

Public Comment by Other Means

Respectfully, I'm asking that you choose a no action option in regards to this 90/10 bill and no to outfitter set asides.

Wyoming is probably the most well managed state in the west for a combination of opportunity and quality big game hunting in my opinion, and I feel that large changes like this aren't necessary.

As a non-resident sitting on 9 years worth of points, and someone who's hunting plans in your state would be majorly affected by these changes, I completely respect residents wanting 90/10 and to have more opportunity in their home state. I feel that the outfitter set asides set a bad precedent for the future of hunting and will eventually negatively affect anyone, both resident and non resident, who don't have the means to hire an outfitter. Outfitters already have a large pool of candidates to try to attract as clients.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Riley Zavada

I am a Non- Resident of Wyoming. I have hunted your great state for several decades along with many family members. We have made countless memories that I will treasure forever. I ask That you take a "no action" option of just leaving things as they are in regards to Nonresident hunting in Wyoming. I also ask that you firmly oppose the "grand compromise".

Please keep Wyoming accessible to the countless families that want to come and hunt on their own and not be forced to go with an outfitter if they want any reasonable chance to hunt regularly.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Clay Oliverson, Utah

Good afternoon, my name is Tony Shumaker. I am a 100% disabled Vet, I have been coming to Wyoming since 2017 to hunt various tags. Mostly reduced price tags and occasionally a type 1 if I was lucky enough to draw or get one on the donated list. Wyoming is a special place in my family as they have seen the change it has made in our lives. I struggled with my injuries and was quite miserable and considering suicide.

My wife encouraged me to get outside and get back to what I used to do before everything happened. So in 2017 I went to Wyoming with a cow tag in my pocket.

Gasping for air I climbed and chased elk for days. Mostly finding peace as I rested trying to catch my breath. What I noticed was how beautiful the views were. I was so consumed by it I had forgotten all about my woes, it changed my outlook on life.

Since that trip I have been taking my family with me. We have made friends with several resident families. So much so that we regularly vacation there not during hunting season.

My concern is that with the Taskforce considering outfitter set asides it will ruin that success story for generations not born.

If I hadn't been able to get a DIY NR tag would any of that happened, would I be a success story or a statistic?

My kids love it there, will they ever be able to have the same experience. Or will such a reduced pool of NR DIY tags drive point creep so high they will never really have a chance to draw. They are 8 and 10 now and I fear will be so far behind in the points game they will likely never draw a type 1 tag.

Sincerely, SFC Shumaker US Army Retired

Good evening,

I write today asking you to not support outfitter license allocations/set-asides in Wyoming. Privatizing a public resource will lead to long-term negative consequences for wildlife, resident sportsmen, and the hunting heritage. Specifically, allocating tags to outfitters will have two very negative effects:

1. It is very harmful to the thousands of businesses in Wyoming that cater to DIY sportsmen: the motels, vacation rentals, restaurants, sporting goods stores, and many more benefit from higher volume DIY hunters. To create outfitter allocations, which guarantee money to outfitters and guides (many of whom are NOT Wyoming residents) at the sacrifice of so many Wyoming owned businesses that cater to DIY hunters is tragic. Government should not pick winners and losers in business.
2. Outfitter allocations will lead to decreased private access for resident sportsman. The certainty in tags will allow large outfitters to lease even more private land and lock out residents from areas of traditional access. This has happened in every state with significant private land holdings in the West – and it is exacerbated when outfitters take any portion of tags.

I believe in free markets and capitalism – not big government socialism and welfare handouts. Because I am a staunch supporter of the free market system, I find it disheartening that Wyoming would consider forcing consumers to hire outfitters in order to obtain any portion of the public tags available to non-resident hunters.

In the end, Wyoming has generally done a very good job managing hunters, wildlife, access – and has done so relatively equitably. My strongest recommendation is to not try and fix something that is not broken. Everybody wants a little bigger slice of the pie – but nobody is starving right now. Status quo is the most desirable path. The second most reasonable path is to give Residents 90/10 – but not if it means outfitter set-asides.

Thank you for your time.

Dean Holecek

Dear Director Nesvik,

I am writing to humbly ask you to vote no on any outfitter set-aside tags for the Wyoming non-resident deer, elk, and antelope draws.

I am a husband, father of two young children, public school teacher, and hunter from Oregon and understand that as such, I have little-to-no influence over the wildlife policies of Wyoming. That being said, I do care deeply about the wild places and wild things that exist within your great state's borders, and worry that the opportunity to enjoy all that Wyoming has to offer is rapidly ending not only for me, but particularly for my children. This is not meant to be dramatic, it is simply reality. If 50% of all non-resident big game tags were allocated to those who hire an outfitter (which I cannot afford) it would make obtaining a tag in even low-demand areas extremely difficult for families like mine. This is because it would take many more years of building points in order to draw--due to the drastically reduced numbers of available tags. That proposition rapidly becomes quite costly, and at a certain point is too much of a financial burden to justify. My kids are not even old enough to hunt, and this puts them so far behind in the preference point scheme that hunting in Wyoming would certainly be off the table.

It could be argued that someone like me should find a higher paying job in order to afford an outfitter. The thing is, I love my job and the opportunity it affords me to be able to make a positive impact on the lives of kids in my community. I also love the satisfaction that comes with planning and hunting for myself with friends and family--learning an area and the habits of its wildlife, trying to solve the puzzle and tap into the landscape as much as possible. I have nothing against outfitters or those who hire them--many offer a great service--but the ability to hire outfitters is already available, and I see no reasonable justification for mandatorily funneling business their way using a public resource held in trust for the citizens of Wyoming. Doing so will not only affect families like mine, but I also fear it would affect local Wyoming businesses that depend on non-resident hunting patrons each fall. I know that when my dad and I hunted deer in your state in 2020, we spent hundreds of dollars at local Wyoming businesses including motels, grocery stores, restaurants, gas stations, sporting goods stores, and several tourist shops to buy souvenirs for our families. It was a lifelong

dream for my dad to hunt mule deer in Wyoming, and he spared no expense on our trip. I would imagine that these kinds of expenditures at local businesses would be far less likely for fully outfitted non-resident hunters during hunting season, as most everything would be provided to them by their outfitter. Outfitted hunters also have no need to take scouting trips in the summer, which is another time when DIY hunters spend money in Wyoming.

Another thing to consider is the negative effects mandatory outfitter tag allocations would likely have on Wyoming resident hunters. Coming from Oregon, I have lived the negative results that extremely limiting DIY non-resident hunters have had on game management. One of the many things that make hunting in Wyoming great is your Access Yes program, which opens thousands of acres of private land to resident and non-resident hunters alike. Because Oregon has a non-resident outfitter allocation as well as transferable landowner tags (which I am also strongly opposed to) nearly all of the private land that holds quality wildlife habitat is completely off limits to resident hunters unless they pay a substantial fee to either hire an outfitter, lease access, or buy a landowner tag. It seems logical that if outfitters mandatorily corner that much of the non-resident hunter market in Wyoming, they will have the power and money to lease more private land. Wealthy non-residents willing and able to pay as much as it takes would incentivize outfitters to lease more land that could be (or was) enrolled in Access Yes, making these great pieces of accessible private land no longer accessible to regular resident hunters.

I hold no resentment with Wyoming resident hunters' desire for a 90/10 tag split. It makes sense, and is basically the standard for most western states. But if in order to accomplish that there must be this "grand compromise" in which half of that 10% of tags goes straight to pre-booked, outfitted non-resident hunters, I sincerely ask that the task force reconsider. Wyoming's tag allocation system works extremely well as it is now, and if I had my wish it wouldn't change. But if deer, elk, and antelope tag allocations do end up moving to 90/10, please keep any outfitter allocations out of it.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Randy T Davis

Terrebonne, Oregon

Hello Sir, I am writing to comment on the upcoming recommendations that the task force is working on regarding Nonresident regional tags and outfitter-specific draws. Please feel free to enter this as a public comment.

for some history, I am not a resident of WY, I am an avid elk hunter in as many states as I can draw tags in. I am a former hunting guide on public lands in CO, and I currently

spend some of my time guiding climbers and other outdoor enthusiasts, almost entirely on public lands. I have watched the task force meetings so I feel like I am at least somewhat informed on the recommendations the task force is working on.

Having participated in most of the options for draws to obtain an elk tag in the west I would like to offer my opinion for consideration, currently, I believe WY has some of the best opportunities to hunt big game in the west, both for residents and nonresident, a significant part of that is that so far WY has resisted the pressure to have an "outfitter pool" or whatever name that goes by, in the draw, or a significant set aside that cut's into the available licences in the draw.

As a nonresident who has the means to hunt multiple states every year but not the means, or the desire, to do an outfitted hunt, that is hugely important to me, one has only to look at UT, NM, and to a lesser degree MT and ID to see that having outfitter set aside reduces the ability of the average hunter to have a grand adventure, when it becomes a pay to play system the average joe loses out most of all, in the current climate of diversity reducing the ability of the less wealthy demographic to get a NR elk tag seems short-sighted. I would urge you to strongly oppose any preference for outfitters or landowners, I believe there are ample opportunities to make a living off of wildlife without giving preference to wealthy individuals, more money should not move you to the front of the line for a publicly owned asset.

Having been lucky enough to make some of my living off of the use of public lands for much of my adult life I have deep gratitude for that privilege as the mountain west is probably one of the only places on earth this opportunity exist, as such I have always felt that I was privileged to be able to make money off of a publicly owned asset, not owed a living from that asset, I have always viewed the DIY hunters and outdoor recreationalist as the priority user group, the owners of the land, while I was lucky to be able to take some of the leftover resources for personal gain... it is very clear that the WOGA does not share this ethic, and I would urge you as committee members to consider this when making decisions to guarantee revenue to a group that does not appear to me to be entitled to help from the government to run a profitable business if a hunter draws a tag they have the choice to hire an outfitter, the ability to afford an outfitted hunt should not have an impact on your odds of drawing a tag at the expense of those who would prefer to go out without assistance.

as to some of the other issues on your table, I don't oppose 90/10 allocations, the residents of a state should be heavily favored when limited natural resources are at stake, removing the cap on NR general tags is also something I don't have a strong opinion on, it seems like as long as the total is biologically sound there is some for everyone.

I think transferrable landowner licences are a recipe for the wealthy to have yet more access at the expense of the public, I believe that there is no benefit for the public

hunter and this should be opposed above all, the problem of inaccessible to the public elk only gets worse if this is implemented.

is there an option to leave things as they are? status quo is arguable the best big game license allocation system in the west for both residents and nonresidents, it seems like all the considered alternatives don't really improve things for anyone, with the exception of 90/10 improving residents odds, which as said above isn't an unacceptable move as residents should have significant preference.

Thank you for your time,

Grant Kleeves

Respectfully, I'm asking that you choose a no action option in regards to this 90/10 bill and no to outfitter set asides.

Wyoming is probably the most well managed state in the west for a combination of opportunity and quality big game hunting in my opinion, and I feel that large changes like this aren't necessary.

As a non-resident sitting on 9 years worth of points, and someone who's hunting plans in your state would be majorly affected by these changes, I completely respect residents wanting 90/10 and to have more opportunity in their home state. I feel that the outfitter set asides set a bad precedent for the future of hunting and will eventually negatively affect anyone, both resident and non resident, who don't have the means to hire an outfitter. Outfitters already have a large pool of candidates to try to attract as clients.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Riley Zavada

Hello,

My name is Josh Lane, I am writing to you as a concerned non resident sportsman. First of all thank you for your service on the task force, I'm sure it's a thankless and under appreciated task. As far as the issues you are considering go I understand that there is concern from residents wanting a 90-10 split on the elk, deer, and pronghorn, which I can appreciate. I am concerned about the possibility of the outfitter allocation of tags and what it could possibly lead to in the future. In my humble opinion if it isn't broke don't fix it. A 90-10 split would bring Wyoming into line with every other western state, and I appreciate the generosity that has been bestowed on non residents by Wyoming. Myself and my family love Wyoming and have been hunting there for several years. We

have made lifelong friends from some of the residents we've met out there. Again I would encourage you to take no action or change nothing. Thank you for your time,

Josh Lane

Thank you for your time and effort on the task force. My name is Seth, I've been visiting WY for over 30 years. I have been so grateful to have made many wonderful memories in your state camping, hiking, sightseeing, fishing, and now that I can finally afford it, hunting. I have had many wonderful interactions with business owners, landowners, ranchers, hunters, friends, outfitters, and other persons in all levels of WY government. Our family makes it out to WY whenever we can, sometimes multiple times per year, all over the state. Part of our trips are to scout the upcoming hunting season. We spend \$\$ on gas, groceries, lodging, auto care, and other amenities when we travel by car. This Nov I plan to be near Greybull for 2 1/2 weeks of DIY elk hunting, on top of 2 weeks we've already been to WY this year on 2 other trips.

Please consider forgoing outfitter set-asides in a 90/10 R/NR "compromise" on deer, elk, and antelope tags. There are some really great folks I know from the outfitter and guide industry in WY, and they provide a great service. However, I just don't think it's wise and prudent for the legislature to pick one industry as a "winner" at the expense of other WY businesses, which is exactly what happens when NR non-outfitted tag allocations are dramatically reduced. Thank you for your consideration.

Seth Franke



Dear Task Force Member:

I am writing about proposals currently being discussed by the Wyoming Wildlife Task Force, of which I see you listed as a member. Most specifically, I am commenting on a proposal to allocate a large portion of the non-resident tag allocation to those non-residents who would engage the services of an outfitter.

I completely understand why Wyoming residents want to reduce the non-resident allocations to 10%. I support Wyoming doing what it feels is best for this allocation between residents and non-residents. A 10% allocation is what most states allocate to non-residents.

What I am writing to oppose is a further bifurcation of that 10% non-resident tag quota to an outfitter pool. There are many folks who cannot, or choose not to, use the services of an outfitter. Allocating a large portion of the non-resident tags to a specific group negatively impacts the majority of non-residents, most of whom have diligently applied to Wyoming over the last 10+ years.

For purposes of giving an example of how this outfitter pool might impact Wyoming resident hunters, I provide the ten-year experiment from my home state of Montana, where we had an outfitter pool of non-resident tags that was eventually overturned by a citizens ballot initiative. During that period of outfitter set asides, leasing by outfitters increased dramatically, as expected, with most of the hunter displacement impacting resident hunters. That leasing also made it difficult for our public access program, the Block Management Program, similar to the Wyoming HMA/WIHA program, to compete with the new stream of dollars redirected to the outfitting industry.

I understand and expect that Wyoming will do what it feels is best for their state, and I support that effort. My purpose in writing is to share with you my opposition to splitting the non-resident tag allocation into outfitter/self-guided pools.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Thanks,

Campbell Black

New Zealand

021 030 9461

As a resident of Wyoming, I am writing because of some of the topics being discussed by the Wyoming Wildlife Task Force. My greatest concern is with the outfitter pool. I am proud to live in Wyoming because of our unparalleled public lands and wildlife resources. I want nonresidents of all backgrounds to have equal opportunity in enjoying what Wyoming has to offer. Setting a significant portion of NR tags for an outfitter pool effectively puts the Wyoming experience beyond the grasp of the average working class citizen. I am involved with hunting nonprofits and internet forums where people from all across the country (and internationally) express their desire to visit Wyoming for its hunting and accessible lands. Many of these people budget for years for a single trip to our state.

I believe deeply in the North American Model of conservation and am therefore uncomfortable with monetizing tags in this way. I empathize with Wyoming outfitters trying to make a living, but I think providing good customer service is all that is needed to attract business given our wealth of wildlife.

I do appreciate the Task Force's commitment to advocating for the resident hunter.

Best,

Ryan Caillet

607 S 24th St Laramie, Wyoming

Dear members of the Wyoming Wildlife Task Force,

I am writing to you today to express some thoughts on current topics of discussion, as you move towards final recommendations. I am writing to you as a non-resident hunter. I fully understand the primary scope of your mission is to reconcile issues for resident hunters, which is what I will primarily be speaking to today.

I want to provide a brief introduction. I attended the University of Wyoming in the early 90's. I have hunted and fished in Wyoming. I also have worked for almost 25 years in the fish and wildlife management field, both for Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, and Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife. I am an avid hunter and angler.

First, I want you to understand I am keenly aware of a state's desire and obligation to address resident hunter and angler concerns. I am not surprised Wyoming resident hunters desire a larger percentage of limited entry deer, elk, and antelope tags. A 90/10 allocation split was a long held normal in Montana, and I think it is entirely reasonable for Wyoming residents to implement the same.

The idea that causes me the greatest concern is the outfitter set aside allocation. I have heard that up to 50% of the non-resident tag allocations may potentially go outfitter clients. This is problematic for both the run of the mill non-resident hunter but can also have lasting and unintended consequences for the resident hunter.

When I worked in southeast Montana as a Game Warden, one of my responsibilities was to identify properties for enrollment in Block Management (equivalent to Access Yes). Some of these properties were owned by absentee owners. Number of absentee landowners increased every year I worked in Montana, and I would guess Wyoming is experiencing the same issue.

I distinctly remember several conversations with ranch managers in my attempts to enroll the properties in a public hunting program so the state would have better access to manage a burgeoning elk herd in the area. Several of the absentee landowners liked to hunt. They could leverage a better deal for themselves, family, and friends by leasing to an outfitter. The outfitter could then provide them with guaranteed tags that were valid anywhere they hunted with the outfitter. This then provided an impetus for the outfitters to lease as much land as possible, given the guaranteed client base.

Not only did the resident hunters of Montana lose potential properties for public hunting, but they also lost existing properties as ranches opted for more money via an outfitter lease.

I would strongly encourage the members of the task force to consider this as you move forward. I can directly speak to seemingly benign decisions having unintended consequences. I am not saying this is a 100% probability for Wyoming, but I do believe history has shown what the result will be with guaranteed outfitter allocations.

Wyoming has been blessed with wonderful and wild landscapes, and an abundance of wildlife. I trust all of you are holding this in highest regard as you move forward in your considerations. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these issues.

Respectfully,

Jason Snyder

Dear Mr. Nesvik,

I am writing to you concerning the proposals that are currently under consideration by the members of the Wyoming Wildlife Task Force and specifically would like to comment on two items:

1. Proposal to move the allocation of limited entry elk, deer, and antelope tags to a 90R/10NR split - I support Wyoming doing whatever it thinks is best with respect to this proposed allocation change. While as a non-resident (Ohio) I have greatly enjoyed Wyoming's generosity with respect to tag allocation to NR's, I fully understand that given the large increase in demand for these types of tags, Wyoming residents may feel the need to "play defense" and set aside an additional portion of these tags for its residents. If that is what Wyoming feels best serves its residents, I support its decision. I am hopeful, however, that current tag allocation for tags such as the current "General Elk Tag" (soon to be a region specific tag I gather), cow elk tags, and doe deer/antelope tags may be left alone. Your state is such a phenomenal place to visit and provides many of us non-resident hunters with a chance to support your wildlife conservation efforts, visit some truly wonderful country, and patronize Wyoming businesses during our time there. The types of tags that I reference above seem to be a way for us non-resident hunters to participate in a way that is perhaps less intrusive to Wyoming residents. As an accommodation to Wyoming leaving existing tag allocations for those types of tags alone, one way for Wyoming to benefit from leaving such tag allocations alone is to raise those tag fees to a value that it perceives will more fairly benefit the state and its wildlife conservation efforts. I believe that many non-residents would be happy to support such tag fee increases - I know that I would. In any event, I will support whatever WY feels is best in this regard.

2. Proposal to allocate 50% of NR tag allocation to NR clients of WY outfitters - I respectfully oppose this proposal for three reasons. First, I believe that this proposal will ultimately negatively impact Wyoming residents. Such a tag set aside for outfitters will ultimately encourage the monetization of Wyoming wildlife and lead to increased private land leases by outfitters, pushing Wyoming residents out of formerly accessible property and reducing resident access and opportunity. Second, this proposal penalizes non-resident DIY hunters, many of whom have invested materially in WY conservation efforts over the years through preference point purchases and who are unable to afford the services of outfitters. Third, this proposal would result in

government putting its finger on the scales in such a way as to attempt to manipulate market forces that would otherwise work in a healthy manner. As a business owner myself, I never expected to receive any assistance from government or any other party with respect to gathering business. The success of my business depends entirely upon the quality of the services that we provide rather than from governmental action that steers business to us. If we do good work, we thrive. If we don't, we lose business (appropriately). Good outfitters will have no trouble obtaining clients for their business from interested NRs that draw tags without the need for government intervention. Outfitters who are of lesser quality will have a more difficult time obtaining clients but that's a good thing. It benefits Wyoming to have only outfitters that are of high quality operating within its borders. Like any other business, good businesses will continue to get business and thrive. Businesses of lesser quality will not and that benefits Wyoming.

Thank you very much for considering my comments and for the hard work that you're doing on the committee.

Sincerely,

Dave Kearns

Dear Task Force Member:

I am writing about proposals currently being discussed by the Wyoming Task Force, which I see you are listed as a member. Mostly, I am commenting on a proposal to allocate up to 50% of the non-resident tag allocation to those who would hunt with an outfitter.

I understand why Wyoming residents want to reduce the non-resident allocations to 10%. I support Wyoming doing what it feels is best for the allocation between residents and non-residents. That 10% allocation is what many states allocate to non-residents. My home state of NV has similar allocations to non-residents.

What I am writing is to oppose setting aside up to half of the non-resident tag quota to an outfitter pool. I am a DIY hunter and there are many like myself that cannot or choose not use the services of an outfitter. Allocating a large portion of the non-resident tags to a specific group negatively impacts the majority of non-resident, most of whom have applied to Wyoming over the last 17 year that the preference point system has been in place for NR's.

I understand and expect that Wyoming will do what it feels is best for their state, and I support that effort. My purpose in writing is to share my opposition to splitting the non-resident tag allocation into outfitter/self guided pools.

Sincerely,

Brian,

As a member of the Wyoming Wildlife Task Force, I would like to inform you on my stance on potential recommendations on future allocations of hunting licenses. As a non-resident, I have hunted Wyoming one time in the past, successfully harvesting a cow elk. However, I have two trips planned for this fall: first a trip with my brother on an antelope hunt and a November elk hunt that my dad has a tag for. My impression of Wyoming is that it is one of the best managed states regarding western hunting, and I look forward to hunting in Wyoming many times over my lifetime.

However, with the recent push to 90/10 on the big 5 I have heard that there are discussions to move Deer, Antelope, and Elk to the 90/10 as well. With the talk of 90/10 I have heard that the Wyoming Outfitter and Guides Association would agree to support the move if ~50% of the non-resident pool is “allocated” to the non-residents that are outfitted/guided. I DO NOT SUPPORT An OUTFITTER POOL/ALLOCATION. If passed, I am concerned about the potential loss of hunting opportunities for the non-resident, along with decreased access for the resident hunter.

If the 90/10 is needed to support a growing hunter population of Wyoming that is one thing. However, to essentially subsidize a group of businesses and reduce the total pool of opportunity from the average blue-collar is something I DO NOT SUPPORT. Wyoming has historically been a very conservative state. But if done this “hand-out” is essentially a very liberal gift of guaranteed money for these businesses and supports the privatization of a public asset (elk/deer/antelope). The wilderness restriction for non-resident hunters is already a gift to the outfitters and guides, so please ensure Wyoming does not give more liberal handouts to these businesses. Below are some additional items to consider:

Reasons to not allow an Outfitter Pool:

- If a guaranteed revenue stream is provided to outfitters (aka. allocation of the non-resident pool) outfitters general revenue risk reduces. With this reduced risk, outfitters will be more willing to increase leased hunting ground and increase lease costs. This inherently will reduce the access to for both resident and non-resident hunters alike. As more land is leased, the remaining public lands will become more and more crowded reducing hunter satisfaction. In addition, this may reduce the effectiveness and/or increase prices to maintain ACCESS YES properties (walk in hunting).
- I support free business, and if the outfitters are needed in the normal demand/supply environment their businesses will continue. There should not be any free hand-outs in this supply/demand equation.

Concerns for 90/10 Allocation for Elk/Deer/Antelope:

- With a reduction of non-resident tag holders, what impact will this have on small businesses within the rural communities. With currently 20% of deer and antelope tags and 16% of elk tags allocated to non-residents, there would be a ~50% decline of out-of-state hunters. This would imply a ~50% reduction of spending that these out-of-state hunters bring to the Wyoming economy. The small diners and hotels that are reliant on hunters during the fall months to provide a steady income may be decimated if they lose 50% of their income over a ~4 month period (not including any scouting trips many tag holders)
 - In addition, if there is an “Outfitter Pool” this would only increase the reduced income to local businesses as many outfitters provide food and lodging. Maybe the spend would be the same here, but the number of businesses benefiting from the income will reduce; leaving local dinners and hotels to suffer.
- As I assume any recommendation coming from the Task Force would have to be revenue neutral, remaining tag holders or applicants would see increased prices. How far do we have to go on pricing? I know there is sufficient demand today, however as prices increase, we are moving to the European Model. This will only reduce opportunity for our middle to low-class families across the country. Over-time I fear our western hunts will be priced so high the rich will be the only to afford them. Over years, this decreased opportunity will destroy opportunity and lower our total hunter base which totally contradicts most of our outdoor industry looking to support increased hunter participation.
- Looking at current demand of non-residents seems to be very short sighted, as I am very nervous for the future generations of hunters. I fear my kids and grandkids will not have the hunting opportunities that I have today. Sadly, I feel like I do not have the opportunities that my father had, unless of course I have the funds to buy hunts such as sheep auction tags.

As a summary, please be very thoughtful on any change to tag allocations to ensure your local small businesses are not impacted and future generations of hunters do not lose opportunities (by reduced tags or increased prices). In addition, please ensure you do not support a free hand-out to the guides and outfitters but voting “NO” to any Outfitter pool tag allocation.

Thank you,

Tyler Kiedrowski

I’m deeply troubled by the Wyoming Wildlife Taskforce pursuit of allocating Wyoming elk, deer and antelope tags with a 90/10 split, with the prospect of further allotting non-resident tags as priority to guides and outfitters first.

I believe the current statutes set forth for tag allocation are fair and equitable for all. In turn, I suggest the Taskforce review leftover tags taking priority first to residents of the state before fulfilling additional non-residents tags.

Please consider the lessons learned from other western states. Allocating tags to guides and outfitters is the privatization of natural resources. Additional lands will be leased and controlled by guides and outfitters. The result is residents of the state and non-residents alike suffer while a small minority group benefit with captive wealth from the privatization of natural resources. This does not follow the tenants set forth in the North American Conservation Model.

Lastly, as a non-resident public land hunter of Wyoming, I support the recreation and tourism economy in the state of Wyoming. The beneficiaries are residents; hotel owners, multitude of store owners, restaurants owners, Wyoming Game & Fish, etc. the list goes on and on. When non-residents are forced to utilize guides and outfitters you are stifling the majority from the economic benefits. It only benefits the guides and outfitters and puts less dollars in the pockets of other Wyoming business owners. Take the designated wilderness regulation into consideration. Guides and outfitters already have a feather in their hat for a "captive" general public.

I selfishly do not support 90/10 tag allocation for residents and non-resident for elk, deer and antelope.

I wholeheartedly do not support the privatization of natural resources through guide and outfitter tag allotments. Everyone loses except one shareholder group. Please do not support this!

Please forward to other Taskforce members. Thank you for your time and efforts to serve your communities and state.

Best,

Travis

Dear Sir,

I strongly disagree with the 90/10 tag allotment that Wyoming is discussing. The residents get a ton of tags each year. Many families get a crazy number of tags. 3 deer tags 3 Elk tags and 3 Antelope tags per hunting member plus a bonus big 5 tag every once and awhile. It called greed. Of course we out of staters pay more then 70% of the budget annually. Wyoming made the sheep, Bison and moose tags not obtainable for us. I lost many points when they out priced me. The lost revenue to the whole State because we are having a harder time getting tags is huge. We spend some crazy amount money compared to residents, I have heard it to be 8 to 1 for every dollar. This

is money that is spent in small towns for goods and services. IE, restaurants, fuel, snacks, hotels, auto repair, sporting goods, butcher shops, horse rentals, guide service and so on and so on. A resident buys tags at \$37.00/\$22.00 antelope and a nonresident spends \$614.00/\$34.00 special antelope and doe. Then the nonresident spends many more dollars employing many Wyoming residents with all the goods and services. The people of Wyoming are losing revenue that is needed to support their families. I have donated many funds for the Rocky Mountain ELK foundation , Mule deer and so on. Yes we pay federal taxes as well for Federal lands. As you can see other States see this happening and are getting on the bandwagon. Where and when does this end ? Many hunters that are Residents in "name a State" also put in for other States. If each State follows suit then we have a so called war on out of Stater. We are an unrepresented group that pays the lions share. I would hope for all nonresident tags stop being sold for all the States for one year. When the legislators see how important we are to the States Budget and conservation efforts I would hope they would treat us better. I am very upset with this trend after buying points in many states for over 20 plus years. Thanks for your time. Anthony Naples

Dear Ms. Ruckle,

I attempted to submit my comments via the website, but I never got a response that they were submitted. I find this upcoming meeting to be of the utmost importance regarding the issues being addressed, and I want to make sure you have my comments.

Please know that I am a Wyoming resident.

Regarding 90/10:

I believe the system should be left status quo, unless ALL units go 90/10. The TF certainly should not be giving 40% of SD tags to outfitters while residents get status quo in SD areas.

Regarding SD/HD areas and waiting periods:

I find this proposal very troubling. I haven't drawn my bull elk tag in 8-9 years and it has approximately 35% draw odds on average. Therefore, it would be considered SD. If this proposal passes, the TF is going to flood units with 30%+ draw odds with successful HD hunters who are on waiting periods. That would make areas like mine harder to draw. The TF would be favoring HD hunters over SD hunters.

To be clear, I am against waiting periods. HD hunters know they are putting in for difficult units, and they choose to put in for those areas. Let them live with their decisions.

Regarding 40% of outfitter tags being set-aside:

The TF should not pass this recommendation. First, the State of Wyoming should not be giving a state resource to an industry that pays absolutely nothing for it. Second, there are outfitters in this state that are booked out for years without set-asides. They are booked because they provide an exceptional service to their clients. By supplementing an entire industry, the TF would be giving life-support to poor business owners. Finally, this proposal would favor the Haves over the Have Nots. Hunting should be open to all. Not just people who can pay for an outfitter every year.

Regarding Comment # 1 and Comment # 6:

I am in favoring of passing the proposal for only one Type 1 antelope license for residents and favoring residents in the leftover draw. They both seem like reasonable proposals.

Off-the-cuff ideas:

How about proposing 85/15 in every DEA unit without outfitter set-asides and no waiting periods. This would give WY residents more opportunity for the most part (minus elk), and it wouldn't be slashing NR opportunities significantly. Plus, it would give outfitters enough clientele to continue supporting their way of life.

How about proposing residents choose deer or elk when it comes to LQ and leaving splits status quo? If a resident chooses to put in for LQ elk, they could only hunt general deer. If they put in for LQ deer, then they could only hunt general elk. This would significantly increase resident draw odds for both deer and elk LQ units, and it would allow residents to hunt both every year.

How about proposing making all deer and elk units LQ throughout the state. Stop allowing hunters to "shoot for the moon" and use general as a back-up. By proposing this, hunters would be forced to choose the best option first and would increase draw odds across the state. Plus, in theory it should allow the G&F to better manage each herd.

My point being, there are other ideas the TF should be considering. Maybe my ideas are lacking in complete thought, but there are other ideas that should be considered.

In closing, maybe pumping the brakes would be the best course of action. Allow other options to come forward and have public comments. The 90/10 DEA issue is not so that needs to be solved in the next two months. If you would like to discuss my thoughts in more detail, I would be willing to provide my telephone number. Thank you for your time and being a volunteer.

Shane J. Rinker

Casper, WY

Good Evening Elissa,

I wanted to share my opinion for the Task force. I am 51 years old and live in Minnesota. I have only had 3 hunting licenses in Wyoming in my lifetime but have traveled to Wyoming at least once a year since I was 16, sometimes multiple times a year for many reasons backpacking, family vacations, Wyo Rodeo, visiting friends, many other reasons. I know how important tourism is for Wyoming and love the state and what it stands for. If the non resident tags are reduced it will impact the amount of non residents entering the state outside the prime summer tourism season. This would have a large impact on motels, restaurants, gas stations, grocery stores, taxidermists, meat processing, and on and on. I have a friend who owns a motel in Buffalo WY and is concerned about the repercussions this could have on her motel during the fall season. I hope you will please consider the No Action in this matter. Thank you for your time.

Brian

Hello Ms. Ruckle,

I am a non-resident of Wyoming that applies for Elk and Antelope tags in your state. As a member of the Wildlife Task Force, you are in consideration of allocation of 90% of the big game tags to residents and half of those to private business. Here are my and my peers concerns:

1. In no government agency should that agency take from the people and give to private business to enrich a special interest private business.
2. The control of tags will result in lease up of large amounts of land reducing access for especially Wyoming residents (see Montana).
3. Half of non-residents are not able to afford outfitter costs. This will slash travel and tourism revenue (see Montana).
4. The 10% opportunity for me as a non-resident is so small - why would I invest in Wyoming? I will go elsewhere.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Mark Scholze

Wisconsin

Elissa,

As a member of the Wyoming Wildlife Task Force, I would like to inform you on my stance on potential recommendations on future allocations of hunting licenses. As a non-resident, I have hunted Wyoming one time in the past, successfully harvesting a

cow elk. However, I have two trips planned for this fall: first a trip with my brother on an antelope hunt and a November elk hunt that my dad has a tag for. My impression of Wyoming is that it is one of the best managed states regarding western hunting, and I look forward to hunting in Wyoming many times over my lifetime.

However, with the recent push to 90/10 on the big 5 I have heard that there are discussions to move Deer, Antelope, and Elk to the 90/10 as well. With the talk of 90/10 I have heard that the Wyoming Outfitter and Guides Association would agree to support the move if ~50% of the non-resident pool is “allocated” to the non-residents that are outfitted/guided. I DO NOT SUPPORT An OUTFITTER POOL/ALLOCATION. If passed, I am concerned about the potential loss of hunting opportunities for the non-resident, along with decreased access for the resident hunter.

If the 90/10 is needed to support a growing hunter population of Wyoming that is one thing. However, to essentially subsidize a group of businesses and reduce the total pool of opportunity from the average blue-collar is something I DO NOT SUPPORT. Wyoming has historically been a very conservative state. But if done this “hand-out” is essentially a very liberal gift of guaranteed money for these businesses and supports the privatization of a public asset (elk/deer/antelope). The wilderness restriction for non-resident hunters is already a gift to the outfitters and guides, so please ensure Wyoming does not give more liberal handouts to these businesses. Below are some additional items to consider:

Reasons to not allow an Outfitter Pool:

- If a guaranteed revenue stream is provided to outfitters (aka. allocation of the non-resident pool) outfitters general revenue risk reduces. With this reduced risk, outfitters will be more willing to increase leased hunting ground and increase lease costs. This inherently will reduce the access to for both resident and non-resident hunters alike. As more land is leased, the remaining public lands will become more and more crowded reducing hunter satisfaction. In addition, this may reduce the effectiveness and/or increase prices to maintain ACCESS YES properties (walk in hunting).
- I support free business, and if the outfitters are needed in the normal demand/supply environment their businesses will continue. There should not be any free hand-outs in this supply/demand equation.

Concerns for 90/10 Allocation for Elk/Deer/Antelope:

- With a reduction of non-resident tag holders, what impact will this have on small businesses within the rural communities. With currently 20% of deer and antelope tags and 16% of elk tags allocated to non-residents, there would be a ~50% decline of out-of-state hunters. This would imply a ~50% reduction of

spending that these out-of-state hunters bring to the Wyoming economy. The small diners and hotels that are reliant on hunters during the fall months to provide a steady income may be decimated if they lose 50% of their income over a ~4 month period (not including any scouting trips many tag holders)

- In addition, if there is an “Outfitter Pool” this would only increase the reduced income to local businesses as many outfitters provide food and lodging. Maybe the spend would be the same here, but the number of businesses benefiting from the income will reduce; leaving local dinners and hotels to suffer.
- As I assume any recommendation coming from the Task Force would have to be revenue neutral, remaining tag holders or applicants would see increased prices. How far do we have to go on pricing? I know there is sufficient demand today, however as prices increase, we are moving to the European Model. This will only reduce opportunity for our middle to low-class families across the country. Over-time I fear our western hunts will be priced so high the rich will be the only to afford them. Over years, this decreased opportunity will destroy opportunity and lower our total hunter base which totally contradicts most of our outdoor industry looking to support increased hunter participation.
- Looking at current demand of non-residents seems to be very short sighted, as I am very nervous for the future generations of hunters. I fear my kids and grandkids will not have the hunting opportunities that I have today. Sadly, I feel like I do not have the opportunities that my father had, unless of course I have the funds to buy hunts such as sheep auction tags.

As a summary, please be very thoughtful on any change to tag allocations to ensure your local small businesses are not impacted and future generations of hunters do not lose opportunities (by reduced tags or increased prices). In addition, please ensure you do not support a free hand-out to the guides and outfitters but voting “NO” to any Outfitter pool tag allocation.

Thank you,

Tyler Kiedrowski

Hi Tod,

I am working on getting out to Wyoming for a couple hunts and based on what I have read it sounds like the direction Wyoming is going is going to make it much more expensive for me to come out and enjoy your great state.

I travel through Wyoming every year heading for Colorado for OTC elk hunts. Each year I have spent a night in Wyoming in a hotel, bought dinner, fueled up etc.. I have been putting in for points to get into hunting your state now for a few years, something like 5 or so, so I know I am not as heavily vested in this like folks accumulating high

points. My goal is to get into a few good hunts before my knees go and I had decided on Wyoming being the place I wanted to go, in large part because of the opportunity you offered a non-resident to come out and do it on their own.

I understand and support the folks in Wyoming being able to decide how many tags they will give to non-residents. Where I am getting concerned and why I am writing is that the changes you all are looking at are going to make it harder as someone who would like to do the hunt on his own to do it without hiring an outfitter. Sounds to me like the plan you are looking at is going to award 40-50% of the non-resident tags to the outfitters. I don't hold anything against those folks but to me this means those folks get a guaranteed client base and those of us who want to do it on our own have to compete for an even smaller number of tags or we pay the outfitters.

I have to think this might result in more land being locked down by leases and thus reducing the likelihood of gaining access to private land too for those of us who try to do it on our own.

I went out to Wyoming when I was a kid (not hunting) with my Dad on Muley and Antelope hunts and the hotels and towns were busy with people coming out to hunt. That sure doesn't seem to be the case today and I wonder if you aren't going to shut down a little bit more business for the stores, restaurants and lodging folks as a result of some of these decisions.

Thanks for taking a look at my comments.

Chris Spierings

Hello Tod Larson,

Is the Task Force recommending that Non residents will get only 10% of available tags? For elk, deer & antelope?

If this is true.....

Why don't you recommend that 30 % of these tags go to residences, 30% to non residents, 30% go to non residents that use outfitters...

Then the remaining 10% go to the mobility impaired or youth....

1) Just think of the \$\$\$ you would bring in w/ all those non resident licenses...

you could even lower the nonresident license price & still triple the income for the game & fish department....

2) Be the first western state to actually make a change in the license department & Triple the \$\$\$ revenue....(All the other states around you are going to a 10% nonresident tag availability)

Don't just keep this to yourself,

Share it w/ all the others.

Thank you for your time,

Arthur Stritzel

Life member of RMEF

15 year Wyoming Elk hunter

(Rodney Wise)

As a resident of Wyoming I support the 90/10 for elk deer and antelope and support the 3 year waiting period for any one who draws a LQ type 1 2 or 9 tag. The 90/10 does very little for resident draw odds but the 3 year waiting period does help the draw odds for the mid tier area but really does not help the very hard to draw LQ areas... i do not support set aside outfitter tags at all as far as I am concerned the wilderness law is enough welfare... Transferable landowner tags would only be good for private land only.. Deeded land only not area wide tags....

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to respectfully suggest a consideration in the preference point system for the elderly. I am a nonresident that is 81 years old. I have been hunting in Wyoming for 60 years. I have 20 preference points for a sheep tag, 3 preference points for a deer tag and 2 preference points for an elk tag. I apply every year and have done so for most of my life. As you are aware, hunting tags for nonresidents for all species are getting more difficult to obtain with each passing year.

The Rocky Mountain Bighorn is the only sheep I need to complete a Grand Slam. As you know, in recent years in most of the sheep hunting areas nonresidents generally draw a tag with 20-23 preference points. I am in good health and was optimistic that I would have drawn a tag in the next two or three years with the current nonresident tag allocations and was also optimistic that I would still have the physical abilities for the hunt as I have no health issues.

It is my understanding however that nonresidents have been receiving 20% of the moose and sheep tags. This year I learned that in beginning in 2023 nonresidents will only receive 10% of the moose and sheep tags. Statistically, with the present system that change likely means that I won't draw a tag for several more years.

At 81, every year is a gift! I plan to hunt well past the century mark but as you know, we have little control of our life expectancy.

I have read about the plan to increase the odds in the random draw for sheep and moose by squaring the preference points thereby giving those with more preference points a greater chance in the random draw. But it is also my understanding that change doesn't become effective for four more years.

One of my hunting buddies is Mr. Ray Ingle. Mr. Ingle had a heart transplant roughly 3 years ago and has returned to hunting camp since his transplant. Mr. Ingle is 76 years old and has 21 preference points for a moose tag. He hopes to be able to hunt moose when he finally draws a tag. Mr. Ingle was looking forward to drawing a tag in the next year or two. But, as in my case, his goal posts have been moved further away.

My point is this – some of us are getting old, have participated in the preference point system for many years and have now had the goal posts moved significantly at least for moose and sheep. I expect the same thing to happen for other species such as deer and elk. I would like for the board to consider making changes in the preference point system to move the goal posts a little nearer for the older hunters as they age and improve the opportunity to draw a tag in a reasonable length of time.

My suggestion is this. Perhaps, the commission could make allowance for age by adopting a policy that is age related. For example, after an applicant has reached a certain age (perhaps 75 years old) and still wants to apply and hunt, he would become eligible to purchase 2 preference points per year. Likewise, after the applicant reached another milestone (perhaps 80 years of age) and still wants to apply and hunt, he would become eligible to purchase 3 preference points per year. Again, after perhaps 85 years of age, the applicant would become eligible to purchase 4 preference points per year. I doubt that many would achieve these goals but what a blessing if some did. I don't know of any of my acquaintances that have hunted into their 80's but I believe many could be encouraged to do so. I believe something like this would help.

Thank you for reading and considering this matter.

Kindest personal regards

Tod,

I have given my comments below to each of the 5 different comment options on the website. Please see below:

Comment #2 and Comment #4: It is interesting that the weighing of this new category of High Demand (HD) game units only weighs "Resident Demand". Has anyone thought about party / family hunting groups? Have you thought about residents living in the middle of this hunting unit on the home ranch that gets landowner tags? Will this impact non-resident hunters?

I do not believe this is necessary. I understand that the new draw bonus point system will square your points. It sounds like this may have already been decided. I have been

involved with that here in Spokane and also in Montana draws. I believe this is not a good system. I know a lot of people who have become frustrated and quit the draw in both states because of the system.

There are two major problems that exist outside the “draw” that need to be addressed and fixed.

1. All of the “Drawing services” that charge non-residents a fee to put in applications by power of attorney flood the higher demand units. All state wildlife agencies love this as the bonus point revenue has become a big part of their budget. Should Wyoming regulate this more? This is mostly non-resident bonus point income that will greatly decrease if regulations get too onerous. Let the hunter make the application, not some mass production application service. Eliminate the power of attorney applications.

2. Game populations and trophy quality are not what they were 20-30 years ago. Tag numbers keep getting reduced. The RESOURCE Wyoming has to offer has become the problem. Politics prevail over wildlife biology. Doe and Cow tags are offered up to pacify resident hunters. This is only a band aid or pacifier to get them some meat on the table. The target objective population of game established by Fish and Game is used to control unrest with the hunters. Many hunters remember the game populations and available trophy animals of 30 years ago. That is the target population they want to see.

Trophy quality bulls and bucks come only with increased numbers of animals. This cannot be accomplished with the “political” wildlife biology. Solve this problem and number of available tags will increase again, not decrease. More animals will allow bucks/bulls to mature.

The even greater problem is the predation problem from Wolves, Grizzly and Cougars. At some point, Wyoming will have to stand up against the Federal Government and take control of the problem.

I do not believe it is necessary to establish H.D. units based on “resident” draw odds nor to make successful applicant’s wait three years after drawing.

Comment #3: Reduce the allocation of tags to 90% residents and 10% non-residents in the better hunting units which have been labeled high demand units. This was done to the sheep allocations. I now have 22 sheep points and feel that the Game Department took my point money and abandoned me. I am 75 and do not have much hope of actually drawing a sheep tag.

I know lots of hunters that have many points for Elk (like 12-14 points). It would be an injustice to change to a 90 / 10 split. They are obviously wanting to hunt in the HD areas or they would not have accumulated that many points.

The splits are already really bad for non-residents at 80 / 20 and 84 / 16. To go to 90 / 10 would be devastating not only for the non-resident hunters which would only give

63% of what they now receive, but would have a huge negative economic impact on every community.

It feels like this 90 /10 split is a foregone conclusion that is yielding to the political pressure from resident hunters. This is only natural. Many members of the task force are greatly affected by their professions: elected officials; outfitters; taxidermists etc. that can't help but be influenced by those forces. That pressure was not there 20-30 years ago when trophy quality game was more plentiful and more tags were issued.

To change to a 90 / 10 split only kicks the can down the road. Local economies dependent upon out of state hunters suffer. Non-resident hunters will be reduced by 36%. Resident hunters will only see a slight improvement that will only be temporary if trophy quality and game availability is not improved. The problem is still coming back to the real issue – trophy quality and game populations. What about out of state's hunter's kids getting a hunting opportunity?

I have enclosed a model from the Alaska Moose Federation that explains a study by Alaska Fish and Game of the increase in herd size from one cow moose. It is a game numbers problem we have. Bucks and bulls need a few years to get trophy size which means a larger herd like was there 30 years ago. You can't make them appear by a bunch of drawing regulations.

The current preference point system has become mathematically insolvent for those in the middle with say 6-10 points, but more so for those with fewer points below them. This is dependent upon their age also. Going to a square the points system is not fair to the hunters that have been unsuccessful for 12-14 years and are close to drawing a premium tag.

I encourage the task force to evaluate implementing the resident preference point system on a stand-alone basis and not convolute the out of state elk, deer and antelope preference point system. The residents need something that will work the best with all you have learned. The residents have the bulk of the tags which makes it a little easier. If a 90 / 10 split is approved, the out of state system will make HD odds almost a moot point.

Politics are everywhere today. Landowners pressure WF&G to say this is the target objective for elk numbers in game unit X. They use this target to placate landowners and stand up to hunter's complaints on say mature bull numbers or ?? We need leadership, not political wildlife management. Attempts to make everyone happy will end up making everyone unhappy. When will the can get kicked to the end of the road? Increasing game populations to provide a better resource is the answer. Let bulls and bucks get a chance to mature. Find a way like Colorado's ranching for wildlife that will help the landowner get some revenue for the wildlife they feed.

Comment 5 Outfitter Nonresidential Drawing Pool:

Ok to clarify this the elk tags will be reduced for non-residents from 16% to 10% (a 37% reduction) and additionally 40% of the 10% nonresident quota or 4% of the remaining 10% would go to the outfitters. I believe this leaves 6% of the tags for hunters like my friends that have 10-12 or more preference points. Totally unfair.

Outfitters already have a monopoly on nonresident hunters in wilderness lands which I believe are the majority of the higher demand elk units. If this is implemented, outfitters would have a financial incentive to lease more ranches shutting out resident and nonresident hunters. This is a very bad proposal that is obviously aimed to assist a special interest group. In 2022, there were 16 elk tags (16%) available in a unit. This proposal of 90 / 10 with outfitter allocation would reduce the available tags to 10 of which the outfitter gets 4. Drawing odds would go down the drain and most hunters would ask for a refund of their preference points and give up. This proposal benefits the wealthy hunters. I do not believe this has been thought through enough as to other negative ramifications. I can't believe that this outfitter license pool even made it to your 5 items. If all 5 of the proposals are approved, this one is like throwing the baby out with the bathwater. Wyoming will look a lot like Europe where only the wealthy that can afford to hire an outfitter will be able to hunt.

There are a lot of very complicated factors involved and many different moving pieces as follows:

1. Financial repercussions to the Fish and Game budget which I have heard may rely on out-of state hunters for up to 50% of its revenue. I don't know if this is correct, but I urge all task force members to weigh this repercussion.
2. Preference points have been in place for nonresidents for a long time. I have heard hunters I know say that Wyoming should refund the say 10 sheep points that they have.
3. I believe there is a very real danger that some attorney who needs some business may organize and file a class action lawsuit to go after paid in preference points. The harder the bear gets poked the more this could happen.
4. If the resident hunters want a cow tag that is leftover then they should have to put in for it in the applications as a second choice and they would have it. Many out of state hunters will only shoot a cow in their lifetime and depend on these licenses. Remember the little guy.
5. Implement adjusting of the target / objective animal populations in Higher Demand Units to allow more bucks and bulls to mature to trophy age. This would reduce the number of cow tags in order for more bulls to be born of which only a few will make it to trophy age. See the Alaska F&G study attached.

6. I can fish or hike in a wilderness, but I can't hunt there. The outfitters already have this. What is the thought for more allocated tags?

In closing, I want to repeat myself if I may. The resource is the key to the whole equation. The problem here is reduced trophy quality and game numbers and the politics thereof. Great and stronger leadership is more important now than any time in the past. I appreciate the great state of Wyoming and each and every one of the members on the task force. I urge you to weigh the comments I have sent in as coming from someone that has a viewpoint influenced by where he is and where he has been just as each and every one of you has been influenced by where you are. Wyoming has the total authority to regulate the game resource within its state even if it lives on Federal or private lands. I urge you to evaluate the matters before you as there may be serious unforeseen consequences that may backfire. I apologize if I come across negative. I have hunted in Wyoming for 30 years and have seen a decline in trophy quality, number of tags etc. that many of you have also seen.

Please give a hard copy to all of the task force members for their review as well.

Sincerely,

Rich Dahm

Dear Wyoming Taskforce members,

My name is Matthew Young, and I want to begin by thanking you for your dedication to Wyoming's wildlife and our hunting heritage. Managing your state's wildlife resources and allocating hunting opportunities represent a tremendous challenge. Thank you for taking on the responsibility!

I understand that before the Taskforce rest a number of different issues and proposals. As a nonresident who loves to return to Wyoming with tag in hand, I wanted to express the following:

Wyoming certainly has been generous to nonresidents over the years with their tag allocations. Transitioning goat/sheep/moose to a 90%/10% allocation structure places your state in line with others in the West. If residents choose to move deer/elk/antelope in the same direction, I honestly understand the sentiment.

What I am hoping the Taskforce can refrain from doing, however, is further complicating the nonresidents' hunting opportunity by requiring nonresidents to contract with an outfitter for a certain percentage of tags. I have nothing against outfitters. In fact, some very good friends of mine operate in that industry. But strategies like outfitter-sponsored tags run contrary to the tenets of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. Please don't undermine the doctrine that serves as the global model for wildlife conservation.

Furthermore, such profit-seeking endeavors, like outfitter-sponsored tags, will produce unintended consequences, even for Wyoming resident hunters. Your state's WIA/HMA program is the finest private land access program in the nation. No other comes close in my opinion. But turning nonresident tag acquisition into a money stream will complicate the state's ability to open up private access for resident and nonresident hunters alike. Montana residents, a few years ago, got rid of their own nonresident outfitter-sponsored tag program through a citizen's ballot initiative. Much of the concern centered around loss of access for resident hunters. Please don't make the same mistake. Don't hold back the public's access to a public resource to appease a private business owner. Please keep Wyoming's wildlife public.

Thanks again for your time and passion for hunting and wildlife. We appreciate you.

Sincerely,

Matthew Young
