

**MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS
HUNTING SEASON / QUOTA CHANGE SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Species: Elk
 Region: multiple
 Hunting District: multiple
 Year: 2008 & 2009

1. Describe the proposed season / quotas changes and provide a summary of prior history (i.e., prior history of permits, season types, etc.).

Implement limited either-sex elk archery permit only hunting in those HDs that currently have limited entry opportunity for rifle either-sex elk. Proposed permit levels represent 65% of most recent 3-year average of unlimited license sales. This percentage was consistently applied in the districts below. Given that crowding has been an articulated concern in these districts, a lower percentage was used than the 85% used for outside the Missouri River Breaks where crowding has been less consistently an issue. A reduction was proposed (instead of "current numbers") as districts below do exhibit leasing concerns and a permit reduction arguably magnifies the intended drawing uncertainty of limited permits.

PROPOSED REGULATIONS

REGION 4

HD410

General Elk License.

- none.

Special Elk Permit. Drawing only. Apply by June 1.

410-00 200 permits.

- Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Antlerless Elk. Archery Only Season
- Oct 26 - Nov 30 - Antlerless Elk.

410-20 55 permits.

- Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Either-sex Elk. Archery Only Season.
- Oct 26 - Nov 30 - Either-sex Elk.

410-21 1560 permits. (Changed to 410-15)

ArchEquip only. Valid in HDs 410 and 417.

Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Either-sex Elk.

HD417

General Elk License.

- Oct 26 - Nov 30 - Antlerless Elk. Only youth ages 12-15.

Special Elk Permit. Drawing only. Apply by June 1.

417-00 400 permits.

- Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Antlerless Elk. Archery Only Season
- Oct 26 - Nov 30 - Antlerless Elk.

417-20 125 permits.

- Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Either-sex Elk. Archery Only Season.
- Oct 26 - Nov 30 - Either-sex Elk.

410-21 1560 permits. (Changed to 410-15)

ArchEquip only. Valid in HDs 410 and 417.

- Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Either-sex Elk.
-

417-80 300 licenses. Resident/Nonresident (A9/B12). Not valid on CMR refuge lands.

- Sep 06 - Oct 19 - Antlerless Elk. Archery Only Season
- Oct 26 - Nov 30 - Antlerless Elk.

REGION 6

620-21 (Changed to 620-15) 1080 permits. ArchEquip only. Valid in HDs 620, 621 and 622.

- Sept __ - Oct __ - Either-sex elk. Archery Equipment only.

REGION 7

798-21(Changed to 798-15): 720 permits. Arch Equip only. Valid in HD's 700 and 701
Either sex elk.

2. Why is the proposed change necessary?

There are several problems associated with unlimited either sex elk archery permits in those areas that are currently limited entry for either sex elk rifle hunters. Many of these issues are fundamentally tied to the (typically) enhanced age structure of bull elk in these districts and the value those bulls represent. The problems are:

Perceived inequity among hunter groups. FWP has long taken comments critical of limited entry rifle opportunities in areas with unlimited archery. Countering arguments have included the (typically) small total harvest by archers and the ability for anybody to enter the sport of bowhunting without having to sacrifice their rifle opportunities. Most recently, in some areas the relatively large archer take of bulls and identified access reductions tied to unlimited and secured archery opportunity moves the argument away from total archery harvest. As or if access restrictions extend into rifle season, unlimited archery opportunity can directly impact rifle hunting opportunity. Limited permits removes this inequity.

A high nonresident participation rate relative to the 10% cap and nonresident participation in other areas. In that sense, unlimited permits that foster a relatively high nonresident participation in specific areas are arguably counter to the cap's intent and manifestation at the local level. While some argue that nonresident elk licenses are already limited and so should not be capped again, in truth limited elk permits across the state have long and consistently maintained a 10% cap in their drawing process. Limited permits maintains a consistent nonresident participation rate.

Hunter crowding and its influence to elk distribution and/or hunt quality. In some areas the presence of world class bull elk and unlimited permits has attracted ever increasing numbers of people—residents and nonresidents alike. With that growing hunter presence has come hunter comments speaking to eroded hunt quality and unwanted impacts to elk distribution. The limited permits structure affords the Commission the ability to adjust numbers when/where/if necessary. Additionally, a reduction in permit numbers (from current unlimited levels) can immediately speak to crowding.

The unlimited season structure easily facilitates leasing and its (typically) exclusive access to wildlife. Field observations and assessments have identified leasing as a growing component of Montana's landscape. While such circumstances are typically first seen as a reduction in hunting access, there can also be significant impacts to management effectiveness as or if access restrictions create refuges that prevent adequate harvest. While any limited permit adoption may not reverse or prevent existing leases, the limited structure and the annual uncertainty it brings arguably facilitates leasing to a lesser degree. From that, limited permits may reduce both rate and volume of future leasing efforts. Criticisms that limited structures may impact commercial interests or gains typically do not speak to the loss of management effectiveness or to the general public's place in Montana's public wildlife management as it is currently defined. A permit reduction effectively magnifies the intended drawing uncertainty.

In a broader context, structural changes based upon management considerations beyond the biological arguably enhance and maximize the Department and Commission's potential strategic role in tomorrow's wildlife management arena. As social pressures to access finite resources continue to climb, collaborative efforts that engage all relevant parties must necessarily keep pace. As a first step towards that collaboration, the Department, reasonably as facilitator, technical advisor and steward of the Public Trust, must responsibly use available tools like season structure to maintain, illustrate and emphasize legitimate values and to articulate rationale and process for divergent parties to engage one another directly. In this case, an unlimited season structure is clearly advocated by some—but that structure's availability just as clearly threatens the legitimate values of others. Given the indirect nature of most interactions (with perspectives typically speaking not to each other but to FWP or the Commission), it seems that only after all parties "come to the table" and are equally aware, respectful and "dependent" upon one another can effective and sincere collaboration begin. It is to that "start" this proposal and others like it also endeavor.

3. What is the current population's status in relation to the management objectives? (i.e., state management objectives from management plan if applicable; provide current and prior years of population survey, harvest, or other pertinent information).

While individual districts vary in their population status vs. objective, the Missouri River Breaks Elk Management Unit (EMU) is perceived to be 146% of objective based upon

most recent surveys. This proposal, as it focuses on either sex (“bull”) permits, is not intended or anticipated to inappropriately reduce antlerless harvest.

In this context, the proposal’s relationship to Elk Plan season packages needs to be addressed. To restate earlier presentations to the Commission, FWP considers elk objectives to be fixed until they are deliberately and collaboratively changed. FWP further recognizes that proposed season packages must communicate the appropriate level of potential harvest based upon population status and objective. That is to say, any proposal must appropriately be “Liberal”, “Standard” or “Restrictive”. From this, a structure’s exact detail may reasonably change during established season setting process—but the sum of those changes must accurately reflect the “correct” level of intended harvest. In this case, the proposal—as it varies from exact Elk Plan language--speaks not only to maintaining appropriate harvest potentials in the short term (2008 – 2009) but comprehensively in the long term as well.

4. Provide information related to any weather/habitat factors that have relevance to this change (i.e., habitat security, hunter access, vegetation surveys, weather index, snow conditions, temperature / precipitation information).

Regional staff has articulated (see attached) specific access restrictions that are seen to be facilitated by the current unlimited season structure.

5. Briefly describe the contacts you have made with individual sportsmen or landowners, public groups or organizations regarding this proposal and indicate their comments (both pro and con).

In addition to a long history of debate on this topic, staff have engaged and continue to engage the public on this proposal. Opinions vary widely on the central theme (limited vs. unlimited) and the actual numbers. In that diversity of opinion, there are both staunch supporters and detractors.

Submitted by: Kujala

Date: December 7, 2007

SUMMARY OF EMAILED AND MAILED TENTATIVE REGULATION COMMENTS 2008

Antelope Archery				
Hunter				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	66	27	12	105
Nonresident	0	39	2	41
Other	3	3	0	6
Total	69	69	14	152
Landowner				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	2	67	2	71
Nonresident	0	0	0	0
Other	0	1	0	1
Total	2	68	2	72
Business/Outfitter/Government				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	0	50	0	50
Nonresident	0	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0
Total	0	51	0	51
Unknown				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	114	37	12	163
Nonresident	0	8	4	12
Other	15	17	2	34
Total	129	62	18	209
TOTALS	200	250	34	484

All Elk Archery				
Hunter				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	50	38	15	103
Nonresident	0	46	6	52
Other	3	8	3	14
Total	53	92	24	169
Landowner				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	6	71	7	84
Nonresident	0	1	0	1
Other	0	2	0	2
Total	6	74	7	87
Business/Outfitter/Government				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	1	51	0	52
Nonresident	0	1	0	1
Other	0	2	0	2
Total	1	54	0	55
Unknown				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	97	60	24	181
Nonresident	1	12	4	17
Other	21	27	3	51
Total	119	99	31	249
TOTALS	179	319	62	560

Breaks Archery				
Hunter				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	66	10	29	105
Nonresident	1	24	8	33
Other	2	5	2	9
Total	69	39	39	147
Landowner				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	2	10	6	18
Nonresident	0	2	0	2
Other	0	1	0	1
Total	2	13	6	21
Business/Outfitter/Government				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	0	4	1	5
Nonresident	0	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0
Total	0	5	1	6
Unknown				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	70	31	101	202
Nonresident	0	3	1	4
Other	9	11	5	25
Total	79	45	107	231
TOTALS	150	102	153	405

Outside Breaks Archery				
Hunter				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	18	39	5	62
Nonresident	0	4	0	4
Other	1	5	0	6
Total	19	48	5	72
Landowner				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	1	18	3	22
Nonresident	0	3	0	3
Other	0	1	0	1
Total	1	22	3	26
Business/Outfitter/Government				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	0	3	0	3
Nonresident	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Total	0	3	0	3
Unknown				
	For	Against	Other	Total
Resident	15	49	57	121
Nonresident	0	0	0	0
Other	2	6	4	12
Total	17	55	61	133
TOTALS	37	128	69	234

MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS
HUNTING SEASON / QUOTA CHANGE SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Species: Elk
Region/HD: Regions 4, 5 and 7; LPTs 401-15 , 411-15, 420-15, 500-15, 502-15, 580-15, 590-15, 799-15 as applied to all or portions of HDs 401, 403, 441, 450, 411, 412, 426, 511, 530, 420, 447, 455, 500, 570, 502, 510, 520, 575, 580, 590, 702, 704, 705
Year: 2010

1. Describe the proposed changes and provide a summary of prior history.

Proposed Change: Assemble existing License Permit Types (LPTs) 401-15, 411-15, 420-15, 500-15, 502-15, 580-15, 590-15 and 799-15 for all or portions of the 23 HDs 401, 403, 441, 450, 411, 412, 426, 511, 530, 420, 447, 455, 500, 570, 502, 510, 520, 575, 580, 590, 702, 704, 705 (as described in 2009 regulations) **into one bundle/LPT 900-15**. This permit group would be valid only during the archery season throughout the entire area described in total by the 23 districts or portions of districts (see 2009 regulations). These permit holders could also archery hunt in other general license districts. Total number of permits would be equal to the sum of the first and second choice resident and nonresident eligible applicants from the 2009 drawing process. This sum is 2950 (rounded from 2947) and would accommodate 95% of the 2009 eligible resident applications and 45% of the 2009 eligible nonresident applications. This number of permits would apply to both the 2010 and 2011 seasons. Applicants may apply first, second or third choice. Antlerless elk would remain available on the general license during the archery season.

Prior History: Prior to 2008, these areas had limited either sex elk rifle permits with general license either sex archery seasons. For the 2008 season, either sex archery permits were established with the 23 districts “bundled” into eight groupings/LPTs. The number of permits available was unlimited. For the 2009 season, the number of permits available was limited to 100% of the 2008 total applicants equal to 4080 permits. Other season elements remained unchanged. Total first, second and third choice applications for residents and nonresidents in 2009 was 3453 (2791 residents, 662 nonresidents). 3431 permits were awarded through the drawing with 649 left unallocated. These unallocated permits were not made available for surplus sale. For both 2008 and 2009, archery hunting for antlerless elk was available on the general license.

2. Why is the proposed change necessary?

As a refinement to the 2008 implementation of elk archery permits in these 23 districts, placing all 23 districts into one “bundle” is a response to expressed interest in increased hunter mobility across these districts.

The permit reduction is another refinement of the 2008 archery permit implementation 100% of the total 2008 applicants was a deliberately too-large number relative to the structure’s original intent. The large number of permits (confirmed by over 600 unclaimed permits after the drawing) represented transition to the new structure. In order to more fully implement the intent of the limited permits to include managing some of the likely hunter shift out of the Missouri Breaks where unlimited permits were capped and reduced in 2008 and 2009, the proposed permit level is still a relatively high number but is less than demand as described by eligible applicants in 2009. If permit supply remains more than permit demand, the intent of limited permits cannot be realized.

The intent of limited permits in these districts is (broadly) effective elk management and equitable/consistent allocation. While less tangible, "hunt quality" is generally pursued as well. In a comprehensive assessment, each has degrees of overlap and interface with the others.

- A. Management effectiveness. Whatever else, management effectiveness alludes to the season structure's ability to facilitate, foster or accommodate movement toward objective in a manner that reasonably accommodates public expectations and values. Objectives can include post-season elk numbers observed, bull:cow ratios and/or harvest objectives. Management needs and/or public expectations and values typically include some critical minimum amount of effective access/harvest relative to elk distribution and random allocation of high value harvest opportunities. While general license either sex opportunity maximizes individual options, the same widely and consistently available ability to pursue high value older aged bull elk very typically does not directly address population management (antlerless harvest), can lead to indirect impacts to population management in the form of adjusted elk distribution away from areas of hunter access (and so relative high hunter density) and can accommodate very non-random harvest allocation of valued bull elk. In a further complication to effective management, very limited or exclusive access can magnify deleterious impacts to effectiveness by receiving elk concentrations that then become largely unavailable for harvest.

"Going first", archers can influence rifle hunting opportunities and management returns via direct harvest and/or elk distribution shifts in response to archery hunting pressure. This potential is further emphasized by the recent growing trend of archery stamp sales in Montana. After a period of relative stability and slow growth, archery stamp sales jumped from approximately 30,000 in 2002 to nearly 41,000 in 2007. Recent research in southwest Montana (wolf/ungulate project, Hamlin and Cunningham) has provided spatial information illustrating elk distribution shifts over the course of the archery season—in a manner different from historical observations. Among the variables likely contributing to that shift is archer presence (representing elk disturbance and mortality) in varying relative amounts on the landscape with elk responding into the safest/quietest areas. In this context, the permit structure allows for potential hunter number adjustment for enhanced or maintained management effectiveness

While not the singular cause, consistently available general license harvest opportunity is fully capable of accommodating if not encouraging "refuge" areas via intentional land purchase, management or leasing for exclusive elk hunting opportunity (or no hunting at all). These circumstances can range from landowner decisions to resident land purchase or leasing to commercial hunting operations with predominately nonresident hunting clients. With the general license season structure and its annual availability, there can be little or no incentive for some to provide public access or other mechanism sufficient to obtain a dispersed elk distribution and/or prescribed harvest. Indeed, the specific intent to have elk consistently and reliably available for hunting (speaking to both "managed" elk presence via limited hunting & harvest and license/permit availability) can be counter and confounding to publicly developed management objectives. To be clear, this proposal does not and cannot prohibit exclusive or limited/no access scenarios that preclude effective management. However, it does pursue through public process a relative reduction in the general season structure's contribution to such specific realized or possible circumstances. Additionally and in the context of incentives as well as regulation, the limited permit structure enables the potential broader application of currently defined but little-used elk hunting access contracts ("HB 454 agreements"). While there is question as to how effective this tool can be, these contracts represent landowner ability to secure a permit specifically for the landowner's property annually (with FWP Commission approval) in exchange for a formally described level of public access that reflects management need as well as allocation.

- B. Equitable/consistent allocation. For reasons of limited physical habitat security and/or intentional bull management, rifle permits for either sex elk were already present in these areas. The absence of any

general license rifle opportunity for bull elk was the specific filter used to identify these 23 districts. This filter and approach reflects programmatic intent to maintain or implement either sex ("trophy bull") elk permits for both archery and rifle seasons wherever either sex permits exist (and no either sex general license opportunity exists) for one or the other. As a direct or indirect product of implementation either sex permits often result in older aged "trophy" bull elk. These bulls and the opportunity to pursue them have a high social and monetary value that can significantly influence individual hunter, and outfitter decisions, expectations and perceptions.

Montana's hunting heritage includes public support and expectation for reasonable and random allocation of valued opportunity with residents given preference via the "10% nonresident rule" of permit and license allocation. The critical contributions of private land habitat, wildlife tolerance and hunter access has also been recognized and assigned preference via landowner preference in permit drawings.

While permit numbers for the rifle season are relatively lower to directly reflect typically high individual harvest success rates relative to management objectives, archery permits in these areas can be relatively greater in number based upon typically lower individual success rates. While 2950 either sex archery permits are proposed for these 23 districts, either sex rifle permits numbered less than half that number at 1375 in 2009. However, while 3453 eligible applicants secured 3431 out of the 4080 available archery permits, 11,676 individuals (sum of 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice applicants) applied for the 1375 rifle permits. These long odds can severely limit an individual's opportunity to participate in these high value pursuits. Given the rifle season limitations can be fundamental to the bull age structure archers engage, it is not uncommon for rifle hunters to see inequality in any archery opportunity that is perceived to be more generous. Archers counter with "buy a bow".

To summarize, limited permits randomly allocates potential for harvest, is consistent with the typically lower relative harvest success rate of archers and typically results in better drawing success rates for archery permits than for rifle permits.

- C. Hunt quality. Although varying opinions and definitions exist for "hunt quality" and FWP has been challenged when addressing the topic, this concept along with "crowding" was and continues to be a (growing?) theme commonly expressed in public comment across a diversity of topics. The 2008 and 2009 implementation of a permit structure allows for the potential or realized adjustment of hunter numbers in response to public interest for maintained or higher hunt quality as it is directly or indirectly influenced by the number of hunters in an area. In this context, this structure also provides framework to engage hunter shift to these permitted areas that may be catalyzed by other changes and/or evolving hunter interest. Again, these points are further emphasized by the trend of archery stamp sales in Montana.

3. What is the current population's status in relation to the management objective?

Twelve of these 23 districts are over objective relative to elk population levels. Either sex archery permits do not represent the primary mechanism for antlerless harvest. However, the permits do represent effort towards potential change in some areas out of current circumstances that do not address or facilitate management effectiveness. Antlerless harvest remains on the general license in all of these 23 districts and addresses concerns about individual archer contribution to overall population control as well as one type of elk archery opportunity with no additional permit required

4. Provide information related to any factors or circumstances that have relevance to this change.

The grouping of these 23 districts into one bundle is tied to the management assumption that many if not most hunters will not move widely across the 23 districts but rather will tend to hunt in one hunting district or a relatively small group of districts that is the focus of their application.

Nonresident allocation has been and continues to be a function of existing allocation process reflecting preference to residents (and landowners via landowner preference). If the nonresident application date is moved, drawing results will be available several months earlier. The permit number and bundling are seen as "works in progress" defined out of the last two years' season implementation. Similarly, continued implementation and evaluation will drive any future refinements or maintenance.

Refunded licenses for nonresidents unsuccessful in the *permit* drawing are typically assigned to alternate nonresident hunters that were unsuccessful in the *license* drawing. While those hunters may not hunt in the same portion of the state, total number of nonresident licenses in Montana will not necessarily decline from this proposal. Relative to local economies, resident hunters as well as nonresidents provide significant financial inputs. Based upon 2007 hunter numbers and Fiscal Year 2008 dollars, residents contributed 56% of estimated elk hunter financial expenditures summed across all 23 districts. Within individual districts, resident elk hunters contributed 32 to 91% of the expenditures. This proposal does not directly speak (certainly there can be overlaps with elk hunting) to deer, antelope, upland bird and other hunting opportunities as those hunter pursuits also provide economic contribution.

If adopted party application would be available for these permits. In addition to landowner preference, landowners may potentially secure a modified permit via access contracts (HB 454 option).

5. Briefly describe the contacts you have made with individual sportsmen or landowners, public groups or organizations regarding this proposal and indicate their comments (both pro and con).

The 2008 elk archery adoptions have prompted considerable debate. While individual elements have been part of many conversations since the last biennial season setting, this specific proposal as a whole has not received significant public review to date. Given the debated history of this topic and the anticipated or known advocacy for the 2007 season type from some landowners, outfitters and the Montana Bowhunters Association (MBA), this is anticipated to be a contentious proposal. This is not to imply a lack of strong support from other members of the public as formal or informal inputs have ranged from advocacies for the 2007 season structure to more limited permit numbers.

Submitted by: Kujala
Date: November 20, 2009

Approved:

Disapproved / Modified by:

Reason for Modification:

2010 ELK OBJECTIVES AND STATUS				
Hunting District # Elk Management Unit name	Elk Plan Objective Point/Range for HD (Observed)	2010 or most recent elk observed (list year if not 2010)	Status -- over, at or under objective	Estimated elk numbers assuming 80% of elk are observed
100 PURCELL	300	138 (2009)	Under Objective	173
101 SALISH	see HD 103		At Objective	
102 SALISH	see HD 103		At Objective	
103 SALISH	260	283	At Objective	354
104 LR CLRK FK	225	no survey	At Objective	
109 WHITEFISH	600	186	Under Objective	233
110 WHITEFISH	see HD 109	134	Under Objective	168
120 SALISH	110	125	At Objective	156
121 LR CLRK FK	1355	1454	At Objective	1818
122 SALISH	see HD 120		At Objective	
123 LR CLRK FK	365	390	At Objective	488
124 LR CLRK FK	130	138	At Objective	173
130 BOB MRSHL	see HD 140		At Objective	
132 NRTH SWAN	low numbers	no survey	At Objective	
140 BOB MRSHL	225	265	At Objective	331
141 BOB MRSHL	see HD 140		At Objective	
150 BOB MRSHL	400	306	Under Objective	383
151 BOB MRSHL	see HD 150		Under Objective	
170 NRTH SWAN	see HD 132		At Objective	
200 LR CLRK FK	300	335 (2007)	At Objective	419
201 NINEMILE	600	610 (2009)	At Objective	763
202 LR CLRK FK	350	378	At Objective	473
203 NINEMILE	950	592	Under Objective	740
204 ROCK CR NORTH OF AMBROSE CR	400	390	At Objective	488
204/261 ROCK CR AMBROSE CR TO WILLOW CR	520	413	Under Objective	516
210 ROCK CK	850	1315	Over (Under)	1644
211 SAPPHIRE	600	900	Over Objective	1125
212 FLINT CK (SUBOBJECTIVE)	1000 (500)	2003 (148) in 2009	Over (Under)	2504
213 FLINT CK	750	1060 (2009)	Over Objective	1325
214 SAPPHIRE	450	320	Under Objective	400
215 DEER LDGE	1400	1716	Over Objective	2145
216 ROCK CK	325	251	Under Objective	314
240 BITTROOT	750	645	At Objective	806
250 WEST FRK	2000	744	Under Objective	930
260 BITTROOT	no wintering elk		At Objective	
261 ROCK CK WILLOW CK TO SKALKAHO CK	400	444	At Objective	555
270 SAPPHIRE (SUBOBJECTIVE)	3000 (2600)	3527 (2489)	Over (At)	4409
280 BOB MRSHL	no wintering elk		At Objective	
281 BOB MRSHL	600	488	Under Objective	610
282 BOB MRSHL	see HD 285		Under Objective	
283 GARNET	500	836	Over Objective	1045
284 GRNITE BTE	see HD 293		Under Objective	
285 BOB MRSHL	1000	864	Under Objective	1080

2010 ELK OBJECTIVES AND STATUS				
Hunting District # Elk Management Unit name	Elk Plan Objective Point/Range for HD (Observed)	2010 or most recent elk observed (list year if not 2010)	Status -- over, at or under objective	Estimated elk numbers assuming 80% of elk are observed
290 GARNET	see HD 298		At Objective	
291 GARNET	600	770	Over Objective	963
292 GARNET	800	637	Under Objective	796
293 GRNITE BTE	750	592 (2009)	Under Objective	740
298 GARNET	600	519	At Objective	649
300 TENDOY	800	896	At Objective	1120
301 GAL/MADISN	500	402	At Objective	503
302 TENDOY	625	626	At Objective	783
310 GAL/MADSN	1500	290	Under Objective	363
311 GAL/MADSN	2700	2096 (2008)	Under Objective	2620
312 BRIDGER	600	869 (2007)	Over Objective	1086
313 N YLWSTNE	4000	2209	Under Objective	2761
314 GAL/MADSN	3000	3091	At Objective	3864
315 CRAZYMTNS	1000	1399	Over Objective	1749
316 N YLWSTNE	no wintering elk		At Objective	
317 ABSAROKA	900	636	Under Objective	795
318 DEER LDGE	500	415	At Objective	519
319 FLEECER	955	683	Under Objective	854
320 TBCO ROOT	1000	1146	At Objective	1433
321 SAPPHIRE	no wintering elk		At Objective	
322 GRAVELLY	8,000	7237	At Objective	9046
323 GRAVELLY	see HD 322		At Objective	
324 GRAVELLY	see HD 322		At Objective	
325 GRAVELLY	see HD 322		At Objective	
326 GRAVELLY	see HD 322		At Objective	
327 GRAVELLY	see HD 322		At Objective	
328 TENDOY	625	514	At Objective	643
329 PIONEER	830	218, partial survey	At Objective	273
330 GRAVELLY	see HD 322		At Objective	
331 PIONEER	1290	695	Under Objective	869
332 PIONEER	830	454	Under Objective	568
333 TBCO ROOT	see HD 320		At Objective	
335 DEER LDGE	600	388	Under Objective	485
339 GRNITE BTE	700	1004	Over Objective	1255
340 HIGHLAND	1600	1532	At Objective	1915
341 FLEECER	525	333	Under Objective	416
343 GRNITE BTE	700	443	Under objective	554
350 HIGHLAND	see HD 340		At Objective	
360 GAL/MADSN	1200	872	Under Objective	1090
361 GAL/MADSN	175	<150 (2007)	Under Objective	188
362 GAL/MADSN	2500	3362	Over Objective	4203
370 HIGHLAND	see HD 340		At Objective	
380 ELKHORN	2000	1414	Under Objective	1768
390 BRIDGER	900	1143	Over Objective	1429
391 BRIDGER	550	734	Over Objective	918
392 W BG BLT	1100	1040	At Objective	1300
393 BRIDGER	1500	no survey	Over Objective	

2010 ELK OBJECTIVES AND STATUS

Hunting District # Elk Management Unit name	Elk Plan Objective Point/Range for HD (Observed)	2010 or most recent elk observed (list year if not 2010)	Status -- over, at or under objective	Estimated elk numbers assuming 80% of elk are observed
400 GLDN TRGLE	0	no survey	At Objective	
401 SWTGRASS	350	394 (2009)	At Objective	493
403 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
404 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
405 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
406 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
410 MI RVR BKS	2300	2107	At Objective	2634
411 SNOWY	800	444 West + 1825 East (2008)	Over Objective	2836
412 SNOWY	300	507	Over Objective	634
413 LITTLE BLT	500	411	At Objective	514
415 BOB MRSHL	200	264 (2009)	Over Objective	330
416 LITTLE BLT	475	1213	Over Objective	1516
417 MI RVR BKS	400	549 (2009)	Over Objective	686
418 LITTLE BLT	150	67	Under Objective	84
419 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
420 LITTLE BLT	1200	1192	At Objective	1490
421 BIRDTAIL	500	514	At Objective	643
422 BOB MRSHL	500	1673	Over Objective	2091
423 BIRDTAIL	see HD 421		At Objective	
424 BOB MRSHL	see HD 425		At Objective	
425 BOB MRSHL	2500	2616	At Objective	3270
426 MI RVR BKS	75	no survey	At Objective	
432 LITTLE BLT	325	433	Over Objective	541
441 BOB MRSHL	500	712 (2009)	Over Objective	890
442 BOB MRSHL	see HD 425		At Objective	
444 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
445 DVLS KCHN	2200	2932	Over Objective	3665
446 E BIG BLT	950	1629	Over Objective	2036
447 HIGHWOOD	700	1047	Over Objective	1309
448 LITTLE BLT	see HD 420		At Objective	
449 CASTLE MTN	600	833	Over Objective	1041
450 TETON	100	192	Over Objective	240
452 CASTLE MTN	see HD 449		Over Objective	
454 LITTLE BLT	250	197	Under Objective	246
455 DVLS KCHN	see HD 445		Over Objective	
471 GLDN TRGLE	see HD 400		At Objective	
500 MID YLLWST	60	estimate 50	At Objective	63
502 MID YLLWST	50	64	Over Objective	80
510 MID YLLWST	10	0	Under Objective	
511 SNOWY	see HD 411		Over Objective	
520 ABSAROKA	1050	891	At Objective	1114
530 SNOWY	see HD 411		Over Objective	
540 LITTLE BLT	600	1268	Over Objective	1585
560 ABSAROKA	700	967	Over Objective	1209
570 MID YLLWST	100	220	Over Objective	275
575 MID YLLWST	225	237	At Objective	296
580 CRAZYMTNS	975	2640	Over Objective	3300

2010 ELK OBJECTIVES AND STATUS				
Hunting District # Elk Management Unit name	Elk Plan Objective Point/Range for HD (Observed)	2010 or most recent elk observed (list year if not 2010)	Status -- over, at or under objective	Estimated elk numbers assuming 80% of elk are observed
590 BULL MTN	1050	1598 (Bull Mtns flown in 2007-08 & Pine Ridge Flown 2009-10)	Over Objective	1998
600 HI LINE	0	no survey	At Objective	
610 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
611 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
620 MI RVR BKS	see HD 621		Over Objective	
621 MI RVR BKS	1400-1650	2553	Over Objective	3191
622 MI RVR BKS	see HD 621		Over Objective	
630 MI RVR BKS	see HD 631		At Objective	
631 MI RVR BKS	300 - 350	386	Over Objective	483
632 MI RVR BKS	see HD 631		At Objective	
640 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
641 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
650 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
651 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
652 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
670 HI LINE	see HD 600		At Objective	
680 BEARS PAW	see HD 690		Over Objective	
690 BEARS PAW	250	692	Over Objective	865
700 MI RVR BKS	200-300	603	Over Objective	754
701 MI RVR BKS	see HD 701		Over Objective	
702 CISTR FRST	see HD 704		Over Objective	
703 HI LINE	low numbers	no survey	At Objective	
704 CISTR FRST	500	325 (2009)	Over Objective	406
705 CISTR FRST	se HD 704		Over Objective	
TOTAL	90910	94304		117880
Estimated elk numbers are not comprehensively validated with site specific research or enhanced monitoring efforts. Estimates are not framed with confidence intervals and are subject to adjustment.				
Over Objective: Over objective range expressed in Elk Plan				
At Objective: Within objective range expressed in Elk Plan				
Under Objective: Under objective range expressed in Elk Plan				
49 of 161 (30%) districts over objective				
80 of 161 (50%) districts at objective				
32 of 161 (20%) districts under objective				
Estimated elk equate to 0.0031 elk per acre of habitat within elk distribution				
Estimated elk equate to 323 acres of habitat per elk within elk distribution				