

Exhibit B

**Public Correspondence received as of
September 22, 2011**

From: Sherry Willis [mailto:sherryw@centurytel.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2011 11:58 AM
To: odfw.info@state.or.us
Subject:

September 8, 2011

To Whom it may concern:

I would like you to consider changes in the hunting and fishing disability law.

I am a quadriplegic and I qualify for the disabled permit under (1d). I cannot hold or shoot a gun but under the law I have to be the one to wound the animal. I would like to see this law changed so that a person that cannot hold or shoot a gun could have someone else shoot his/her animal for them.

The way the law currently reads, only a blind person can have someone else shoot for them. (1d, 1e). I am allowed to purchase a license and tag but not to shoot. Please correct this discrepancy in the law.

Thank you.

Jamie Brinkley

910 E St

Lebanon, OR 97355

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: Legal Archery Equipment

From: Bob & Pam DeSantis [mailto:pbdesantis@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 11:19 PM

To: odfw.commission@state.or.us

Subject: Legal Archery Equipment

What is the process for putting an archery equipment rule change before the commission ? I have two rulle changes I would like to propose .

1) Change the current ban on the use of mechanical broadheads .

2)Change the current ban on electronics attached to a bow . So that one might use lighted knocks , lighted sights , bow mounted range finder or camera .

As most states allow the use of these items , I feel Oregon should bring their regulations inline with current technology . Any information you can provide on the process would be apperciaed . If these issues are already schedualed before the commision , could you provide me with the dates of any public meetings that adress them .

Thank you for your time .

Robert DeSantis

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: Increase of elk tags

From: ODFW Comments

Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2011 11:43 AM

To: Michelle Tate; Thomas Thornton; Ryan Torland; Don Whittaker

Subject: FW: increase of elk tags

From: Char Gibbs [mailto:dennisgbbs@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 6:29 AM

To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us

Subject: increase of elk tags

Please do not increase the number of tags in the units your last news report listed.

We have a hard enough time finding elk on the public lands and if these tag numbers are increased it certainly will not help. I believe that the ODFW is being pressured by private land owners and these are the same folks that will not allow hunting unless you have deep pockets to pay them. We all ready have cougar and wolf problems so it would not be long until the so called "over management objective" would be met any way.

I really don't like the idea of extending the one season to August to March. Who would gain from this? private land owners only! these elk travel from private to public lands. These elk will be stressed and mortality will certainly come into play.

Please consider the people that can not hunt private lands, not just the private land owners in this issue.Thank you.

Roxann B Borisch

From: p.wenrick@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2011 4:01 PM
To: ODFW Comments
Subject: Grant County Elk hunting 2012

Increased quotas are great, however I would not increase the private land owners 200% **in units (247A1 and 247A2)**. These two hunts allow the taking of "any elk" ...WHICH IS 100% wrong. NO ADDITIONAL BULL ELK SHOULD BE HARVESTED. If you allow private landowners additional tags they should be required to pay ODFW 50% of the fees they charge their clients for bull elk or allowed to take antlerless elk only.

If the private land owners have a problem with elk damage, they should allow the public hunting access without trying to collect additional funds from the hunters. Especially the land owners who having grazing rights on public lands.

Northside

247 increase tags public land +100 tags
247A1-----NO INCREASE
247A2-----NO INCREASE
247D2 increase tags private lands LOD + 100 tags

The 2011 regulations (pg19) LOP tags will be limited to five tags or 10% of the total tags controlled hunt tags, which ever is greater. The ORIGINAL PROPOSAL has the public hunt gaining 100 tags and the LOP tags going up 700 tags.

I don't think this fits the premise of 10% controlled tag rule. Your ratio is off when you are trying to give the LOP program 700 controlled tags.

I think you should make public the LOP tags records for these hunt areas being addressed, see who is trying to drive the train(landowners, interested persons).

Murderers Creek

246A increase tags
246B increase tags
246C increase tags
246 increase tags

I hunted in the WEST Northside unit since the 1980's and had to accumulate numerous years of points before drawing tags. I've seen this unit go downhill in conditions and habitat since I started hunting in the unit in 1980's. In fact I have given up on Northside and will be hunting a different unit henceforth. OREGON hunter since 1960 and a LIFE member in RMEF.

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: State Government Gone Wild

From: Roger Sheley [mailto:karmafarmer1@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 4:04 PM

To: ODFW Commission

Subject: State Government Gone Wild

Good Folks,

I am a stronger support of conservation and love nature and the outdoors. In fact, I possess a Ph.D. in Rangeland and Restoration Ecology. I own farm land in eastern Oregon and use it to promote youth hunting in Oregon.

I moved to Montana (as a professor at MSU), then returned. I reviewed the State Hunting regulations and was staggered to see the governmental attempts at micromanagement of every detail of hunting. Does the state really believe this level of micromanagement is helpful? It is not.

These regulations are so specific and confusing that it takes a Juris degree to be sure that I am are not breaking the law. And, I bet you there is no data showing that this level of control and regulations helps the ecosystem or wildlife.

Please look over the regulations from the prespective of someone trying to understand them and determine if they would like to hunt in the state or not. I have not hunted in this state since I returned from Montana because the regulation are so complicated that its not worth it.

Please generalize some regulations and get goverment out of every aspect of it. It has become ridiculous.

Thank you for considering my comments. For now, I will enjoy watching the wildlife on my property. I am assuming that is legal, so long as I don't get too close.

Roger

-----Original Message-----

From: ramming@ykwc.net [mailto:ramming@ykwc.net]

Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 11:09 AM

To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us

Cc: OHA_Ty@yahoo.com

Subject: 2012 Grant County Elk Tags

Hello:

I am writing regarding the possible change in tags sold in Game Management units in Grant County. It is my understanding that several units are presently over the desired Management Objective for elk. I believe that the number of tags that are being sold for these units should remain the same and not increased in 2012.

Once elk become over populated there is a chance they will spread out into adjacent units and bring these units closer to their MO. I did not research each unit closely, but unless cow tags are presently issued in these units additional tags should not even be considered.

Predators are also a concern. It is my understanding that the cougar population has stabilized in many areas of the state, while bears and wolves are on the increase. Wolves or hi-breeds have been spotted in many units in eastern Oregon, spreading as far south as the Steens Mtns.

With a wolf or hi-breed killing on the average of 32 elk per year it would take very few of these predators in a unit to bring the MO in line. I for one would rather have a few to many animals over the next several years instead of ignoring potential predator pressures. I believe it is easier to decrease herd numbers than it is to increase numbers. I say maintain herds on the high side! Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Dan Ramming

Member of RMEF, OHA and an active Hunter Education Instructor

Roxann B Borisch

From: turkeyarat@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 1:01 PM
To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us
Subject: Elk changes

Gentlemen,

In regard to the changes you are suggesting:

246A: increasing the number of tags to 450 will push the number of hunters up. Though this is great for a draw selection the area is too small to put that many hunters in. I have hunted this unit and the limited ability to get around and the number of hunters will provide a conflict.

246C: I have hunted this unit and found that increasing the number of tags to 400 would probably be fine.

I have not hunted any of the other area for suggested changes and any input I have would not be very valid. However, on the private lands I have tried to obtain permission and had no luck. If the private lands have too many elk and the owners are complaining of having too much damage the owners need to allow more access to the land... extended dates will no be any help if limited access still exists.

Dave Thompson

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: Proposed changes to elk regulations

From: barneyrs@comcast.net [mailto:barneyrs@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 11:34 AM

To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us

Subject: Proposed changes to elk regulations

The proposed changes to the Grant County elk regulations are simply another way for the private landowners to cash in on the public funds that are directed toward wildlife management. The only way I could support these changes would be if all of the new tags were only available to the general public, and access must be provided without fees going to the landowner. If they really only want their crop damage reduced, they should not disagree. Most hunters are honest, respectful, safe, and trustworthy to follow the rules. Most large landowners use their landowner tags as a private hunt club, bringing in thousands of dollars each year. It is said that some even haze the animals onto their property before the season begins. In many circles, ODFW is viewed as the private employees of the large landholders. It seems that every year there is less opportunity for the hunter that is not financially able to pay access fees.

Roxann B Borisch

From: Michelle Tate
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 11:29 AM
To: Roxann B Borisch
Subject: FW: Changes to Grant County elk hunting proposed

From: Kris F. [mailto:krisf@mattressworld.biz]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 11:33 AM
To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us
Subject: Changes to Grant County elk hunting proposed

What are the possibilities of transplanting Elk from over populated units to under populated units? Such as the santiam unit. I have hunted the santiam unit for the past 12 years and have seen many elk. They were more plentiful in the beginning of those 12 years but since have declined in numbers significantly, from what I have seen personally and from articles I have read. I have been told that many years ago odfw used to transplant Elk at a location near hwy 63 and that it hasn't been done in a long time. Is there any reason as to why transplanting Elk no longer occurs? I would really like to hear your feedback on this.

Kris Foster
503-913-8500
krisf@mattressworld.biz

Roxann B Borisch

From: Tony Pranger [tony.pranger@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 8:41 AM
To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us

In regards to the proposal to lower the elk population in Grant County, I am strongly opposed to the idea. I believe that wolf predation will soon be a significant source of elk reduction as has occurred in other states.

If there is to be an increase in antlerless elk tags, I would only support it if there was a corresponding decrease in bull tags.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Tony Pranger
Grant County hunter.

Roxann B Borisch

From: Gregg Baron [ezfish@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 1:32 AM
To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us
Subject: Changes to Grant County elk hunting proposed

Dear ODFW,

The proposed plan to increase elk tags and elk hunting opportunities would only make sense if elk numbers were on the increase. Unfortunately, I believe the opposite is true, where elk numbers are on a downward trend in Grant county along with much of eastern Oregon.

I've been a bowhunter for over 30 years and have traveled and hunted many of the units in the eastern half of the state, including Murderers Creek and Northside. Over the last 10 years (and longer), elk numbers are not on the increase, they're on a steady decline. Elk numbers are never going to reach the historical highs of the past, the adopted MO's have seen to that, which is why many of the traditional elk hunting areas have fewer elk and hunting opportunities.

Now, instead of having adequate big game animals on public land, I see more elk and deer on private land. So this doesn't surprise me that a group that appears to be mostly local ranchers and hunters that live around these same ranchers would like to increase elk hunting on their property. This appears to be a very short sided plan without considering what's best for the elk in the long term.

I'm really tired of private landowners having so much control and impact on the public big game herds in Oregon. This is why the current big game MO's were adopted in the first place; to reduce litigation expenses for damages related to game animals. Fewer animals means fewer dollars spent for damage complaints. Unfortunately, opening up cow elk seasons to reach MO's within 3 years created a downward trend in overall elk numbers and still continues today. Elk have never recovered and unless ODFW adopts new plans to reduce (this is already happening) or eliminate cow hunting and work with the USFS, State and private forestry to improve big game habitat, elk will continue to struggle and numbers will continue to decline.

Bottom line; I do not support increasing tag numbers in Grant county unless biologist have determined sufficient elk numbers exist to warrant an increase in tag numbers. And as I already stated, I believe elk numbers are below carrying capacity and MO's in Grant county.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Gregg Baron

Roxann B Borisch

From: Brute [brute@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 6:12 PM
To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us
Subject: Changes to Grant County elk hunting proposed

Hello

I'm opposed to the proposed time frame of some of these hunts.

I feel you should not be hunting so early or late in the seasons.

Aug.1 The calves are still to young. The extra month they get with cow is very beneficial.

Or so late in the season March 31 as the bulls have lost their antlers and the cows should have been bred it is to much of a stress on them.

I would be more willing that the season started with bow season and ended by Jan 31.

Having season that last 8 months out of the year is ridicules.

Is the Management Objective level meant in the County to do this in the first place?

Thank You

Ken Smith

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: Grant county hunt proposal

From: mark [mailto:mkport@oregoncoast.com]

Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 4:46 PM

To: ODFW.Comments@state.or.us

Subject: Grant county hunt proposal

Dear ODFW

After reading this proposal the my blood pressure went through the roof !

First of all how can the herd count numbers be the same for three years in a row ? I do not believe that the herd count number are accurate and need to be verified by someone besides just the ODFW biologist . Why are the herds just east of Grant county so far below management objective levels and Grant county so far above ?

For whatever reason Oregon department of fish and wildlife is bound and determined to release more tags and put more pressure with longer season on a declining resource .

I believe ODFW needs to stop and look at what is going on with our deer and elk herd in this state , instead of just trying to sell more tags .

Ladies and gentlemen we have a serious problem in this state with most big game management units well below management objective levels . Believe it or not we have serious problem and it will only get worse once the wolfs move into more of our state . If we do not start managing for the health of the herd instead of trying to sell tags hunting in Oregon is going to be lost .

I am totally opposed to the Grant county proposal for these reasons , and can see only a poor out come for the future if they are approved .

Currently I am a hunter education instructor , Tillamook county chapter president for OHA , and chairman of the OHA partnership improvement committee .

Sincerely

Mark Davenport

Roxann B Borisch

From: craig starr [starrcs@peak.org]
Sent: Saturday, August 20, 2011 5:42 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us; 'Roy Elicker'
Cc: 'Curt Melcher'; 'Ronald Anglin'; 'Thomas Thornton'; 'Don Whittaker'
Subject: Archery Review Committee

Dear Commissioners and Director Elicker:

I likely won't be able to attend your October meeting in Pendleton due to the travel distance and conflicting family obligations. I'm sending you this message in hopes that you will consider it in spite of my absence from your meeting.

At your June meeting, I quoted to you from the text of the report on the 2003-2005 Archery Review Committee (ARC), as follows:

"The Committee felt if there were biological reasons for restricting cow tags, then everyone should be restricted equally – bow/rifle/Permanent Disabilities Permit (PDP) holders."

Following my testimony, a member of your staff indicated that the language quoted from the report was probably not well written and at least implied that the language as written didn't reflect the ARC's intent.

Since I wasn't involved in the leadership of Oregon Bow Hunters (OBH) back when the ARC was doing its business, I wouldn't have been able to personally dispute that contention at your June meeting and no opportunity was provided for doing so anyway. However, as a result of the staff comment, I decided that I had better do some research. I don't know the individuals who reportedly represented OBH on the ARC, but I contacted three (3) of the other archery representatives I do know who served on the ARC and asked them for their take on the ARC's intent.

To a person, the archery representatives I contacted said that the language I quoted to the Commission exactly expressed the ARC's intent. Essentially they indicated that the understanding was that ODF&W could eliminate all archery either-sex elk hunting when a unit dropped below MO if all firearms antlerless hunting was eliminated in the unit. Further, if ODF&W didn't eliminate all firearms antlerless elk hunting in a unit below MO, they said that the understanding was that any restriction on archery either-sex hunting needed to be equitable with the restrictions on firearms antlerless hunting. Since, as I testified in June, there are nearly 2,300 firearms antlerless elk tags (including about 140 youth tags) offered in central and eastern Oregon units totally closed to archery antlerless hunting, the current system is far from the equitable approach advocated by the ARC.

As you know, I've been arguing against the Department's current process for eliminating archery either-sex elk hunting in central and eastern Oregon units for the last couple of years just on the basis that it is patently unfair to totally eliminate archery antlerless opportunities while continuing to provide them for firearms hunters in the very same units. Each year, your staff has represented to you that ODF&W is simply following the ARC's recommendations in proposing to close units to either-sex archery elk hunting. The contacts I've made since your June meeting indicate that archery representatives with first-hand involvement in the ARC process dispute your department's interpretation of the ARC's recommendations.

At your October meeting, rather than simply perpetuating a management practice for closing units to archery either-sex hunting that is disputed by archery organizations, and that is failing on its face and is directly contributing to other archery management issues, I urge you to direct your staff to work with representatives of Oregon's archery hunting organizations to develop a management system that is consistent with all of the recommendations of the ARC process, not just the selected ones used by your staff to define the current practice. I believe that an appropriate process for managing archery either-sex hunting to replace the current failing practice can and should be developed in time for the 2012 archery seasons, and I hope you'll direct your staff to work with archery representatives to that end.

Sincerely,

Craig Starr, President
Oregon Bow Hunters

Roxann B Borisch

From: ODFW Commission
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2011 3:45 PM
To: 'Daniel.Edge@oregonstate.edu'; 'Bobby Levy'; jenglund@englundmarine.com; 'Skip Klarquist'; 'Bob Webber'; 'Holly Akenson'; 'Mike Finley'
Cc: Ronald Anglin; Roy Elicker; Michelle Tate; Roxann B Borisch
Subject: FW: OHA Partnership Improvement Committee letter
Attachments: partnership committee.pdf

Hello:

On behalf of Oregon Hunters Association, attached is their letter with regard to deer, elk, antlerless tags & hunts and seasons. This letter will be saved and filed as "Public Correspondence" in the 2012 Big Game Regulations exhibit in your October 7th Commission packet.

Regards,
Teri Kucera
Executive Assistant to Roy Elicker
Director's Office
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Avenue
Salem, Oregon 97303
(503) 947-6033

From: oha [mailto:oha@ccountry.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2011 4:35 PM
To: ODFW Commission
Subject: OHA Partnership Improvement Committee letter

Hello Commission Members,
Please see the attached letter to you, which was mailed today.

Cynthia Martinich
OHA Office Manager
541-772-7313
oha@ccountry.net



OREGON HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

Helping Wildlife • Enhancing Habitat • Protecting Our Hunting Heritage

Ron Anglin, Director, Wildlife Division
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Avenue N.E.
Salem, OR 97303-4924

RECEIVED

JUL 28 2011

WILDLIFE DIVISION

July 25, 2011

Dear Director Anglin :

GENERAL STATEMENT

We the members of the Partnership Improvement Committee of the Oregon Hunters Association (OHA) have conducted regional meetings to discuss hunting and habitat issues including but not limited to the decline of deer and elk populations in Oregon. Although we are not biologists, we are conservationists. It is our duty to stand up for proper management of wildlife in Oregon. As you can understand, we have many issues of concern. These issues include but are not limited to deer and elk management, antlerless hunts, multiple deer tags, predation, and habitat improvement. This letter is to address some of those issues. We will address primarily deer and elk in this letter. However, all game such as antelope, Big Horn sheep, Rocky Mountain goat, cougar, bear, wolves and game birds are important to us. These issues are important to all of our hunting members. Many of the issues are statewide and some are regional. The regional issues will be addressed by region where possible. We will address the short term concerns now with the intent of addressing long term concerns in the future.

We would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to review and address our concerns. Please feel free to contact us for additional information or if there is a need to clarify our concerns stated in this letter.

DEER

Deer are struggling throughout Oregon, with predation and habitat loss as the main causes. These are long-term issues that we continue to address as an organization. Our primary concern is that management of Oregon big game herds should be focused on population Management Objectives (MO) not buck-to-doe or bull-to-cow ratios. A given unit may reach the stated MO of 20 bucks per 100 does and still have a herd count far below the unit's population MO.

BLACK-TAILED DEER

- Black-Tailed Deer Plan: It is clear that ODFW is aware of the decline in the black-tailed deer population, but it does not appear steps are being taken to lessen the pressure on the remaining depleted herd. The black-tailed deer plan is way behind schedule and will take five years before we see any tangible results.
- Bag Limits: We request that hunters be limited to one deer tag per person per year, as is presently the case with elk. This limitation should continue until a significant measurable and verifiable recovery of black-tailed deer population has occurred.

P.O. Box 1706, Medford, OR 97501 • (541) 772-7313 • oha@ccountry.net • www.oregonhunters.org



- **Damage Permits:** We feel it is imperative that ODFW physically document and verify actual damage by black-tailed deer before issuing damage control permits. We request that ODFW not designate damage control tags as a "unit-wide" hunt. Rather, damage control hunts should be limited to private property where verifiable damage exists.

- **Antlerless Harvest:** We ask that ALL antlerless black-tailed deer hunts be curtailed on public land in units below population MO.

- **Herd Counts:** We ask that ODFW biologists make distinctions between black-tailed deer counted on private land closed to public access and those observed on public land, because concentrations of animals surveyed on private land closed to public hunting skew the numbers when calculating unit-wide population estimates and corresponding tag numbers.

MULE DEER

- **Mule Deer Decline:** Mule deer are also on the decline as stated in the first paragraph of the "Mule Deer Initiative Overview." Currently 39 of the 49 eastern Oregon management units are WELL below their MO. Some units are as much as 10,000 deer short of their population MO.

- **Bag Limit:** It is asked that hunters be limited to one deer tag per person per year as is presently the case with elk. This limitation should continue until the recovery of Oregon's mule deer populations has occurred.

- **Damage Permits:** We request that ODFW physically document and verify actual damage by mule deer before issuing damage control permits. We also ask that ODFW not designate damage control deer tags on public land and that they are strictly issued on the private property where visible damage exists. We request that ALL antlerless mule deer hunts on public land be curtailed until the mule deer population has reached MO's.

ELK

- **Season Length:** We ask that antlerless elk hunts open no earlier than the last Saturday in August to ensure that calves have had ample time to develop before cow hunts begin. Furthermore, we ask that antlerless elk hunts end by January 31 before bulls begin to shed their antlers and to minimize pressure during harsh winter conditions. We ask that non-lethal methods be used in the late summer and late winter months to offer relief for damage on private land.

- **Damage Permits:** We request that ODFW verify and document actual damage before issuing damage control permits. We request that ODFW not designate damage control tags as a "unit-wide" hunt. Rather, damage control hunts should be limited to private property where damage exists.

- **Herd Counts:** We ask that ODFW biologists make distinctions between Roosevelt elk counted on private land closed to public access and those observed on public land, because concentrations of animals surveyed on private land closed to public hunting skew the numbers when calculating unit-wide population estimates and corresponding tag numbers. We do realize Rocky Mt. Elk migrate to wintering grounds when herd counts are conducted and can agree that in this case the distinction is not realistic.

OVERVIEW

DEER AND ELK MANAGEMENT

With regard to the management of our big game herds, we believe it is important for ODFW biologists to focus on the population management objective in an effort to increase the overall herd numbers. The focus on buck-to-doe and bull-to-cow ratios should be the secondary objective.

We also believe that a person should only be able to receive one deer tag per person per year as is presently the case with elk. Given the current state of our deer herds, we should not be harvesting multiple animals until the deer populations can sustain it.

ANTLERLESS TAGS & DAMAGE HUNTS

The number of antlerless deer tags is an issue across the state. It is our request that antlerless tags not be issued on public lands in units below population MO.

We request ODFW document and verify the accuracy of any claimed damage by elk or deer before issuing damage control permits and that ODFW be accountable for making the determinations and issuing the damage control permits. We ask that agricultural damage tags be limited to private property where damage exists.

SEASON LENGTH

The hunting seasons for deer and elk should begin the last weekend in August and end no later than January 31. The current structure of our season's places pressure on big game herds eight months of the year. This excessive pressure most certainly affects the health and reproduction of big game herds.

WORKING TOGETHER WITH OUR PARTNERS

The Partnership Improvement Committee of the Oregon Hunters Association asks that our concerns in this letter be addressed by ODFW. We request a plan of action for the resolution of the issues brought forth in this letter by September 21, 2011, to allow us time to draft a letter for the October Commission meeting.

In conclusion, we would like to stress our desire to work with ODFW biologists on both a state and regional level. OHA can provide funding and volunteers for many of the problems between wildlife and private landowners. We fund and build wildlife-friendly fences that keep elk safe and out of trouble, repair fences damaged by wildlife and feed wintering wildlife to keep them away from private hay stacks. We also fund numerous trapping and relocation projects throughout the state. We are willing to put our money where our mouth is to work toward a better partnership with ODFW in habitat and wildlife conservation.

We the leaders of OHA and the Partnership Improvement Committee look forward to bringing back the deer and elk populations to what they once were.

Sincerely,

On behalf of the 11,000 members of Oregon Hunters Association,

Oregon Hunters Association Officers and Board of Directors

The Central Region Presidents of OHA

Prineville Chapter President, Dale Conlee; Redmond Chapter President, Harold Duncan; Bend Chapter President, Mike Whitney

The SW Region Presidents of OHA

Josephine Chapter President, Brett Loper; Rogue Valley Chapter President, Don Pritchett; Umpqua Chapter President, Cindy Rooney; Tioga Chapter President, Charlie Fullerton

The NW Region Presidents of OHA

Tillamook Chapter President and Committee Chair, Mark Davenport; Clatsop County Chapter President, Wendell Locke; Columbia County Chapter President, Frank E. Hupp; Hoodview Chapter President, Catherine Hamell; Pioneer Chapter President, Dan Allee; Portland Chapter President, Leslie Shaw; Yamhill Chapter President, John Gander

The West Central Presidents of OHA

Capitol Chapter President, Stu Crosby; Emerald Valley Chapter President, Neal Reiser; Lincoln County Chapter President, Madalene Siniscal; Mid-Willamette Chapter President, Sam Lucontro; Siuslaw Chapter President, Dan Straight

The SE Region Presidents of OHA

Lake County Chapter President, Gerald Slay; Harney County Chapter President, Fred Hellbusch; Klamath County Chapter President, Rick Vieira

The NE Region Presidents of OHA

Baker Chapter President, Charlie Brinton; Union County Chapter President, Morgan Olson; Columbia Basin Chapter President, Chuck Beckett; Malheur County Chapter President, Doug Knott; Mid-Columbia Chapter President, Chuck Ashley

Ty Stubblefield, Field Administrator
Duane Dungannon, State Coordinator
Al Elkins, Lobbyist

Oregon Hunters Association
Partnership Improvement Committee
P.O. Box 1706
Medford, OR 97501
541-772-7313

cc:

Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission
Roy Elicker, Director, ODFW

Senator Jason Atkinson
Senator Suzanne Bonamici
Senator Peter Courtney
Senator Chris Edwards
Senator Fred Girod
Senator Jeff Kruse
Senator Frank Morse
Senator Floyd Prozanski
Senator Bruce Starr
Senator Joanne Verger

Senator Alan C. Bates
Senator Brian Boquist
Senator Richard Devlin
Senator Ted Ferrioli
Senator Mark Hass
Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson
Senator David Nelson
Senator Diane Rosenbaum
Senator Chris Telfer
Senator Doug Whitsett

Senator Lee Beyer
Senator Ginny Burdick
Senator Jackie Dingfelder
Senator Larry George
Senator Betsy Johnson
Senator Rod Monroe
Senator Alan Olsen
Senator Chip Shields
Senator Chuck Thomsen
Senator Jackie Winters

Representative Jules Bailey
Representative Cliff Bentz
Representative Deborah Boone
Representative Kevin Cameron
Representative Jason Conger
Representative Margaret Doherty
Representative Tim Freeman
Representative Sara Gelser
Representative Bruce L. Hanna
Representative Paul Holvey
Representative Dave Hunt
Representative Bill Kennemer
Representative Wayne Krieger
Representative Mike McLane
Representative Andy Olson
Representative Dennis Richardson
Representative Patrick Sheehan
Representative Sherrie Sprenger
Representative Carolyn Tomei
Representative Gene Whisnant

Representative Jeff Barker
Representative Vicki Berger
Representative Katie Brewer
Representative Ben Cannon
Representative Jean Cowan
Representative Sal Esquivel
Representative Bill Garrard
Representative Vic Gilliam
Representative Chris Harker
Representative Val Hoyle
Representative Bob Jenson
Representative Betty Komp
Representative Shawn Lindsay
Representative Nancy Nathanson
Representative Julie Parrish
Representative Arnie Roblan
Representative Greg Smith
Representative Kim Thatcher
Representative Matt Wand
Representative Matt Wingard

Representative Phil Barnhart
Representative E. Terry Beyer
Representative Peter Buckley
Representative Brian Clem
Representative Michael Dembrow
Representative Lew Frederick
Representative Chris Garrett
Representative Mitch Greenlick
Representative Wally Hicks
Representative John E. Huffman
Representative Mark Johnson
Representative Tina Kotek
Representative Greg Matthews
Representative Mary Nolan
Representative Tobias Read
Representative Mike Schaufler
Representative Jefferson Smith
Representative Jim Thompson
Representative Jim Weidner
Representative Brad Witt

Roxann B Borisch

From: Michelle Tate
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2011 9:55 AM
To: Roxann B Borisch
Subject: FW: McKenzie River Black-tail population

Roxie, please include this in the October Commission packet

From: Riley Timmins [mailto:riley_141@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2011 7:13 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: McKenzie River Black-tail population

Dear ODFW Commission,

My name is Riley Timmins and I have some concerns that I wish to convey to you about the current state of the Black-tailed Deer population in the McKenzie River area. I have grown up hunting this area with my father and watched it's demise over the years. What was once a premier area for black-tailed deer hunting is now a forest that is nearly devoid of deer. It was not uncommon to see a half-dozen to a dozen mature bucks and twice as many does in just one day of hunting. The area carried a great gene pool with large heavy antlered deer.

The last season that I was able to hunt there was 2009 and this season I spent every weekend and holiday in that unit hunting hard, on foot, rattling, stalking, sitting, glassing. I saw a grand total of 3 does and only one small forked-horn while driving into the tree farm in the dark. The previous two seasons I managed to take two Pope and Young 3x3 black-tails during the late archery season.

I believe that the recent poaching ring that was busted has had a grave impact on the area. The sheer number of animals that these people have taken from this small area, which is the same core area that I hunt (Gate Creek and Wendling), cannot allow for a population to sustain itself. Especially not with the regular harvest and the rest of the poaching that goes on here as well.

I continue, year after year, to see the numbers of doe tags in these areas to remain the same. Last year there were 1066 doe/spike tags that were issued for this area (619 and 619A combined). I saw 3 does in about 10 days of hard hunting in this area. With the sheer drop in numbers in this area and the recent mass poaching that has gone on, how is it justified to allow for any doe/spike tags at all?

Will anything be done to help bring this population back to what it once was a mere 10 years ago? I may not be a biologist but from someone that has spent a great deal of time in the unit, I can safely say that ODFW needs to do away with the doe tags in this area.

I hope to see some form of action taken on the tag numbers next year.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Riley Timmins

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: McKenzie River Black-tail population

From: Riley Timmins [mailto:riley_141@hotmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2011 7:13 PM

To: odfw.commission@state.or.us

Subject: McKenzie River Black-tail population

Dear ODFW Commission,

My name is Riley Timmins and I have some concerns that I wish to convey to you about the current state of the Black-tailed Deer population in the McKenzie River area. I have grown up hunting this area with my father and watched it's demise over the years. What was once a premier area for black-tailed deer hunting is now a forest that is nearly devoid of deer. It was not uncommon to see a half-dozen to a dozen mature bucks and twice as many does in just one day of hunting. The area carried a great gene pool with large heavy antlered deer.

The last season that I was able to hunt there was 2009 and this season I spent every weekend and holiday in that unit hunting hard, on foot, rattling, stalking, sitting, glassing. I saw a grand total of 3 does and only one small forked-horn while driving into the tree farm in the dark. The previous two seasons I managed to take two Pope and Young 3x3 black-tails during the late archery season.

I believe that the recent poaching ring that was busted has had a grave impact on the area. The sheer number of animals that these people have taken from this small area, which is the same core area that I hunt (Gate Creek and Wendling), cannot allow for a population to sustain itself. Especially not with the regular harvest and the rest of the poaching that goes on here as well.

I continue, year after year, to see the numbers of doe tags in these areas to remain the same. Last year there were 1066 doe/spike tags that were issued for this area (619 and 619A combined). I saw 3 does in about 10 days of hard hunting in this area. With the sheer drop in numbers in this area and the recent mass poaching that has gone on, how is it justified to allow for any doe/spike tags at all?

Will anything be done to help bring this population back to what it once was a mere 10 years ago? I may not be a biologist but from someone that has spent a great deal of time in the unit, I can safely say that ODFW needs to do away with the doe tags in this area.

I hope to see some form of action taken on the tag numbers next year.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Riley Timmins

Thomas Thornton

From: ODFW Commission
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 2:38 PM
To: Michelle Tate; Thomas Thornton
Subject: FW: Big Game Regulation Suggested Change

From: VIEIRA, RICHARD K CMSgt USAF ANG 173 LRS/LGRD [mailto:richard.vieira@ang.af.mil]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 2:09 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Big Game Regulation Suggested Change

I am the president of the Klamath Chapter of OHA. I had a chapter member call me to see if we could request changing the wording on the Big Game regulations in reference to Party Applications on Page 13 of the 2011 Big Game Regulations.

This is the discussion that led to this request:

Applying as a party is not a problem, however, if they do not get their 'party' hunt - they would like to have different 2nd, 3rd, 4th...choices and not be tied to the party leader. This group gathers, when they are successful in their party application, in hunting camp as old friends from across the state. When they do not get their 'party' hunt, they would like to select another choice closer to their home. The argument is: 1. In our modern computer world this should not be a difficult task. 2. This would allow our hunters more flexibility to select the options they want. 3. Keep everyone happy and applying for hunts.

In simpler terms:

1. Party leader & members must have same 1st choice
2. Party leader & members may have different 2,3,4,5 choices

Below is an extract from the 2011 Big Game Regulations, the last line (underlined) is the one suggested to be changed.

2011 Big Game Regulations, Page 13

PARTY APPLICATIONS

You must indicate if you are applying as an individual, party member or party leader when applying for your controlled hunts. All applicants, including party leader must purchase separate applications. Parties must assign ONE member as the party leader. Each party member, except party leader, must enter their party leader's hunting license number on their application. The party leader's hunt choices will be used for the entire party. All members must list the same choices as the party leader on their individual applications.

We suggest this could be changed to:

New: (Suggested changes in CAP LETTERS)

"The party leader's FIRST hunt choice will be used for the entire party. All members must

6/17/2011

list the same FIRST choice as the party leader AND MAY HAVE DIFFERENT, SUBSEQUENT, CHOICES on their individual applications.”

Please let me know what you decide so I can brief my chapter member.

Thanks

Rick Vieira

President

OHA Klamath Chapter

Work: (541) 885-6376

Richard.vieira@ang.af.mil

Home: (541) 591-2452

Bluemth273@charter.net

Thomas Thornton

From: ODFW Commission
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2011 8:26 AM
To: Kevin Blakely; Thomas Thornton
Cc: Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: ELK HUNTING SOUTHWEST OREGON ROGUE UNIT/ RIFLE WHAT HAPPENED???????

From: James Chapman [mailto:JChapman@rogueriverfd.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:03 PM
To: ODFW Commission
Subject: ELK HUNTING SOUTHWEST OREGON ROGUE UNIT/ RIFLE WHAT HAPPENED???????

Hello, my name is James Chapman and I am writing this letter in hopes that it won't fall on deaf ears! I was born and raised in a small community in the Cascade Mountains Prospect, Oregon to be exact. There was always certain things you could count on like a friendly wave, help from a neighbor and great hunting." Well there use to be great hunting!" My whole family was born and raised here we are all hunters, we all enjoy to hunt and some of us count on the fact of killing an elk or deer as part of our food source. But I need to speak up what I have seen happen for the last 10-12-15 years is absolutely ridiculous and has gotten out of control. I have gone several Roosevelt elk rifle seasons where I haven't even seen an elk, and I've grew up here there is not a part of the country I don't know, but I [we] can't find an elk?

Years ago my father, brother {timber faller} and I {firefighter} sat down and decided we would start hunting in the sky lakes wilderness my father a retired forest service worker with 37 years at the forest service located in Prospect {believe me he knows the rogue national forest} Anyway the first year we did it which I will speculate and say was around 1986-87 we would only have to go a mile or so in and we would start seeing elk {no roads} no pressure. And we did pretty well some seasons we would all fill our elk tags other years one of us would but we would see and be in elk, the thrill of the hunt that's what it's all about, right? As years went on 10-12-15 I (we) began noticing once again we are 5 miles back in the wilderness and where are all the elk? I mean we are as deep in a remote area as you can be in the rogue unit with the exception of the Umpqua all experienced outdoorsman and hunters we didn't need a GPS or satellite phone just a good old compass and a map my dad didn't even need those and NO ELK! Ridiculous!

1. Too much pressure. Too many people. Have any of you driven from the top of Ginko Basin or Huckleberry Mountain down to highway 62 during elk rifle season? It looks like downtown Medford on a Saturday night wall to wall cars and trucks and tents and campers. Which of course they get there the Wednesday or Thursday before the season starts and sit in camp and shoot there guns and carry on and clang and bang! There wouldn't be a self respecting Roosevelt elk that I have ever seen within two miles of these "elk hunters". TOO MANY PEOPLE! Perhaps we should think about going to a draw like the east side has. Its not even fair for the poor few elk that don't escape to the confines of the crater lake national park which I speculate is a lot, they get ran too death you use to see herds of 20-30 now you see groups of 3-5 all of them with there tongues hanging out.
2. Time of year. Seriously mid October I have actually hunted elk in Prospect during season in shorts 85 degrees, that's not elk hunting! We use to have two seasons early November and second season mid November. You know the time of year it rains, snows pushes them out of the Crater Lake national park. You may not know this but elk actually like snow in fact they love it, we use to be able to track elk all day in snow {November}. Would we always get one no, but we sure enjoyed the thrill of the hunt! Hard to track elk when the forest sounds like a bustling city and you're walking on popcorn.
3. I could go on and on in fact if you would like to contact me I will leave my number, but what I'm trying to say in all honesty Roosevelt elk hunting in the rogue unit is ruined it no longer takes skill, forest knowledge the ability to hike, work hard and kill a nice bull, right!!! The last time we killed a nice bull during rifle season was in the bottom of red blanket canyon 2002. We worked for it, we earned it. Now I hear stories of first timers driving down 6215 Ginko basin road and kill an elk because someone else chased it out in front of them, I realize that happens but its few and far in between and the damn elk are ran to death. Lets start thinking about conservation of our elk are there fewer elk I believe so but pressure makes a lot of them

hide in the park. Are there too many hunters? YES. How about at least considering going to a draw so my 9 year old son can enjoy the thrill of the hunt like I use too. So he at least as a chance to see an elk during elk season. As it is now you ODFW, state of Oregon appear to be content taking my money for a season that has been frustrating at best. I realize I don't have to pay, but how am I supposed to teach my son the wonders of hunting if I don't. Something needs to be done something needs to change. I'm not an activist or some crazy guy up in the hills I'm a hard working American that wants more out of his local elk season for myself, family and friends. This is just a fraction of what I would like to say and if anyone of you would ever like to sit-down or call me I would love the opportunity to express my feelings, and offer some thoughts not as an expert just as a country boy who grew up in the heart of elk country and has watched them my whole life.

Thank You for your time,
James Chapman
(541 973-6362

Thomas Thornton

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2011 9:12 AM
To: Thomas Thornton; Timothy L Hiller
Subject: FW: Public Comments from the Web
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

From: Roger Steen [mailto:prsteen@ykw.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2011 4:01 PM
To: odfw.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Public Comments from the Web

PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM THE WEB

Topic: Spring Bear Season
Name: Roger L. Steen
E-mail: prsteen@ykw.net

Comment: My comment is in regards to Spring bear season. For the past several years there has been too much snow on the ground to hunt even late May when there is 3'-4' of snow at 5000'. You could hunt if you could get to the area to hunt. The argument is that sows with cubs come out later and they might be taken accidentally by hunters if the season is extended. The cubs are usually under the feet of the sow and hard to miss them in the field. So that is not a good argument in my mind. I have missed going bear hunting 2 years now because of the snow depth. I'm sure there are many more of us in the same spot. If the season could be extended for 2 more weeks, I believe there would be a much better chance of being able to enjoy the hunt and the outdoors. The bears aren't going to come out of their dens if there is 4' of snow over them. I am only talking about the bears I hunt at the 5000' elevation level, not the bears at lower elevations. I hope you will take this suggestion as well intended, not just wanting changes for the sake of a change.

-----Original Message-----

From: David Loeck [mailto:dl_loeck@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, May 06, 2011 7:39 AM

To: odfw.comments@state.or.us

Subject: Comments-Increase Archery oppurtunites for Any Elk in the NE

Hi All,

After reading the Reg Changes for 2011, I started thinking, our Archery season opportunities are on the decline. I As we all know, hunting the Eastside of Oregon switched from Any Elk to Bull only in many units, like the ones I typically hunt.

Thankfully, the Desolation Unit was not effected until this year.

If feels like we, the Bowhunters, are loosing opportunity, rather than increasing our opportunity.

I am not sure if you have tried archery, but it is tough. However, I do enjoy the fall hunt in September and I do enjoy the rut. Still, I am not too keen on the bull only thing. I prefer any Elk as I will gladly take a cow if provided the opportunity.

What this change will in Reg will do, is drive guys like me to either switch back to Rifle because there is no longer an advantage to hunting with a bow -OR- drive guys like me to further decimate those areas that are any Elk, like what happened in the Desolation Unit (a swarm effect). Other side effects will include small communities like Granite Oregon and Ukiah Oregon who rely on the tourism money from Hunters. I have seen the swarm effect all ready (Desolation as an example).

After the Bull only regulations went into effect, I saw a significant decrease in hunting pressure in Starkey and Ukiah units and the Desolation Unit pressure increase, as most Archery hunters moved to a nearby either sex area, Desolation. I hoped more Archery draws would have been added to offset the loss of the Bull only change in Archery but I have not seen any such changes.

How does one go about getting some Archery cow elks being added to the synopsis for this next year? I'd like to see about 10% of all reported hunters in a given Archery unit, such as Desolation, Ukiah, or Starkey, be given an "Any Elk" or "Any Cow" tag for that area. This could be similar to the Sled Spings Archery options.

This accomplishes many things.

- 1) Increased Revenue- Many Archers will apply for these tags, I guarantee it.
- 2) Decreased "Swarm" effect, hunters will be more evenly distributed throughout the State
- 3) ODFW is now increasing the number of hunting opportunities
- 4) Local Businesses will not lose business
- 5) A happier hunting community, guys like me!

If at all possible, I'd like to get this changed immediately. I have been hunting that area for years, and really don't want to pass up on that particular hunt, nor do those in my party. I know of at least 20 people who

hunt that same area and are all ready making plans to move to another area (see swarm effect), with that area likely being the Saddle Mountain unit.

Is there any way to get some Archery cow tags, Any Elk tags or some sort of Game Management tags for those Eastern "Bull Only" units? A small percentage is all that is needed. Maybe like 7-10% of all tags sold last year. Make it a draw.

I know the counter argument will involve elk populations, predation and such. But really? The Archery hunting population is like 10% of the whole hunting population. Archery success is like 7% as it is, while I believe Rifle is much higher than that.

Please at least give hunter's like me a shot at a cow tag for my hunting area! I don't need one every year, but at least I like a shot at one! Right now, I have no chance of an Archery Elk Cow tag for those units I prefer to hunt. My choice is either switch to Rifle and apply for a cow tag or General Season Archery Bull only, for those areas. Really? Don't care for rifles, and as much as I'd like to get a bull, A cow will do just fine.

Thank You.

Joel Hurtado

From: Moffitt, Rick D <rick.moffitt@hp.com>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2011 7:39 AM
To: Hunter.reports@state.or.us
Subject: Reporting

If you want people to report then make it easier. Just ask if they filled a tag or not. I won't report any more unless it's simplified.

Joel Hurtado

From: Gary and Sandie Hertel <ghertel@charter.net>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Hunter.reports@state.or.us
Subject: wishing and hoping

Would love to draw a sheep tag this year....63 almost 64 years old.....8 years after quad by pass surgery, feeling spry.... I have always reported my success/failure on your site.... Here is hoping my name is put at the top of the bucket this year..... Really, why isn't there some sort of preference point/age related system that would help out old-timers? I think something needs to be devised---because not everyone can afford to spend \$70,000 at an auction to buy a tag... I have been putting in for W. Deschutes since year number one.....as have a lot of folks I know... Just wish there was a better way... Thanks Gary Hertel, The Dalles

Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Info
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 7:54 AM
To: Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: pamphlet/documentation wording

From: ROSESTLG@aol.com [mailto:ROSESTLG@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 9:58 PM
To: odfw.info@state.or.us
Subject: pamphlet/documentation wording

Suggest changing the word "kill" (did you kill a deer, did you kill an elk, etc.) to harvest or take. Harvest in particular sounds much more sporting than kill. It is the image of 'hunting' that is of concern here. Hunting should portray the intent of maintaining herd size, thus its health. Killing just doesn't portray that, at least to me.

Respectfully

Ray Graves

Public Correspondence
Topic Concerns Re: Baulah
↳ Ukiah Unit Hunts

I would like to take this time to report to you some problems, and concerns in 2 of my hunts of 2010.

Our first hunt was Baulah Unit for deer. my wife and I were hunting around Drewsey, Birch creek Baulah reservoir etc. everywhere we went the ground was tore up, destroyed from over grazing of cattle. its something a person would have to see to believe. Also the BLM and forest service has gone in this area and cut down thousands of acres of Moghonamy thickets and juniper. I met a forest personal up there and asked him why all the clear cuts? I was told (as I already knew) they were cut so the ranchers would have more grove area and more water for their cattle. As a hunter I object to this, for we all know the deer and especially the elk need this for cover and food. its very clear to the eye that this whole area is overgrazed by the ranchers in this area.

The second problem was on our general spike hunt in the Ukiah unit. We put our 15X30 wall tent on top by Pearson creek road. Again from the 1st day we started having problems due to cows. We had cowboys riding A.T.V. horses, airplanes, helicopters riding and flying around, there were no elk in the area due to the harassment. The second day of the hunt we came into camp tired, wet, to find 12 CATTLE laying where our tent used to be. they tore our tent down looking for food. bent up our tent poles. I contacted the owners: BAR V Cattle Co. Logansport, and JOHN PETERSON

Woodrow STAR from the Indian reservation and told them they need to get their cows out or they might start missing some since there are no elk. they laughed and told me sometimes its hard to find them. all also that this is the first in 15 years that this area is open to open grazing. My concern is that this area is going to end up looking like the Drewsey area.

I realize we cant stop the cattle problem, but we can monitor the problem to make sure there is no overgrazing and the cattle are out of the woods at a date where the hunters who support the Game Dept are not interfered with or hindered. its hard enough to find game, we dont need cowboys running it out of the woods.

THANK
YOU John

