the legalese and just come out and say, who, what, when and where. Nice and concise. As it stands it sounds like you all are making it easier for someone you know to hunt out of season for trophies on their land. Which does no body else a bit of good. I hope you can clear it up for us laymen John Q Public.
Patrick Kruse	Fairfield	MT	Agree	I think implementing this shoulder season project will aid MFWP / landowners and sportsman in the management of Montana's elk population. I enjoy seeing MFWP creating and brainstorming new management objectives that give more hunting opportunities.
Paul Bray	Townsend	MT	Disagree	At best a very poor second choice. An either sex hunt would be much more efficient and desirable. Another choice would be issue more cow permits..
paul Downing	Columbia Falls	MT	Undecided	The thing I don't like is the early rifle in august. I believe that will effect archery hunters making it even harder for us to get close to elk. Extent the archery season to the august 15 date and extend the rifle at the end. I believe that would benefit both types of hunters. I belive a lot of hunters would go for this idea.
Paul McKenzie	Columbia Falls	MT	Agree	This is a great idea but will only be successful if landowners provide for access. FWP must develop an access assistance program that pairs permit holders with landowners with problem populations and willing to provide access.
Peter Borgesen	KALISPELL	MT	Agree	I strongly support this project
Philip Anderson	Lakeside	MT	Agree	Important to keep herds healthy and it's a good opportunity for land owners and hunters to work together.
Philip t Huff	Havre	MT	Disagree	I think it is a great idea if wildlife on private property is causing damage and if the landowner will let you hunt during regular season
Phillip Kicbusch	Coram	MT	Agree	I have bow hunted 410 the last 4 yrs, and have seen increasing number of small bulls. The herds stay on ranches like the Flying Arrow, during archery and general season, and damage the surrounding landowners property after general season closes. This would be a good way of reducing those numbers without having too many hunters in a small area.
Preston A. Ricci	Missoula	MT	Agree	I also think there should be opportunities for senior hunters 62 and older like there is for our youth. Hunting gets harder the older you get and it would be nice to have one last chance at a elk.
Quinton	BUTTE	MT	Undecided	I would agree with this, but I believe we already do this on a case by case basis with landowners who allow public hunting. It is done with damage hunts. Could this also limit general public access to private land if a land owner has plans of hunting a shoulder season where he may control access? I would hate to see this abused or used as a way to kill trophy animals that are forced onto private land by winter weather.

## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Randal W. English	Helena	MT	Disagree	I am very strongly opposed to the proposed Elk late season shoulder season. I have read the Final Elk Season Guidelines (10/08/2015) and believe I can generally agree with the intent; however, the implementation of the shoulder season (as it currently exists) is corrupt and wrong. I think we all can agree that one of the biggest issues is very large groups of elk concentrated on private lands that generally do not allow open public hunting. The elk continue to learn that these areas are safe havens and mass migrate to the private lands. I have hunted in districts 392 and 446 for more than 30 years and have witnessed many changes in that time period and one thing is certain, the availability of quality bull elk continue to decline on hunt-able public ground and continue to increase on the private lands which do not allow general access. To me, hunting isn't about having someone drive you out into a field and shooting an antlerless elk just to get the "tolerated population down". As far as I am concerned, the practices currently being conducted under the shoulder season umbrella is shameful.... The wildlife of Montana is owned by the people of Montana and allowing the shoulder season on private ground continues to rewards those individuals who profit and benefit from a public asset without compensation to the citizens of Montana. If the ground is not open to general elk harvest during the regular season in a way that applies sufficient pressure to redistribute elk herds, then a shoulder season should NOT be allowed. Isn't it interesting how just few wealthy landowners can dictate that an entire program be constructed wasting sportsman's funds and management resources? Want to solve the issue? Re-district those lands where the elk are concentrating to antlerless elk only (for all) and watch the problem solve its self. The guidelines suggest this is an alternative...let's see it happen..
Randy	Brenteson	MT	Agree	Something needs to be done. I did notice the article in the Tribune failed to mention that landowners have to let some public bull hunting, or has that been changed.
Randy Balcerzak	E. Helena	MT	Disagree	I am very strongly opposed to the proposed Elk late season shoulder season. I have read the Final Elk Season Guidelines (10/08/2015) and believe I can generally agree with the intent; however, the implementation of the shoulder season (as it currently exists) is corrupt and wrong. The wildlife of Montana is owned by the people of Montana and allowing the shoulder season on private ground continues to rewards those individuals who profit and benefit from a public asset without compensation to the citizens of Montana. If the ground is not open to general elk harvest during the regular season in a way that applies sufficient pressure to redistribute elk herds, then a shoulder season should NOT be allowed.
Raymond Winn	Vaughn	MT	Disagree	If the ranchers would allow access to hunt the elk would not be on their property. FWP management plan would not be over quota if we excluded these ranches from the management forecast. Actually all areas would be under management forecasts. I have hunted in Montana all my life and it is getting to be a rich mans sport. All we talk about is the animal numbers are at all time highs, but not on public land.
Raymond Neldon	Missoula	MT	Disagree	I suppose it is too much to ask landowners to be "capable and respectful" of Montana hunters and other citizens
Rey	Billings	MT	Agree	I hope this is not an opportunity for OUTFITTERS to make money because most of these elk herds are found on private lands who would not allow public hunting. since most of the elk are in private land, is this shoulder season also open for commercial or guided hunting? I hope it is not or the private land owners will commercialize this opportunity.
RICHARD MAGAARD	Nevis	MN	Undecided	MAGAARD, will the shoulder season be available to archers? Will the persons who didn't get drawn in the regular drawing be eligible? Need more info, please.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Richard Strong	Bigfork	MT	Agree	Good idea
Rick L Keller	Belgrade	MT	Disagree	<p>Part of the problem is the elk have learned where they are safe. They are now on private property that allows no hunting. These large ranches have become off limits to the hunters and then the landowners want the FW&amp;P to do something about it. As a hunter, I respect private property rights and I know there are hunters who have abused the privilege of hunting on someone else's property and it is a black eye for all of the ethical hunters. Also the quality of the meat that late in the year starts to diminish quickly and you put those animals in a very stressful situation and it will increase winter mortality on the animals that live through an extended hunting season. Montana could and should support more elk than what we have. Colorado has two to three times the population of elk than what we do and yet they seem to manage to have a season that ends in October and it is usually a one week season that you get to chose to hunt in. We have a 5 week season and that is more than enough time to hunt and possibly harvest an elk. We should have more respect for our wildlife than to put additional stress on them. This is about selling licenses and making the ranching community happy, when they in fact limit our opportunities. It is a double edge sword, how do we bridge those gaps. It certainly isn't in killing more elk so a rancher doesn't have to deal with them. I just hunted in the Big Hole Valley and there are probably at least a 1,000 elk on three ranches that won't allow hunting. Why can't we find out why and look at solutions to remedy that. Maybe it is a special drawing situation like the Sun Ranch use to do. Also I saw some of the issues with grazing on Forest Service land and the land was over grazed. Wild animals are going to go where there is food and that also is part and partial of why those elk are down on those ranches. Their food source is gone. Managing elk and deer is difficult at best because there are many variables to consider and food, shelter and the stress we put on them render them very vulnerable to starvation, depredation and diseases. This is more about the wildlife and what is best for them. This was done in the past and the FW&amp;P did not feel it was biologically a sound practice. Why the sudden turn around? Who are you appeasing? Certainly not me..I for One OBJECT TO EXTENDING THE SEASON to kill more elk, maybe a better alternatives need to be explored. Also when a person draws a cow elk tag that is what they should have to shoot and it should not be an either or type of tag, which is happening in many of the Southwestern hunting districts.</p>

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Agree, Disagree or Undecided</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Rick Lindholm	Billings	MT	Agree	This could be a great program and I am optimistic that it could work. I have never been a part of late season hunts or damage hunts before, but I think that I will apply this year if I can. I have been a public land hunter all of my life and honestly I have a hard time feeling sympathetic for most property owners' "financial hardship" from damage caused by elk, deer, bear, wolves, ect... because their cattle are on everyone's public land year round earning them money from our property and eating forage meant for wildlife. When I see many big ranch owners driving around brand new vehicles I can be rest assured that they are not experiencing any sort of "financial hardship". With that said I know there are ranchers out there that are in dire straights because of excessive game populations and I would love to help them out by harvesting cow elk off of their property with an over the counter B Tag for that area. My main concern is that; first we are not letting people who are already well off take advantage of the system to earn more money from the taxpayers; second it is easy for an average person to apply for and take part in these "Shoulder Season" hunts (maps, permission already granted and clear direction of where to go and how to use the program); third we are not setting up an elk slaughtering program where people are lining up on one field and decimating an entire herd in a day like what happened last year. I am all for allowing late season hunts in certain areas but my final suggestion is to relocate elk in densely populated areas to places that have low elk population (I know its expensive and you probably just rolled your eyes but think about all of the money spent by the state dealing with all of the complaints, paying landowners for damages, writing new guidelines ect..ect.. just borrow a couple of cattle trucks from the biggest complainers and truck the elk somewhere else)
Rick Vaughn	Lewistown	MT	Disagree	I still disagree with the project and think that more permits need to be given out during archery and general rifle. If the project does get approved in 410 there needs to be hunting allowed on Public land. There is so much public land in that district that it would be hard to restrict the hunts to private land.
Rob Gregoire	Bozeman	MT	Disagree	That is crazy to have a general season from Nov 30 - Feb 15. That is nearly 6 months of unregulated hunting! Expect disgusting shootouts when they cross onto state lands. - Any bull hunting, which should be used only in extreme cases, should be limited to spike only.
Robb Branson	Bozeman	MT	Agree	I commend this new process. I see it as a tool to be used when the regular means of harvest are not working. If used correctly I see it helping F&G meet objectives and goals. The bigger question is , "Will the landowners that should participate, participate for the betterment of the species instead of personal gain only?"
Robert Jones	Billings	MT	Agree	Definitely a positive start in managing ever growing elk population numbers while increasing access to those elk on private lands. Additionally, with the elk being a public resource, not a private privilege, this is very positive progress in resolving public animosity towards private land holders who refuse access but complain about resident elk. Good work MT FWP! Keep it up!
Robert Thomas	Noxon	MT	Disagree	You cannot control populations by killing bulls. Target the females. In Dis. 121, we are super short on bulls
Robert Wood	Hamilton	MT	Undecided	Why would any sportsman in Montana waste time to comment on any proposal. It's meaningless with this group that's in control at this time. Ever wonder why there was so little participation in the 15 and forward scoping sessions? You shouldn't anymore.
Robin Hamilton	Missoula	MT	Agree	In general, it sounds good, but not enough details are available. What districts? When will the public know? Who gets first choice?
Ron Hawkinson	Thompson Falls	MT	Disagree	Shoulder seasons should not begin until after regular seasons close. Elk calves should not be left alone at two months old. Shoulder seasons should be cow only.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Ron Murray	Hamilton	MT	Agree	There needs to be better management and mandatory reporting of harvest. In Region 2 it was open season on coe elk for far to long. You know the rest of the story here. Hunters should be required to go to a mandatory ethics class when granted permission to hunt on private land for this program. You have special training for buffalo and wolf trapping.
Ronald Ream	Condon	MT	Agree	I heard that landowners are trying get special privileges during the elk late shoulder season and some want to sell tags that they are given. Landowners should not be given tags to sell or for friends to use, if they are having problems with elk then they should do Block Management land owners should not get any special privilege to make money off my elk.. If and when this goes through why not open a couple places up for handicapped hunters. Our handicapped roads program is a farce and we need to do something for our handicapped hunters.
Ronald Ries	CONRAD	MT	Agree	I support the season
Roy C. Jones	Lewistown	MT	Agree	Range has a specific, limited capacity to support a specific, limited number of animals, whether they be sheep, cattle, deer, elk, buffalo, or something else. To ignore those limitations is to eventually destroy the habitat. If that happens, everybody loses, people and wildlife. Do what you have to do, but let's maintain healthy habitats! I MUCH prefer public harvest over commercial or governmental control killing.
Ryan Benes	Lewistown	MT	Undecided	Having a late cow shoulder season (after general season closes)would be more economical for hunters and land owners. Having shoulder season on August and September isn't safe or is it fair for those who have drawn special archery permits. Holding a late shoulder season when weather is colder I think would have better results for harvest as elk tend to move onto hay stacks and easier food sources when weather is cold.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Scott Driscoll	Butte	MT	Disagree	<p>I have yet to talk to a fellow hunter who supports the idea of having shoulder seasons. There are quite a few landowners that support this idea and evidently politicians. Many non landowner sportsmen, including myself, have voiced our objections via the "comment period." Once again I have taken this opportunity to voice my opinion and reluctantly take the time to do so as I, along with others are sadly expecting to be ignored once again. It's horribly aggravating to see the voice of the sportsmen ignored so blatantly by the very agency entrusted with responsible game management. No, we do not want shoulder seasons. What we want and what we need is for these areas of over objective elk numbers to be looked at objectively! You know where these high numbers are, you know why there are high numbers in these areas. We call on you to publish this information and address the real problem. Access to the over objective areas is very limited or nonexistent. We have a six week archery season, a five week general season and an abundance of hunters, plus damage hunts. To decrease numbers we do not need more season, but we do need to be able to access these animals. Gaining this access with the handcuff of only being able to harvest antler-less elk is not right. Sure it will work, but imagine the NFL only allowing a select few of the 32 teams to compete for the super bowl while the majority of the league is relegated to competing for third place, but they will generate the majority of revenue for the league. It would pretty much ruin the whole thing. Sure there's football, but who really cares? Putting hunters on land they wouldn't otherwise be able to access will surely help with culling the herd, but why is this limited to antlerless elk? How can state government decide that the average sportsmen has less rights to a public resource than a landowner due to his ability to privatize a public resource? Landowners will not be limited to antlerless elk. I realize the letter says "may" include antlered elk, but it was also stated our comments were wanted and our opinions matter. We don't need a "may", or a pipe dream shot that it might happen. We need equality in that every public citizen will have the same right to public resources as far as our state government is concerned. Shoulder seasons do not require this, which is why I find them unacceptable. We are letting you know this. Please stop catering to landowners to meet your objectives and turning around and stating that this is not the case. Just as actions speak louder than words. You may ignore our words but we hear your actions. I used to believe the greatest aspect of hunting lied within how much of the sport was governed by ethics and how such a premium was put upon doing what is right, just simply because right is right. Watching FWP cater to landowners and politics while ignoring the masses and telling us that this is not what's happening is quickly ruining this belief. Over the past 15 years or so I have noticed a change in how sportsmen view the FWP, actions like this further the distrust. Take a stand for what's right and mange big game ethically for all, equally.</p>
Scott Johnson	Billings	MT	Agree	I think this is a great way to foster the relationship between landowners and hunters.
Scott Lukkason	Great Falls	MT	Agree	I suggest doing a master hunter program similar to Washington that requires completion of a written test, shooting proficiency etc to be eligible for the shoulder season. This will insure you have qualified, motivated hunters who will help maintain the elk populations at target and keep landowner relations in a positive relationship.
Scott Shuman	Manhattan	MT	Agree	This could be a great opportunity for the majority of the hunter that only hunt public lands

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Sean Kelly	Helena	MT	Disagree	The problem is the large private property owners allowing very few hunters on their property to hunt elk once the property owner or their friends/family have harvested their bulls. Once this process has taken place, which may be half way through the season, they do not see a significant decrease in numbers or elk leaving their property at the end or after the season. We all know that pressure moves animals. Why not make these districts antlerless elk only? The shoulder season is not the correct answer for what is happening in these districts, the property owners are the problem. They want the elk numbers reduced or gone but they do not want everyone and their cousin on their property, not that I am saying they should let everyone on their property. If these districts were antlerless elk only, the harvest numbers will be of equal or greater value than that of a shoulder season and there will be an unfair advantage to those who wish to archery hunt these districts. Additionally, if the season runs too late in to the year or into the upcoming year, bulls will be shot once they lose their horns (they look like cows). I know I don't need to preach to FWP about management but that is absurdly negligent to allow a hunting season that late. After a couple of years of antlerless elk only, the property owners will see decreased numbers and learn an appreciation for allowing hunters to manage herds. If they want to outfit their property they sure can. But, if property owners are the culprit for their own elk problem, its because of mismanagement. They need to allow a healthy balance of hunters and not just a handful of the public once their buddies have filled their tags. Let's face it, this shoulder season is fueled by money of land owners like the Galts. Do not allow this season for the sake of conservation and fair chase.
Seth Wheeler	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	I feel that we already have elk management tools in place. We should utilize them. IF the shoulder season is to move forward, then the selection process should be 100% unbiased and conducted by the FWP.
Shane Erickson	Lincoln	MT	Disagree	strongly disagree with ANY firearm hunting before the general season - that will really hurt success during the first week or 2 of general. somewhat disagree with post-general season hunting. you want to increase harvest, move the general season a week or 2 later, or simply extend the season by a week or 2. hunting after the first of the year will subject cow elk to undue stress, which will impact survival rates of cows, and most likely have a negative impact upon the spring calf crop. the elk are stressed enough trying to avoid being eaten by the WAY TOO MANY mountain lions and wolves. give 'em a break, uh?
Shane Watson	Helena	MT	Agree	As long as it keeps the elk numbers at good manageable levels, I think it's a good thing. With the season essentially spread out longer, it might help spread out the hunters themselves, which I hope would only help with safety and alleviating some of the pressure on the animals.
Shannon Niswonger	Lakeside	MT	Agree	Please sign me up
Shaun Gardner	Boulder	MT	Agree	I'm a little worried that the shoulder hunting season is during season and how it's applied during that time. Safety would be a concern as there could potentially be archers with camo only on while rifle hunters have orange. Not sure the shoulder season is a good idea during the early/archery season.



## Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Shawn Tripp	Big Timber	MT	Disagree	Shoulder season will place unneeded stress on your wardens, other department personal, other agencies and public land/resources. Let's face it. Access is essential to harvesting our big game animals. Commercialization by private landowners is not acceptable! As a landowner and now resources enforcement officer I totally understand both sides. Enhance access opportunity and increase penalties. And give your wardens a pay raise and the authority and jurisdiction - full police powers to do their jobs. The way FWP is treated by the legislature is criminal. What are you going to do to educate hunters, landowners and legislators? Please be offensive rather than defensive. Godspeed folks! Please keep up the fight for the sportsman!
shean gross	kalisPELL	MT	Agree	More opportunity for hunters to hunt on private land is great. hunters should appreciate it and respect landowners rules as to allow our children a chance to do so as well in the future.
Stan Buchholz	Billings	MT	Disagree	I think you should seriously look at extending the General Season to Dec. 15 in over objective units. Or possibly starting the general season two weeks later and extending the closure by two weeks or more. I think you would get a higher harvest doing this.
Stephen	Boey	MT	Agree	All the elk belong to the public not the big land owners .They should not receive a dime .The rent forest land cheaper than I can then the Darn cattle get in there and turn it into a moonscape .They should not be able to make money off of public Game GET RID OF THE OUTFITTERS .
steve bachman	darby	MT	Agree	yes i think it would be good to have season before and during regular season so they can not hide on private land that way hunters on public land can have a chance to
Steve Blohm	Billings	MT	Disagree	I believe that current permit holders for those areas that were not successful during the regular season should be given first opportunity to participate in shoulder season hunts.
Steve Brown	Stevensville	MT	Disagree	I don't disagree with the idea as a whole, only with the allowance to harvest bulls outside of a regular hunting season. If the goal of the proposal is to reduce game numbers in general, the best way to accomplish that is to increase the number of cows harvested. Harvesting more bulls will not have nearly the long term impact on the overall population as does cow harvest. It could be argued, in fact, that part of the reason for the problem is that land owners have a financial incentive to keep the elk on their place so that they can sell access to the bulls. By allowing for bull harvest outside of the season as well this does nothing to reduce that incentive, and actually increases it. I don't believe that a serious proposal to decrease game numbers should include additional bull harvest. A case in point is that any depredation hunt that I have ever been involved with, be it deer or elk, only allowed the harvest of cows or does. Never bucks or bulls. The reason being that it is through the cows and the does that a population is controlled, not through the bulls and bucks. There is absolutely no need to allow more bull harvest outside of the general season except for increased financial gain by landowners and outfitters.
steve bue	reed point	MT	Disagree	these large land owners that outfit their places and sell the bull elk from \$2000.00 to \$5000.00 per head or more for trophy animals, and then whine like hell when the cow elk eat their grass and hay stacks. if they really want solve the problem have them join the block management program, with increased hunting pressure in the bmp within 5 years their ranches will be biological dead areas and help move elk on to public lands.
Steve Salsman	Thompson falls	MT	Undecided	As long as it just is not for the private ranches so they can bring in out of star hunters and charge a really high price does this include open land or behind closed gates

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Steven Childers	Santa Fe	NM	Agree	Since this requires hunting on private land, the game commission should do all that it can to insure ethical, respectful and experienced hunters are only allowed to hunt on these lands.
Steven Moss	Dana Point	CA	Agree	I believe that this is a wonderful and necessary program that will benefit conservation as well as the public. You are to be commended!
Ted Tschetter	GREAT FALLS	MT	Disagree	Once again the Fish and Game is catering to private land owners, Outfitters and out of state hunters. This will not benefit the average Montana hunter. Private land owners will not let us have access to hunt during the general season, but want us only because the elk are eating their grass and hay. The elk have changed their habits and stay mostly on private land because they know they are safe. The elk have no reason to migrate to National Forest land because they have all the food and water on private land. The average Montana hunter can not afford to pay \$ 7,500 to \$ 10,000 to hunt on private land for a bull elk. The private land owners are making money off rich out of state hunters and Outfitters. The article in the Tribune on Sunday is a prime example. The Lane Ranch only lets a very select few families on and charges anyone else \$\$\$ to hunt, then complain because the elk are eating their grass that is supposed to feed their cattle. The elk belong to the people of Montana and should not be used by private land owners and Outfitters to profit from. This all boils down to money and who has it. The average hunter does not and Outfitters, private land owners and out of state hunters do. This is not the way it should be!!! If the head of the Fish and Game was an elected official that could be held accountable by the voting public then we could see some real change that would benefit Montanans. Open up more private land, limit the out of state hunters and Outfitters and those of us who love and live in this state will be the benefactors.
Terry O'Neill	Gallatin Gateway	MT	Agree	Understand this is a pilot project but would also like to see the Taylor Fork area should the project come to fruition.
thomas benda	eureka	MT	Agree	elk hunting in lincoln county is very hard. most areas that there are elk are on private land that do not allow hunting. i have heard complaints about elk damage for some of these land owners, but they still will not allow hunting.
TIFFANY SHOTNOKOFF	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	The idea is simply not supported by any hunters in our family or friends. These landowners complain about damage to their land by game animals and their cattle having to compete for food, but yet they don't let hunters on their land during the general season. They then want us to help them outside the general season or want reimbursement for the choices they made to keep general public out??? The answer is simple No!! You either let the general public in during regular season to hunt and stop leasing out your land to outfitters, out of states, and hunters who have to pay because your making a profit off them or NO shoulder season hunts for those landowners. Let's not make this complicated you let general public on your land during the regular season and if there's still an elk problem after the general season those and ONLY those landowners should be considered for a shoulder season. If the land is in any way leased, outfitted, or having any person pay to hunt NO SHOULDER SEASON for that landowner no matter how many elk they have!! In the end it is the landowner's decision to let the public in or not that would affect their option for a shoulder season.
Tim Engleson	Eureka	MT	Agree	Great idea, about time. Thanks.
Tim Eve	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	I think if these land owners had their land in block management there would not be a problem with too many elk on it. The last thing I want to see is the land owner be able to still charge for trophy hunting in the general season and have a shoulder season to take care of the cow elk.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
TIM ROSS	BILLINGS	MT	Undecided	I'M NOT CONVINCED THIS WON'T BE ANOTHER WAY FOR LAND OWNERS TO KEEP TAX PAYING RESIDENTS OUT AND SEE DOLLARS FROM SPECIAL INTERESTS , FAMILY AND FREINDS. WILL THERE BE A DRAWING THE SAME AS DAMAGE HUNTING ? WILL PERMITS STILL BE HELD TO TWO POSSIBLE TAGS PER YEAR AS THE B TAGS ARE ? DOES FISH AND GAME TAKE INTO ACCOUNT HOW MANY BULLS RUN OFF AND DIE WITH ARROWS STUCK IN THEM ?
Timothy S Mitchell	Saint Ignatius	MT	Disagree	Congratulations, Montana Fish and Game Dept and the Governor are another step closer to ending public hunting and turning Montana into Texas style hunting
Todd Seymanski	Great Falls	MT	Disagree	There should not be any bulls shot and there needs to be a fair game damage list, not the crooked way things are done now!!
Todd Timbrook	Linwood	NJ	Undecided	As a landowner near the Castle Mountians I have a few concerns/comments that I would hope are taken seriously. We bought a small parcel two years ago. We don't ranch the land and invested over 1m to buy our own area to hunt. We got tired of getting run over with over pressured public land and also didn't want to be guided anymore. It is something we worked hard for over 20 years to be able to make a reality. So that's the basic framework for why we invested in your state. We love Montana and have great respect for its citizens and the ranchers who we have come to know. We also understand conservation and the desire for the DNR to better control over population objectives. My comments are as follows: 1. We are primarily archery hunters and love the challenge. It is hard enough to get close enough for an opportunity with a bow in hand and if we allow hunters with rifles in the woods around Aug 15th it would ruin the experience. Elk don't respond well to pressure and gunshots. The rifle season is a totally different experience and I would hope to keep the lines separate. Having hunters in the field for an extended rifle season would be fine with me. We also pay the highest non-resident tag price in the country for our opportunity. 2. Quotas: how are the tags going to be made available? How are we to measure how many animals need to be taken during this special season? I would suggest a reporting mechanism similar to black bear regulations. 3. We boarder the National Forest land. We access our parcel through the neighboring ranchers parcels. If they were to allow increased hunting pressure on their lands I'd like to know how Fish and Game will enforce no trespassing laws. I would hope the sale of these permits would allow an increased presence of wardens. As I mentioned we have a small area we hunt and we invested in our privacy. 4. This season should ONLY be for private lands and NOT the National Forest from Aug 15th through archery season! After the rifle season it would not concern me as much. Let's be thoughtful and preserve the rights of the archery hunter who pays just as much for a tag as the rifle hunter. Thank you for your consideration. I can be reached at 609-892-2887 to discuss further.
tom reiner	shepherd	MT	Undecided	Who will be allowed to participate? I am on the same damage hunt roster of last season when I shot an an elk on the Galt ranch, one of two I harvested last year. If all ranchers in the affected area are willing to participate, and all participating hunters are willing to actually hunt, then maybe this will work. If you have a group of hunters who are only interested in shooting an "easy" elk I doubt any more elk will be taken than before. I think you should use names off the damage hunt rosters to determine participants in this hunt. My rationale is that these people are probably familiar with the area and are willing and able to hunt. This is why I signed up for the damage hunt last year and was successful. It would have been easier to get an elk had there been more ranchers participating in the hunt, and the participation letter had been sent out in a timely manner: I didn't receive my letter till 3 days after the hunt began.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
tom eggemeyer	bozeman	MT	Disagree	Why don't we just drop all the pretense and just go ahead and make FWP a division of the Department of Livestock. Kowtowing to the ranching community seems to be the direction FWP is moving as being their primary objective.
Tom Jandron	Clancy	MT	Agree	I think it sounds like a great opportunity to got elk population healthy. With the increase of property owners not allowing hunting on their property, not hazing the elk off, ineffective block management areas the big land owners leasing the prime hunting to outfitters. It is severely hindering hunting opportunities for residents.
Tom Shaw	Billings	MT	Disagree	The FWP's currently has this available and it is called damage/management hunts. I am currently on the damage hunt roster for area 410 (number 10) and I have not received any notification regarding damage harvest hunts. Now the FWP is proposing a shoulder season in this area what about all the license paying public that has applied for damage hunts and now won't have the chance to enjoy a hunt.
Tony Jewett	Helena	MT	Undecided	Whereas there are fundamental elements of this proposal that I am in agreement with, there are others that are vague and/or undefined as outlined in the proposed regs that at this point make the proposal untenable. The large number of over-objective hunting units is contradicted by the widespread difficulties everyday public hunters are increasingly experiencing in gaining private land access to harvestable elk herds. Much of these lands are closed to the public during the general season and/or only open as leased properties to outfitters and well-heeled hunters. To the extent that these new regulations begin to crack open that door during the general season, then they are a positive on that level. I see nothing in the regulations that address the issue of how late-season licenses will be allocated -- i.e to who an don what basis. The regulations should not be adopted and put into effect unless all late-season permits and licenses are allocated through a drawing or 1st come-1st serve basis that provide no preference to anyone wishing to participate. Late season hunts should not be allowed on private lands which are closed to the general public during the general hunting season, and used as a means to clean up 'excess' animals' that are considered 'surplus' after the prized bulls are harvested off the private lands that have been closed to the general public during the general hunting season. Those issues aside, there are constructive checks-and-balances inherent in the proposal that provide a general, but shaky, framework of democratic allocation of public wildlife and for building collaborative public-private communications to address the issue at hand. However, the flaws in the proposal -- as outlined in the comments submitted above, override the merits at this point and sink the proposal as a whole. The regulations need to be amended as such in order construct a viable and acceptable framework to move forward.

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

Name	City	State	Agree, Disagree or Undecided	Comment
Travis	Lewistown	MT	Disagree	This is wanted by landowners who complain that there is too many elk on their place. It's quite strange how many, many of these landowners don't even elk hunt. When you go to ask many landowners if you can hunt on their place, they ask for \$500 for cow elk and \$2,000 for bull elk which is accepted by few hunters. Now, you have many hunters on public lands which push elk onto private lands. If landowners truly wanted to elk to do less damage to their land, then they would disagree with this proposal since elk scatter back onto public lands when hunting season ends. So with longer seasons, FWP is taking elk management out of their hands and putting it into private land owners'. According to a map given by FWP in 2011, unit 410 was in-objective for elk numbers. Why is 410 a proposed shoulder season unit when the purpose is to reduce elk numbers in over-objectives units? Archery season needs to be protected. There is going to be a TON of conflicts when an archery hunter is stalking a bull at 40 yards and a rifle hunter shoots the bull at 400 yards and didn't even see the archery hunter because he wasn't wearing orange. Safety SHOULD be a huge priority for FWP. You say this will decrease costs for FWP, but I have to disagree. What's the cost of rescuing hunters when they get frostbites in the winter months while hunting elk? It just isn't safe to have more hunters out during the winter months. We also have to consider other animals too. More hunting pressure in the winter will cause deer, mountain lions, bobcats, antelopes, etc. to suffer even more in the winter months. With deer and big horn sheep populations already low, do we really want to add that much more stress onto them? One animal isn't more important than an other animal. FWP won't receive as much out-of-state money as we do now because hunters will go to Colorado, Arizona, etc. to pursue larger elk herds. Let's get things back to where things were in early 2000s.
Travis Harris	Billings	MT	Undecided	As long as land owners are not allowed charge a fee or only limit it to friends and family and there is a fair way for hu ters to gain access and an ethical way to to harvest elk I would be for this. I thought we had game damage hunts that already did this?
Travis Watt	West Yellowstone	MT	Agree	I appreciate that you have taken into account landowners who often do not allow public access during the regular season, that they must do so in order to ask for late season hunting on their property.
Trent Sullivan	Boulder	MT	Disagree	The worst method used for contoling elk populations, as a resident for 47yrs I am disappointed in the commission.
Vicki Borgesen	KALISPELL	MT	Agree	This is a great idea and a good collaboration between FWP, land owners and hunters. Good call
Vivian	Troy	MT	Agree	Drake..Im all for it as Im sure it will help both farmers and familes.
Wayne Booth	Pensacola	FL	Agree	Great idea to get a healthy, sustained elk population and secondarily reduces damage to private lands. Access to private land is key to success of program.
Wendy Hobaugh	Bozeman and Philipsburg	MT	Disagree	I'm sorry, but the ranches that are using this around Philipsburg simply do not allow hunting during the regular season. They may allow their friends and employee friend on the ranch to hunt, but if you don't know someone the average person can not get on the ranch to hunt. I have a problem with ranches that do not really allow hunting being allowed to extend the hunting season. If they have a problem with the elk numbers simply allow a limited number of hunters on the property during regular season. The other problem I have with the Shoulder season is that it is going to interfere with bow hunting. Once animals are shot at with a gun, you will not be able to get close enough to hunt with a bow. I understand trying to get the large herds off the private land but rewarding land owners that don't really allow hunting is not the answer. Thank you, Wendy Hobaugh - Life time resident

**Public Comment – 2015 Elk Late Shoulder Seasons Pilot Project – Proposed October 2015**

<b>Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Agree, Disagree or Undecided</b>	<b>Comment</b>
william albin	kalispell	MT	Agree	sounds good, but how will the permits be determined ?
WILLIAM BALLOWE	GREAT FALLS	MT	Undecided	How is this going to be different than the HUNT ROSTER? Right now on the HUNT ROSTER you get a number and get a "call" when they need hunters. However there are some landowners who only all their "buddies" to come out and hunt these late season hunts. That is not fair and I am not in favor of the Shoulder Season if this is going to be allowed. If everyone can't be treated equal then there should not be any extra hunting by a select few.
William D. Burdick	Missoula	MT	Agree	I think this is a great idea, although if it is a temporary solution the public forest lands and FWP lands would probably need to be hunted to help disperse and thin out populations.
Willis Lake	Mount Vernon	WA	Agree	As long as the hunters respect the property and its owners I think this is a great way to help the land owners and hunters a like.
Zane Drishinski	CONRAD	MT	Agree	I support the season