



Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission Minutes

Meeting: Thursday, June 5, 2014 – 8:00 a.m.
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Commission Room
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97302

Meeting: Friday, June 6, 2014 – 8:00 a.m.
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Commission Room
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97302

1
2 *Commission minutes are considered draft until approved by the Commission at*
3 *its next meeting.*
4

5 Notice of these meetings had been made by press release of statewide media circulation.
6 Those attending part or all of the meeting included:
7

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Bobby Levy, Chair | Roy Elicker, Director |
| Michael Finley, Vice-Chair | Curt Melcher, Deputy Director |
| Bob Webber, Commissioner | Steve Sanders, Assistant Attorney General |
| Holly Akenson, Commissioner | Erin Donald, Assistant Attorney General |
| Gregory J. Wolley, Commissioner | Teri Kucera, Executive Assistant |
| Laura Anderson, Commissioner | |

8 **MEETING**

9
10 On Thursday, June 5, 2014 at 8:00 a.m., Chair Levy called the Oregon Fish and Wildlife
11 Commission (the Commission) meeting to order.

12 **DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

13 **Field Reports**

14 Field Reports provided in written form only. *This report is available in the meeting materials*
15 *and at*

16 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/Field%20Reports_June%2005-6%202014%20Commission.pdf
17

18 **Expenditure Report**

19 Report added to Exhibit G, *This information is available in the meeting materials and at*
20 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp
21

22 **Adopt Temporary Rules**

23 Roy Elicker, Director, requested the Commission adopt the following temporary rules.
24

25 **1. 635-003-0003 and 635-013-0003**

26 **Salmon Seasons Commercial and Sport Fisheries in the Pacific Ocean**

27 Adopted May 1, 2014: effective May 8, 2014 through June 30, 2014

28 These amended rules incorporate, by reference, the annual ocean commercial (OAR 635-003-
29 0003) troll salmon and annual ocean sport (OAR 635-013-0003) salmon specifications and
30 management measures as adopted by the Pacific Fishery Management Council at its annual
31 Ocean Salmon Management Measures and Impacts meeting, as finalized in April 2014.
32
33
34
35

1 **2. 635-041-0045 and 635-041-0065**

2 **Columbia River Mainstem and Tributary Treaty Indian Commercial Fisheries Amended**

3 Adopted May 6, 2014: effective May 6, 2014 through July 31, 2014

4 These amended rules set a platform and hook-and-line fishery in all of Zone 6 from 6:00 p.m.,
5 May 6 through 11:59 p.m., July 31, 2014. Modifications clarify that sales of fish landed in
6 Treaty fisheries downstream of Bonneville Dam, allowed under agreements with the State of
7 Oregon, are allowed any time fishing is permitted under Treaty regulations. Modifications are
8 consistent with action taken May 6, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the
9 States of Oregon and Washington in cooperation with the Columbia River Treaty Tribes.

10
11 **3. 635-042-0022**

12 **Commercial Spring Chinook Drift Net Fishery Set for the Mainstem Columbia River**

13 Adopted May 6, 2014: effective May 7, 2014 through July 31, 2014

14 This amended rule sets a non-Indian commercial spring Chinook fishery for the mainstem
15 Columbia River in Zones 1 through 5 to commence on May 7, 2014 from 1:00 p.m. to 10:00
16 p.m. (9 hours). Modifications were made consistent with Joint State Action taken May 6, 2014
17 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington.

18
19 **4. 635-042-0145, 635-042-0160, and 635-042-0170**

20 **Commercial Spring Fisheries Amended for Columbia River Select Areas.**

21 Adopted May 6, 2014: effective May 8, 2014 through July 31, 2014

22 These amended rules amend seasons and area boundaries for spring commercial fisheries in
23 the Columbia River Select Areas. Modifications are consistent with the action taken May 6,
24 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington.

25
26 **5. 635-023-0125**

27 **Columbia River Recreational Spring Chinook, Steelhead and Shad Seasons Amended**

28 Adopted May 6, 2014: effective May 9, 2014 through June 30, 2014

29 This amended rule modifies regulations for the 2014 Columbia River spring recreational
30 fisheries with descriptions of the areas, dates, and bag limits for harvest of adipose fin-clipped
31 Chinook salmon, adipose fin-clipped steelhead and shad. Revisions are consistent with action
32 taken May 6, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and
33 Washington.

34
35 **6. 635-019-0090**

36 **Spring Chinook Fisheries in the Northeast Sport Fishing Zone**

37 Adopted May 9, 2014: effective May 17, 2014 through June 1, 2014

38 This amended rule allows recreational anglers the opportunity to harvest wild spring Chinook
39 salmon in the upper mainstem of the John Day River from May 17, 2014 to June 1, 2014.

40
41 **7. 635-023-0125**

42 **Columbia River Recreational Spring Chinook, Steelhead and Shad Seasons Amended**

43 Adopted May 13, 2014: effective May 15, 2014 through June 15, 2014

44 This amended rule modifies regulations for the 2014 Columbia River spring recreational
45 fisheries with descriptions of the areas, dates and bag limits for harvest of adipose fin-clipped
46 Chinook salmon, adipose fin-clipped steelhead and shad. Revisions are consistent with action

1 taken May 13, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and
2 Washington.

3
4 **8. 635-042-0022**

5 **Commercial Spring Chinook Drift Net Fishery Set for the Mainstem Columbia River**

6 Adopted May 13, 2014: effective May 20, 2014 through July 31, 2014

7 This amended rule sets a non-Indian commercial spring Chinook drift net fishery for the
8 Mainstem Columbia River in Zones 1 through 5 to commence from 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, May
9 20 to 5:00 a.m., Wednesday, May 21, 2014 (10 hours). Modifications were made consistent
10 with Joint State Action taken May 13, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the
11 States of Oregon and Washington.

12
13 **9. 635-042-0145**

14 **Commercial Spring Fishery Modified for the Youngs Bay Select Area**

15 Adopted May 13, 2014: effective May 20, 2014 through July 31, 2014

16 This amended rule modifies harvest regulations for a spring commercial fishery previously
17 adopted for the Youngs Bay Select Area of the Columbia River. Modifications are consistent
18 with the action taken May 13, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of
19 Oregon and Washington.

20
21 **10. 635-041-0065**

22 **Columbia River Zone 6 Treaty Indian Commercial Gill Net Fishery Authorized**

23 Adopted May 19, 2014: effective May 20, 2014 through July 31, 2014

24 This amended rule authorizes the sales of fish caught in a Treaty tribal commercial gillnet
25 fishery in all of Zone 6 of the Columbia River from 6:00 a.m., Tuesday, May 20 through 6:00
26 p.m., Thursday, May 22, 2014. Modifications are consistent with action taken May 19, 2014 by
27 the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington in cooperation
28 with the Columbia River Treaty Tribes.

29
30 **11. 635-019-0090**

31 **Spring Sport Chinook Fishery on Lookingglass Creek**

32 Adopted May 21, 2014: effective May 31, 2014 through July 31, 2014

33 This amended rule allows recreational anglers opportunity to harvest adipose fin-clipped adult
34 and jack Chinook salmon, which are in excess of the Department's hatchery production needs,
35 in Lookingglass Creek. This fishery is scheduled for the period from Saturday, May 3, 2014
36 until further notice.

37
38 **12. 635-011-0104**

39 **Requirement to Purchase a Columbia River Basin Endorsement Suspended for Free
40 Fishing Weekend**

41 Adopted May 23, 2014: effective June 1, 2014 through June 30, 2014

42 This amended rule allows anglers to participate in fisheries within the Columbia River Basin
43 without the need to purchase the Columbia River Basin Endorsement during free fishing
44 weekend on June 7-8, 2014. Rule modifications forego the need to possess a Columbia River
45 Basin Endorsement during Free Fishing Weekend by considering all anglers to have the
46 endorsement for that period.

1 **13. 635-041-0065**

2 **Columbia River Zone 6 Treaty Indian Commercial Gill Net Fishery Authorized**

3 Adopted May 27, 2014: effective May 28, 2014 through July 31, 2014

4 This amended rule authorizes the sales of fish caught in a Treaty tribal commercial gill net
5 fishery in all of Zone 6 of the Columbia River from 6:00 a.m., Wednesday, May 28 through 6:00
6 p.m., Saturday, May 31, 2014. Modifications are consistent with action taken May 27, 2014 by
7 the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington in cooperation
8 with the Columbia River Treaty Tribes.

9
10 **14. 635-042-0022**

11 **Commercial Spring Chinook Drift Net Fishery Set for the Mainstem Columbia River**

12 Adopted May 27, 2014: effective May 8, 2014 through July 31, 2014

13 This amended rule sets a non-Indian commercial spring Chinook drift net fishery for the
14 mainstem Columbia River in Zones 1 through 5 to commence from 6:00 p.m., Wednesday,
15 May 28 to 6:00 a.m., Thursday, May 29, 2014 (12 hours). Modifications were made consistent
16 with Joint State Action taken May 27, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the
17 States of Oregon and Washington.

18
19 **15. 635-042-0145**

20 **Commercial Spring Fishery Modified for the Youngs Bay Select Area**

21 Adopted May 27, 2014: effective May 28, 2014 through July 31, 2014

22 This amended rule modifies harvest regulations for a spring commercial fishery previously
23 adopted for the Youngs Bay Select Area of the Columbia River. Modifications are consistent
24 with the action taken May 27, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of
25 Oregon and Washington.

26
27 **16. 635-023-0125**

28 **Columbia River Recreational Fishery Above Bonneville Dam Authorized**

29 Adopted May 27, 2014: effective May 31, 2014 through June 30, 2014

30 This amended rule modifies regulations for the 2014 Columbia River spring recreational
31 fisheries above Bonneville Dam in all of Zone 6. Two adult adipose fin-clipped salmonids may
32 be retained per day, only one of which may be a Chinook. Adipose fin-clipped jack Chinook
33 may also be kept. All sockeye must be released. Revisions are consistent with action taken
34 May 27, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and
35 Washington.

36
37 **17. 635-019-0090**

38 **Spring Chinook Fishery in the John Day River Extended**

39 Adopted May 28, 2014: effective June 1, 2014 through July 31, 2014

40 This amended rule allows recreational anglers an extended opportunity to harvest wild spring
41 Chinook salmon in the upper mainstem of the John Day River until June 15, 2014. The fishery
42 was originally authorized from May 17 through June 1 but adverse weather conditions
43 hampered the fishers' success. This extension of the fishery should allow anglers to recover
44 their lost opportunity.

1 **18. 635-041-0065**

2 **Columbia River Zone 6 Treaty Indian Commercial Gill Net Fishery Authorized**

3 Adopted June 2, 2014: effective June 3, 2014 through July 31, 2014

4 This amended rule authorized the sales of fish caught in a Treaty tribal commercial gill net
5 fisher in all of Zone 6 of the Columbia River from 6:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 3 through 6:00
6 p.m., Friday, June 6, 2014. Modifications are consistent with action taken June 2, 2014 by the
7 Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington in cooperation
8 with the Columbia River Treaty Tribes.

9
10 **19. 635-042-0022 and 635-042-0145**

11 **Columbia River and Youngs Bay Commercial Spring Chinook Fisheries Modified**

12 Adopted June 3, 2014: effective June 4, 2014 through July 31, 2014

13 These amended rules set a non-Indian commercial spring Chinook drift net fishery for the
14 mainstem Columbia River in Zones 1 through 5 to commence from 6:00 p.m., Wednesday,
15 June 4 through to 6:00 a.m. Thursday, June 5, 2014 (12 hours); and modify harvest
16 regulations for a spring commercial fishery previously adopted for the Youngs Bay Select Area
17 of the Columbia River. Modifications were made consistent with Joint State Action taken June
18 3, 2014 by the Columbia River Compact agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington.

19 *Action:*

20 Commissioner Akenson moved to adopt all 19 temporary rules. Commissioner Webber
21 seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

22
23
24 **PUBLIC FORUM**

25 *Note: This part of the agenda is for comments on topics not scheduled elsewhere on the*
26 *agenda. The Commission is unable to take action on items brought to their attention in this*
27 *forum.*

28 No public testimony was given.

29
30 **Exhibit A: COMMISSION MINUTES**

31
32 Approve April 25, 2014 and May 16, 2014 Commission minutes differed.

33 *Action: Deferred*

34
35 **Exhibit B: 2014-2015 BIG GAME REGULATIONS**

36 *Staff Presentation: Tom Thornton, Game Program Manager*

37 *Don Whittaker, Ungulate Species Coordination*

38
39 *Don provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining tag proposals for the coming seasons and*
40 *the 2015 season recommendations. He briefly addressed the regulations process and how it*
41 *works for big game seasons. Brief update on mandatory reporting with some general*
42 *regulations concepts that need to be adopted for the 2015 season and species specific 2014*
43 *tag numbers that need to be adopted today. Don provided information regarding 2015*
44 *concepts including new hunts for adoption in October. This presentation is available in the*
45 *meeting materials and at*

46 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp

1 *Public Testimony:*

<p>Al Elkins, Oregon Hunters Association</p>	<p>Since May 1st the association has been working on analyzing the 2015 concepts that are being presented today.</p> <p>Requested from the Commissioners to allow the OHA to submit their comments in writing on the 2015 concepts that are being presented today to the Commission by the end of the month.</p> <p>Chair, Bobby Levy agreed with the associations request</p>
<p>Scott Beckstead, Senior Oregon State Director, The Humane Society of the United States</p>	<p>Opposes the expanded springtime bear hunts stating the issue is the orphaning of the black bear cubs in these spring hunts.</p> <p>The HSUS only takes opposition to hunting methods or practices that possess serious threat to animal welfare and causes unnecessary degree of suffering. Hunters kill nursing mothers and that results in cubs being orphaned and suffering death by starvation, predation or exposure and we believe that is unacceptable wildlife management.</p>
<p>Bill Tsiatsos, Private land owner, La Grande Oregon</p>	<p>It's not clear in regards to the damage tags if you have to hunt on that particular acreage or if you're allowed to hunt on cooperating land owners.</p> <p>Discussed definitions and interpretations by private individuals and law enforcement by ODFW. Predatory is defined as squirrels, rabbits, foxes etc. Predatory in our situation is wildlife Deer and elk are a predator due to the fact they are eating our income off of our private property as far as grazing ground. That is my only income off of owning property or raising crops is the product that results. If you are harboring numerous animals in the 100's and they are eating all your profit and the state is benefiting more off of the private ground than the individual himself.</p> <p>Mr. Tsiatsos has read that if the state is taking unjustly there should be just compensation. He's had help for fencing supplies for fence damage and sprayed for weeds, but nothing in dollars and cents.</p> <p>Management - For example, If the cattle get out and onto land marsh you're told to remove them immediately and if I'm unable to get them off quickly or don't have the resources to do so, then I'm subject to a fee to have them removed. Versus wildlife on private ground and you want them off you've had hazers to get them off but we still have no repercussions as in getting them off or compensation. Management should be able to control.</p>
<p>Craig Starr, Oregon Bow Hunters, Lebanon Oregon</p>	<p>Opposes the proposal to eliminate portability of the "one elk" archery controlled hunt tags in five eastern Oregon units except in situations like the trophy elk hunt units of Wenaha and others where there are special trophy circumstances. This is particularly true for when the</p>

	<p>archery season occurs during fire season.</p> <p>Supports the proposals to break the link between controlled tags and general tags in the MDI units and the Sled Springs and Chesnimnus controlled elk units.</p> <p>Opposes continuing control on archery deer hunting and establishment of new controls on archery elk hunting in the Warner and Maury units in the absence of any compelling biological justification for the need for controls.</p> <p>Opposes the addition of rifle cow hunts in the Trask unit since all archery antlerless elk hunting opportunities were eliminated by the ODFW. This proposal demonstrates a lack of sensibility on ODFW's part, especially since much of the discussion at ARPAC was related to our on-going objections to this same inequitable approach occurring in many central and eastern Oregon units.</p> <p>Supports mandatory reporting because good data is necessary for good sound game management. Our only concern is that some people are stating they are reporting and that information didn't get through the system.</p>
<p>Rich Thompson, Traditional Archers of Oregon, Newberg Oregon</p>	<p>Opposes the "one elk" hunt only archery elk opportunity in Sled Springs and Chesnimnus units for 2015.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Questions by Commissioners:

Commissioner Finley - According to the slide presentation there is a continuation to protect cubs and sows with cubs. He asked Scott if he felt that the department was doing an inadequate job in this protection.

Scott Beckstead - He defers to the biologists who have studied the phenomena of spring bear hunts and states that the cubs are very young and mothers go out on forging expeditions. It's notoriously difficult, especially for black bears, to determine the sex out in the field and hunters can't get close enough to determine whether their target is male or female. Consequently too many nursing mothers are killed by sport hunters. He further states that he would again defer to the biologists and to the specific data that support these conclusions, but it is clear to the HSUS that there might be some specific discrepancy in when males emerge opposed to females.

Commissioner Finley – Asked, was the topic of portability discussed among the ARPAC group?

1 **Craig Starr** - The group spent considerable time discussing that topic. A vote was never taken
2 but it was absolutely clear that bow hunters were not going to support the elimination of tag
3 portability because of the possible opportunity lost during fire season.
4

5 **Discussion:**

6 **Commissioner Finley** - Can you tell us what the focus or goal was in removing the portability
7 of tags when traditionally it has been there, and what was the consensus of the ARPAC
8 group?
9

10 **Tom Thornton** - The portability issue was discussed at length and the ARPAC committee
11 stated that they could not come to a consensus on that issue. Lengthy conversations took
12 place with numerous scenarios as to when it was acceptable and when it wasn't and therefore
13 a general consensus for a large portion of portability was not agreed upon.
14

15 **Commissioner Finley** - Do you agree with the argument that fire closure may preclude your
16 own objectives being met or reduce opportunity for hunting and if so, does this Commission
17 provide opportunity to the director of the department to allow portability under unusual
18 circumstances?
19

20 **Tom Thornton** - Yes, there are situations where fire can impact hunting. We have a fire policy
21 in place, which if it occurs and restricts the hunters opportunity for the entire area and season,
22 we look at the impacted area and duration. We have things in place that we can do to
23 counteract that situation. For example, we can expand the area and or extend the season.
24 These are things we can do in place by temporary rule to alleviate the impact.
25

26 **Commissioner Finley** - During the presentation I heard the phrase, "you need a deer tag to
27 hunt elk." Don, can you please explain?
28

29 **Don Whittaker** - We have a couple of situations in our regulations where we have it working
30 both ways. These are enforcement mechanisms to reduce those individuals who cheat the
31 system and it improves the control over the number of hunter's potentially hunting deer as well
32 as elk and vice versa depending on the hunt and unit.
33

34 **Commissioner Finley** - In the Beulah unit you are extending the hunt by 11 days. Can you
35 please explain how that reduces the conflict between archery and rifle hunters?
36

37 **Don Whittaker** - As it exists right now in the Beulah rifle cow elk hunt and the controlled
38 archery deer hunt, those two overlap each other approximately by 94% in season dates and
39 98% in area. By extending the season by 11 days, it will provide the archery hunters an 11 day
40 period without the rifle hunters. The rifle hunting season would close at its normal date.
41

42 **Commissioner Finley** - In regards to sow's and cubs, do you agree with the research cited by
43 HSUS and if not, why not? Also, how do you really assure protection of mothers and cubs with
44 this spring hunt, while meeting your goals?
45

46 **Don Whittaker** - The research presented by HUSU is peer reviewed research and is good
47 work. Our particular season structure for spring bear hunting in the State of Oregon is based

1 on data. We have had a number of studies in Southwestern Oregon and Northeastern Oregon
2 where we have kept track of den emergence dates etc., for males and females. Most of our
3 seasons are over by the end of May for the controlled spring season and that season date is
4 based on when most of the females emerge from the den.
5

6 We have based our season dates and our tag numbers to take advantage of the earlier male
7 bear's emergence based on studies conducted in the State of Oregon from as early as the mid
8 80's through mid to late 90's. So we are confident when we put the timing of our season dates
9 combined with the fact of the rules on the books that cubs, and sows with cubs in the area are
10 indeed protected.

11
12 **Commissioner Finley** - How many reports do you have of female bears being harvested
13 inadvertently?
14

15 **Don Whittaker** - Within the departments bear management plan there is a mandatory check-in
16 within 10 days of harvest for any bear. The data we do collect is lactating status and the
17 number of female bears that come in are an extremely small proportion. Additionally in the
18 bear plan, we have a number of criteria that we keep track of all the time and that is the age of
19 the males, females and the proportion of males to females. Our last year of complete data in
20 2012, if we look at that accepted criteria, we are well within the proportion of females to males
21 in those age classes. The criterion used has been developed by the researchers cited by the
22 HSUS.
23

24 **Commissioner Finley** - How do you determine the numbers presented today based on the
25 co-equal value, non-taking of wildlife and eco system function as provided by the legislature?
26 To clarify, what is the eco-system interaction in the geographic unit, the hunt unit that you're
27 striving for having to maintain for aesthetic non-consumptive, which is wildlife viewing?
28

29 **Don Whittaker** - For the ungulate side, we do have established objectives for deer and elk.
30 First we look at the biological capacity of a landscape, our best understanding of what that
31 capacity is for deer and elk. Then we start working publicly through what are the desires of the
32 various interest groups that might be interested in those species that includes hunting, viewing,
33 etc. We also bring into those discussions the acceptance of those animals on the landscape.
34 As was testified today, in some situations too many of those animals may also lead to conflict.
35 In the consideration of our management objectives in deer and elk we incorporate all of that
36 feedback and the net result of those management objectives most often is not a maximum
37 number that could potentially be out there on the landscape. It is what we end up with an
38 acceptance capacity but still within our capability to meet with the demands of all those interest
39 groups, hunters, viewers etc. That process is and has been a very open and a very public
40 process including the commission and multiple meetings with our constituent groups, our
41 conceptive groups, and land owner representatives both farming and ranching as well.
42

43 On our bear and cougar side, in some cases we do not necessarily have specific objectives for
44 population numbers. For example from the cougar plan, the numbers that we utilize there
45 aren't necessarily a management objective population level we want. What we have is based
46 on our best model that we have available at this time. With all of these different potential
47 mortality factors that are occurring on the population there are some of which we can manage

1 and some of which we cannot manage. We would like to have this minimum number of
2 animals out there on the landscape. Then we manage our harvest which is one of the few
3 factors for those populations that we actually have control over so that we don't create the
4 situation that the state of Oregon and many other states were in, in the late 50's and 60's. We
5 don't want this abhorrently low population out there on the landscape. Our harvest of all those
6 species is managed such that we attempt to meet the desires of our consumptive users, but
7 we also maintain numbers out there so that the viewer's know from a holistic standpoint that
8 their existence on the landscape is out there. We try to meet those objectives as well by not
9 producing situations that are driving those animals to local extirpation.

10
11 **Commissioner Wolley** - In the overview of the bear season summary it states "Most conflict-
12 related mortality (95%) continues to occur in western Oregon where human and bear
13 populations are highest, resulting in damage, human safety concerns, and nuisance
14 problems." Is that your basic justification in the increase for the addition of 250 tags in
15 southwestern Oregon?

16
17 **Don Whittaker** - That is only part of it. There are 11 units in the southwestern limited tag
18 hunts. This new controlled hunt includes only eight of those units. What this controlled hunt is
19 going to do is help us distribute some of the other hunters in some areas. Most of the hunters
20 in the southwestern Oregon hunt tend to focus on the three units that are not included in this
21 new hunt and it's taking advantage of a fairly robust bear population that are in those areas
22 from those wildlife management units and it is forcing the hunters with these tags to actually go
23 to other parts of that southwestern Oregon area.

24
25 **Commissioner Wolley** - It's primarily to increase hunter opportunity as opposed to address
26 the bear conflict?

27
28 **Don Whittaker** - That's a big part of it, correct.

29
30 **Commissioner Wolley** - For cougar, you are able to break out more data in terms of human
31 conflict, damage, safety, etc. Do you have that level of information or track data for bear
32 mortality?

33
34 **Don Whittaker** - Yes, we do track a high level of data, which also includes the mandatory
35 harvest and mortality data for southwestern Oregon.

36
37 **Commissioner Wolley** - In regards to the emergence of sows with cubs, one of your
38 protections is the acknowledgement that the sow doesn't stray far from the den when they first
39 emerge, but most hunters, I would assume, don't know where the dens are and could kill a
40 sow within 10 yards of a den, is that a legal kill?

41
42 **Don Whittaker** - Yes, but only if it's a non-lactating female. If we look at the reproductive
43 cycles of female bears, they tend to reproduce every other year. At any given time, on
44 average, only one-half of females will have young cubs with them. Further, when we combine
45 that with our emergence patterns, the males tend to emerge out of their dens earlier and when
46 they emerge, tend to cover a much larger portion of ground in their foraging habits. When we
47 look at susceptibility of these animals to harvest, the chances are low that a hunter will

1 encounter a sow and cubs relative to all other components of the population. Also the timing of
2 our season is engineered to focus those efforts on these early emerging males with larger
3 areas and more probability of being encountered.

4
5 **Commissioner Wolley** -30% of the bears are female, what percentage are lactating?

6
7 **Don Whittaker** - I don't have those numbers here today, but it is very low.

8
9 **Commissioner Wolley** - In regards to cougars, what constitutes a real or perceived threat? Is
10 there a process for an animal to be killed under these criteria and is there a permit required?
11 What are the reporting requirements?

12
13 **Don Whittaker** - No permit is required to take a cougar or bear that is posing a threat to
14 human health or safety. The only reporting requirement is that if they kill a cougar or bear in
15 that particular situation, that they report it and they bring the carcass to us so we may collect
16 all the necessary information and evaluate the situation.

17
18 The process for determining whether it is indeed a threat is based on communication and
19 discussion that occurs with our local district biologist who are the experts in these situations.
20 Based on that evaluation and of the whole communication process our district biologist will
21 determine what actions might be required in response to that particular situation.

22
23 **Commissioner Webber** - In regards to the mandatory reporting system, from some of the
24 testimony we've heard today, the system doesn't seem to be working. Do we have any hard
25 evidence from our side to substantiate the issue?

26
27 **Tom Thornton** - With very rare exceptions, we haven't found any issues with the system itself.
28 I think there are some operator errors that happen with finalizing the reporting. This is why we
29 stress the importance of the confirmation number that is only issued until you have completed
30 the report and clicked on the finish button.

31
32 We also send out reminders to those who have not reported and we haven't found many
33 problems with the system. It's been online and fully functional for six years and it seems to be
34 working very well.

35
36 **Commissioner Webber** - Regarding mandatory check in for cougars and bears, what
37 happens if they don't check in, is there a fine?

38
39 **Tom Thornton** - When we are notified that they did not check in, we contact the OSP and they
40 could be cited for failure to check the animal. There is no fine, but they can be prosecuted.

41
42 **Commissioner Webber** - There are three controlled hunts in the Hepner, Ukiah and Snake
43 River units, all of which are the only opportunity, why are we doing that?

44
45 **Don Whittaker** - The biologists all recommended that we limit those hunts. They feel that
46 having a hunt for any elk that is generally one bull is a more desirable tag and is worthy of
47 being the person's only tag. They are trying to focus those tags on people who are sincere

1 about hunting in that unit and it also takes away some of the opportunity enforcement wise,
2 restricting people to that location.

3
4 **Commissioner Akenson** - Regarding the only elk proposal and the controlled hunts for
5 archers; my impression is that this was a big issue with the committee and they did not feel
6 there was a good resolution on this. Is this the first time this would be enacted for some of
7 these archery units?

8
9 **Don Whittaker** - There are both deer and elk hunts that are restricted to being an only
10 opportunity. We looked back at the report that was reviewed by all of the committee members
11 after the Archery Review Public advisory Committee (ARPAC) was wrapped up and in that
12 report it states quite clearly that they couldn't reach a consensus on this subject.

13
14 **Commissioner Akenson** - Was the lack of consensus about whether or not to have
15 portability, or the details of how the program would be administered?

16
17 **Don Whittaker** - They did not get into that level of detail. They talked about different criteria or
18 consideration for when to implement it. They talked about if the tag was better than the
19 standard opportunity for an area, or if it was a 30-day tag. They brought up several different
20 things. They did not reach a consensus on a definition or exact time for when it should or
21 should not be implemented.

22
23 **Commissioner Akenson**

24 I would like to see ODFW take a more detailed look in this portability issue and wait for another
25 year to get more input from broader stakeholders and the department to really see whether this
26 is the direction or not. It seems like people were surprised about it and maybe it needs to be
27 vetted and discussed a little further.

28
29 **Chair Levy** – agreed.

30
31 **Commissioner Finley** – agreed.

32
33 **Commissioner Akenson** - We received a lot of public comment about the reporting glitches.
34 Is the process pretty simple? Does it list the tags issued so you know what tag you need to
35 report on?

36
37 **Tom Thornton** - Whether it was a sport pac tag, controlled hunt tag or general season tag, the
38 person goes online or if they choose to they can call in by phone. Tags that need to be
39 reported show up regardless of how they were purchased. If it was sports pac tag and the
40 person did not pick up the tag there would be no requirement to report. It's very important that
41 we hear from people who didn't hunt or were unsuccessful who purchased tags The reporting
42 is very important for the expansion value, how many animals were actually taken to know what
43 proportion was unsuccessful or did not hunt.

44
45 **Commissioner Akenson** - In regards to the disabled permits, they seem to have a dropped this
46 year. Do we know why we've had fewer people apply for disabled hunting license and tags?

47

1 **Don Whittaker**- I really can't answer that. I'm not sure why the reduction occurred.

2
3 **Tom Thornton** - I don't know the answer but if you look at the trend it did stabilize when we
4 went to the two year re-up process. It might be hitting that critical mass or whatever, but
5 without additional detail or follow up we don't have a solid answer.

6
7 **Commissioner Akenson** - I don't quite understand about the guide and outfitter tag sales
8 related to the terminology of the allocated tags, drawn tags, sold tags, leftover tags. Can you
9 give us a quick rundown of that program?

10
11 **Don Whittaker** - Back in the late 90's the legislature created the guide and outfitter program.
12 What that program allows is for Oregon licensed guides and outfitters to apply early for and
13 draw tags from our controlled hunts which they can market to their clients and can sell for two
14 times the non-residential tag fee. The number of tags that go into the drawing for guide and
15 outfitters according to the statute is based on the statement that one half of the non-resident
16 tags the previous year go into that drawing. Those that do not get sold go back into the pool
17 and are sold on a first come first serve basis to other outfitters until that one-half maximum is
18 reached. The one difficult caveat in that whole process is for controlled hunts where there are
19 very few tag numbers with only one non-resident tag available in a very small and sought after
20 hunt. This goes into an every other year draw for outfitters and guides to draw and sell.
21 Subsequently, all tags that are not sold by the guides and outfitters come back in to the
22 controlled hunt drawing.

23
24 **Commissioner Wolley** - What occurred in 2007 with the administrative removal of cougars?
25 Was that when the reporting started or was there some type of authorization?

26
27 **Don Whittaker** - 2007 was the last revision of the cougar management plan during which the
28 Commission adopted some criteria where target areas could qualify for administrative removal
29 of cougars for human safety, ungulates, etc.

30
31 **Commissioner Wolley** - Was that primarily Wildlife Services that was conducting those
32 removals, or how were those done?

33
34 **Don Whittaker** - Of the four targeted areas that just went down this last winter, the Wenaha
35 initially started as wildlife services and then the last couple of years were a combination of
36 wildlife services and agents. The other item that was enabled in that time period was that
37 legislation enabled the Commission to develop a process for certifying volunteer agents that
38 can use hounds. Wenaha was a mix of wildlife services and agents. The Steens mountain
39 target area was exclusively wildlife services. The Warner unit target area was exclusively
40 volunteer agents and the Ukiah was actually department employees that were hired
41 specifically to do those administrative removals in that unit.

42
43 **Chair Levy** - Asked for any other comments on the portability issue.

44
45 **Commissioner Finley** - In regards to fire closure in the archery units, what are some other
46 emergencies? I'd like you to respond to the following;

1 Director to review the portability issue for the archery hunts in the five units identified in the
2 proposed regulations and issue emergency regulations as necessary to ensure opportunities
3 due to emergency closures.

4
5 **Director Elicker** - We knew portability was going to be an issue. I think what you've heard
6 from where we sit is that with the ARPAC group when you put 20 hunters in the room you're
7 not going to get a consensus particularly on issues like this. I hear both sides of the issue, and
8 I would suggest to the Commission that we investigate this issue further and see if we can't
9 come up with a policy or a set of policies or criteria that might be something that is more useful
10 than what we have now.

11
12 We try hard to take a subjective look at each of those issues that occurs with fire and those
13 closures that weren't expected by the hunting public to see if we can provide some additional
14 opportunities. Today's testimony illustrates that this portability issue really deserves more
15 attention from the department and I'd be willing to commit to that. We could bring this as part of
16 the big game discussion in October which would give us some time to sit and work with the
17 archery community a little more.

18
19 **Chair Levy** - The motion before us is to vote on proposal and concepts for the big game
20 seasons. We'd defer that until October or do you want us to amend the draft motion?

21
22 **Tom Thornton** - Today, you're actually adopting the tag numbers and those three items that
23 we pointed out for 2014. For 2015, we're looking for your approval in concept and we
24 understand clearly that approval is modified by needing to revisit the tag portability issue.

25
26 *Action:*

27 Commissioner Finley moved to amend OAR Chapter 635, Divisions 045, 065, 067, 068, 069,
28 070, 071, 073 and 075 as proposed by staff; and approve in concept the staff proposals for
29 2015 general and controlled big game and western gray squirrel seasons, with the exception of
30 the portability issue and the commitments by director and staff that were discussed.
31 Commissioner Akenson seconded the motion and the motion was carried unanimously.

32 33 34 **Exhibit C: FURBEARER AND UNPROTECTED MAMMAL REGULATIONS**

35 *Staff Presentation: Tom Thornton, Game Program Manager*

36
37 *Tom Thornton provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining furbearer trapping information and*
38 *trends along with species and season information. He provided information about season*
39 *recommendations for unprotected and protected species along with furbearer harvest seasons*
40 *recommendations. He brought to the Commission recommendations and proposals related to*
41 *the furbearer and unprotected mammal regulations. This presentation is available in the*
42 *meeting materials and at*

43 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp

1 Public Testimony:

<p>David Walker, Oregon United Sporting Dog Association (OUSDA), Tillamook Oregon</p>	<p>Unfortunately we at OSUDA were not made aware of the proposals presented today until the big game meetings in May. Therefore we did not have time to review or make a substantial rebuttal to where we were going to be on the Eastern Oregon bobcat limit.</p> <p>Support the general regulation proposals on both the jaw requirements and the clarification on the tagging requirements.</p> <p>Oppose the bobcat bag limit from five to three in the eastern Oregon area.</p> <p>While the department is proposing no changes to the pursuit season, we would like to see that season extended. We disagree with the findings by ODFW staff in such that there are hunters already scouting for cow elk. Also, our dogs are trained not to pursue off-game. I know that the ODFW and the Commission are always looking at expanding opportunities.</p>
<p>Stan Steele, Oregon Outdoor Council (OOC), Corvallis Oregon</p>	<p>Oppose the bobcat harvest reduction until a meeting of the stakeholders and user groups, along with ODFW, can discuss issues.</p> <p>What we would like to see occur is to develop an Oregon bobcat management plan. Other states, including those that surround Oregon, are doing incredible research.</p>
<p>Jim Soares, Oregon Trappers Association (OTA), Wallowa Oregon</p>	<p>We were not informed of the proposed changes until May.</p> <p>Oppose the reduction in bobcat tags to three because it's not based on reliable data.</p> <p>We would gladly work with ODFW on a bobcat management plan.</p>

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Questions by Commissioners:

Commissioner Finley - Were you here for my remarks on what the statute provides, the requirement binding this Commission and the department, on constituencies, balance between, and taking of non-consumptive use and ecological value?

Mr. Steele – Yes. Policy has to be made in an open and transparent fashion. Utah has a standing committee where those other constituencies are represented and would be welcomed. Dialogue is where we can solve a lot of the conflict, sometimes we won't but at least the discussions can take place.

Commissioner Webber - I got the impression that the number of 1500 represented in Tom's was discussed with OTA, but you don't agree with it.

1 **Mr. Soares** - We talked about those numbers. We kicked numbers around but the talks broke
 2 down without any agreement.
 3

Public Testimony:

<p>Terry Sawyer, OTA Prineville, Oregon</p>	<p>Oppose the bag limit from five to three.</p> <p>We don't know how you can make a regulation change without the catch total from the previous year. Further, we the OTA and district biologists were not involved in this decision making process.</p>
<p>Doug Nichol, President OTA Aumsville, Oregon</p>	<p>We were left out of any input or involvement regarding this recommendation which caught us unprepared to properly address the information to you.</p> <p>Oppose the bobcat harvest limit reduction until better management practices are implemented.</p> <p>Oppose the general regulation proposal on the language change regarding the tagging of bobcats due to the district offices setting forth their own times and days that they will accept those tags. This can lead to hunters not being able to bring in their own tags due to their own work schedule.</p>
<p>Roy Jackson, Private Trapper, Creswell, Oregon</p>	<p>I feel that the statistics on age that was presented, along with the other statistics being collected on harvest, don't accurately correlate with the population in the state of Oregon with the age distribution that exists.</p>

4
 5 **Discussion:**
 6 **Commissioner Akenson** - From the testimony we've heard today, and we have an objective
 7 to harvest 1500 bobcats, but in 8 of the last 10 years we've exceeded that. Why didn't we
 8 decrease the trapping years ago?
 9

10 **Tom Thornton** -The objective has only been in place for four year. In the years when bobcat
 11 harvest peaked between 2003 and 2007, we did reduce the bag limit from seven to five. It did
 12 bring the harvest down slightly and as prices have increased so has the interest which
 13 increases the number of bobcats taken. This is the reason we are proposing the reduction
 14 because once again it has reached that threshold.
 15

16 **Commissioner Akenson** - In listening to the testimony today and in my own review of the
 17 information which was somewhat confusing, looking at data from other states, there seems to
 18 be some variations in the data. Why don't we have our own numbers and maybe the harvest
 19 number is not an appropriate one?
 20

21 **Larry Cooper** - The reason why some of the data varies between Wisconsin, Utah and
 22 Oregon is, in Wisconsin there are over 10,000 trappers while we have approximately 1500.

1 They also have four full-time staff members that do nothing but furbearer management. We
2 have no staff in the Wildlife division that is specifically directed towards furbearers.

3
4 **Tom Thornton** - The primary guideline of a harvest objective and the percent of females in the
5 harvest were essentially agreed to. We continue to monitor the other items, and what we're
6 looking at is several different parameters which suggest the age is coming down and that
7 suggest we're hitting that population hard enough that we're in a decline. This is the basis for
8 the recommendation at this time.

9
10 **Commissioner Akenson** - Since we are voting on two years, it would be nice to see last
11 year's data. Can you tell us why that data is not included?

12
13 **Tom Thornton** - Due to the timing of this meeting, we're operating before we have all of the
14 information from the immediate previous year. Also, the age analysis data on the teeth are still
15 at the lab and we won't have that back for several months.

16
17 **Commissioner Akenson, Finley & Webber** - All stated that the ODFW should explore
18 developing a Bobcat Management plan that looks at the ecological benefits.

19
20 **Commissioner Webber** - From looking at the data and my interpretation of it, I'm at a point
21 where I'm not sure we need to cut back on the numbers.

22
23 **Tom Thornton** - Harvest objectives can certainly be revisited. We're looking at not only that
24 but the other population parameters of the adults in the harvest, the average age going down,
25 and the proportion of the young in the harvest. We also look at the consistent number of
26 bobcats that are taken from year to year; along with the biological factors. This is what leads
27 us to the recommendation.

28
29 **Commissioner Webber** - Since we review this every two years, is there a specific reason why
30 we can't just wait a year to see what and how the incoming data will affect the trend?

31
32 **Tom Thornton** - There is not a specific reason why we couldn't wait, however two years to
33 review and come back to you with a more detailed look at this would be far more acceptable.

34
35 **Commissioner Wolley** - In recommending a harvest objective of 1250, what are the factors or
36 the criteria that go into arriving at that number?

37
38 **Larry Cooper** - In our conversations with the district biologists, the trappers and looking at
39 what the surrounding states were doing we arrived at that number. There is no model that we
40 used to assist us. I think reviewing that number is a very appropriate activity.

41
42 **Tom Thornton** - We also look at the historic numbers going back 20+ years and the
43 performance of the population under that harvest level. We were very comfortable that the
44 number was sustainable.

45
46 **Commissioner Wolley** - Why is there such a large discrepancy in the value of pelts in East
47 and West?

1
2 **Larry Cooper** - There is a great difference in the value of pelts because of the end value of the
3 fur. Each region have different pelts and it really depends on the end user.
4

5 **Commissioner Wolley** - Regarding the communication with the stakeholders, are their claims
6 valid and what type of outreach occurred?
7

8 **Tom Thornton** - I certainly won't say that the concerns are not valid, communication can
9 always be increased. At the meeting with OUSDA, the proposals had not been solidified and
10 hadn't been through the division and the director's office to know they would be proposals, so I
11 was unable to give that information. However, I provided some info about the population and
12 the decline rates at that time and told them what we were considering.
13

14 **Commissioner Anderson** - I'm not really seeing a strong compelling argument that these cats
15 are being over harvested at the level we are seeing right now but It's very clear they are being
16 under managed. How we go about that is clearly an unknown at this time due to staff and
17 budgets.
18

19 Is there a limit on the number of licenses or cards that are issued and if not has that been
20 discussed as a way to put some caps in management on something that we're concerned
21 about without necessarily making the bag limit smaller?
22

23 **Tom Thornton** - It's an open system in that there is no restriction on the number of
24 participants. For each taker who chooses either to hunt or trap they get only one record card
25 and right now it is good for five cats. What you're asking is could we close the system and
26 control the number of participants and that certainly could be done. A drawing could be done to
27 see which of the applicants would receive a card while others wouldn't be able to trap for that
28 year. We've chosen to leave it an open system and just control it with the bag limit.
29

30 **Commissioner Anderson** - I'm somewhat not inclined to go with reducing the bag limit.
31

32 **Chair Levy** - On the record card sales, besides the bobcat information what type of
33 information do we collect?
34

35 **Tom Thornton** - We collect the basic information such as name, address and their brand
36 number so we can tie it back to the individual. For the bobcat itself, we collect the county it was
37 taken in, the sex and the date taken.
38

39 **Larry Cooper** - We also collect the number of traps set, and number of trap nights by species.
40 That's where we get the catch per unit effort information which is collected on the report form.
41

42 **Chair Levy** - The record card and report form, who fills out each of those?
43

44 **Tom Thornton** - The record card is filled out by the licensing staff when they sell the card. The
45 report form is filled out by the trapper himself. However there is a third form that is filled out by
46 the district. It records the county where the harvest is coming from.
47

1 **Chair Levy** - Why didn't we get the county information today since that would have given us a
2 more detailed look at where those harvested animals are taking place? It would have been
3 better for us as a Commission to make a better decision on which way we wanted to go
4 regarding the bobcat issue.

5
6 **Tom Thornton** - We do have that information and I thought it was included in the presentation,
7 but we have always managed by east and west.

8
9 **Chair Levy** - It seems to me that it would not take a lot of effort in determining where those
10 takes are coming from county wise since you are already collecting that information. Then you
11 could make those divisions without adding a person to the job.

12
13 **Director Elicker** - I think this issue has really illustrated the issue for the department to be fair
14 about it .Tom is the manager of the entire game program, which as you know has all the big
15 game hunts, controlled game hunts and huge issues as well as having a vacant position for a
16 carnivore biologist.

17
18 We've been holding that position vacant as a cost savings to try and make it through this
19 biennium. Bobcats have been managed as a furbearer with perhaps not the priority as
20 cougars, wolves and bears which is why we don't have a bobcat management plan. We
21 certainly can look in to that, but I'm going to guarantee the folks in the room if I'm going to
22 spend a lot of time on bobcats, this \$22 bobcat record card will start at a \$100 and go up.
23 When you talk about dividing eastern Oregon, eco zone, and different units, the more you want
24 to focus on opportunity, the more complexity we add, it takes more time, cost and hours to get
25 those answers and provide that level of information that we want to have. We're always faced
26 with trying to manage with some level of information where we always would like more
27 particularly on the animals like bobcats and others. You just do the best you can. I understand
28 you'll vote and handle this in regards to the bobcat limit. I just wanted you to understand that
29 the discussion today is good and illustrates massively the issues of cost and complexity of
30 management and then the cost to the department and who will pay for it.

31
32 *Action:*

33 Commissioner Finley moved to amend Oregon Administrative Rule Chapter 635, Divisions 050
34 and 200 as proposed by staff to set regulations and seasons for the harvest and pursuit of
35 furbearing mammals except that the bobcat tag shall remain at five. Commissioner Anderson
36 seconded the motion and the motion was carried unanimously.

37
38 **Exhibit D: ACCESS AND HABITAT PROJECT FUNDING**

39 *Staff Presentation: Matthew Keenan, Access and Habitat Program Coordinator*

40
41 *Matthew Keenan provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining the Access and Habitat*
42 *program which is requesting approval for ten projects that are a mix between access and*
43 *habitat projects in the southwest and eastern portions of Oregon. This presentation is available*
44 *in the meeting materials and at*

45 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp

1 **Public Testimony: No public testimony was given.**

2
3 **Discussion:**

4 **Commissioner Finley** - Regards to the C2 Ranch Habitat Improvement lands, was there
5 consideration for an elk program?

6
7 **Matthew Keenan** - I do not know if that was discussed, but primarily there are more deer on
8 that land.

9
10 **Commissioner Wolley** - Regards to the JWTR and Jackson Travel management proposal,
11 how are the troopers selected?

12
13 **Matthew Keenan** - Selection is through the lieutenant at the Salem Police Headquarters
14 (SPD) by sending out a solicitation asking which retirees may be interested in the position.
15 How the SPD actually picks the trooper, I do not know.

16
17 **Commissioner Anderson** - There are three projects down in the Medford area, may I assume
18 that they are all on the same council, but the voting all varies. How can that happen in one
19 meeting?

20
21 **Matthew Keenan** - The map actually shows the lines for A&H regions which shows that they
22 are in two separate regions. One is in the southwestern region and the other in the Deschutes
23 Klamath region. They have different meetings with different numbers of attendees

24
25 *Action:*

26 Commissioner Wolley moved to approve the recommendations of the Access and Habitat
27 Board for project funding. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion and the motion was
28 carried unanimously.

29
30
31 **Exhibit E: 2015 ACCESS AND HABITAT AUCTION AND RAFFLE TAG ALLOCATIONS**

32 *Staff Presentation: Don Whittaker, Ungulate Species Coordinator*

33 *Matthew Keenan, Access and Habitat Program Coordinator*

34
35 *Don Whittaker and Matthew Keenan provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining the 2015*
36 *Auction and Raffle tag allocations, and provided income data for the previous year and 2015*
37 *Auction proposals. This presentation is available in the meeting materials and at*
38 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp

39
40 **Public Testimony: No public testimony was given.**

41
42 *Action:*

43 Commissioner Finley moved to approve the 2015 auction and raffle big game tag allocations
44 as proposed by staff. Commissioner Webber seconded the motion and the motion was carried
45 unanimously.

1 **Exhibit F: HABITAT CONSERVATION STAMP**

2 *Staff Presentation: Andrea Hanson, Conservation Strategy Coordinator*

3
4 *Andrea Hanson provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining the cost, rules, award amounts*
5 *and recommended proposals for the Habitat Conservation Stamp. This presentation is*
6 *available in the meeting materials and at*

7 http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp

8
9 **Public Testimony: No public testimony was given.**

10
11 **Discussion:**

12 **Commissioner Finley** - Did the winery just make a donation or did they use the artwork on
13 their label?

14
15 **Andrea Hanson** - We did have a partnership where they would hold the art contest at the
16 winery and use the 2012 Western Meadowlark winner on their wine label. They also promoted
17 both the conservation program and the agency on the back of the wine bottle and donated \$5
18 for each bottle.

19
20 **Commissioner Finley** - Did someone bring that to you or was that your initiative?

21
22 **Andrea Hanson** - I contacted several wineries in the area requesting the art show and if they
23 would be willing to have a label that donates money to the program. They've been wonderful to
24 work with and we're in conversations to have a white wine released this year with the same
25 program and continue the art contest and show at their winery.

26
27 **Commissioner Finley** - You're proposing to reduce the award amount. Is the award amount a
28 necessary motivation or are the artists doing it as a benefit for conservation and, if so, have
29 you considered dropping the award amount in half to see whether or not these artists are going
30 to respond?

31
32 **Andrea Hanson** - We did receive correspondence from some artists that were concerned
33 about the award being reduced. The reasons behind looking at other department award
34 numbers were to determine where we should go with our own number. We settled on the
35 \$1000 award along with 25 free prints hoping that the combination of having their art displayed
36 to the public at the art show at the winery and having the wine label would be sufficient
37 motivation. Also, there is a lot of prestige on the art being part of the art stamp in forms of
38 recognition as the stamp program gets older. Further we felt that the \$1000 would be enough
39 where the program revenue could cover it so that we don't go into the negative and hopefully
40 still attract skilled artists.

41
42 **Commissioner Webber** – In some of the correspondence received there were some concerns
43 about the size of the artwork. Have you considered a smaller size of the artwork?

44
45 In the original review of the program we had not thought about changing the size because 13 x
46 9 is very standard for stamp editions. The first attempt we are proposing is to just bring down
47 the award to \$1000. If we find we can't attract artists or are not getting quality work then the

1 next step we can take would be to reduce the size of the art. The 13x9 size is very consistent
2 with most; if not all state agency stamp contests.

3
4 **Commissioner Akenson** - Will the Duck Pond Winery continue to do the donation program in
5 future years?

6
7 **Andrea Hanson** - We have a contract for this following year where we are talking about a new
8 wine coming out this year. After this year, it will go out to public bid again and ask all wineries
9 whether they'd be willing to have the art show and what sort of donation or partnership they
10 would be willing to give. Taking the applications, the person who provides the most donations
11 would get the contract. It will go to open bid next year.

12
13 **Commissioner Akenson** - Is the Duck Pond wine only available through the winery directly?

14
15 **Andrea Hanson** - They only sell that wine in their showroom in Dundee and online.

16
17 **Commissioner Akenson** - What type of marketing have you investigated for the conservation
18 stamp?

19
20 **Andrea Hanson** - The goal this year is to improve advertisement. I think that's one of our
21 biggest issues. We will put it in the conservation newsletter and talk to our conservation
22 leaders group and ask them to get it to their supporters. We do have some information at the
23 ODFW field offices, but there are many other ways we can advertise. We're going to be adding
24 advertisements on the upland game birds stamp form for the stamps. There are a lot of things
25 we can do through the other venues at ODFW.

26
27 **Commissioner Akenson** - Can the stamps be purchased at the Point-of-Sale sites?

28
29 **Andrea Hanson** - They can be sold at those locations, however most of them don't know how
30 to do that, it is a bit more difficult so we tend to send people to ODFW field offices or they can
31 go online.

32
33 *Action:*

34 Commissioner Wolley moved to adopt Oregon Administrative Rule 635, Divisions 008, and 095
35 as proposed by staff. Commissioner Akenson seconded the motion and the motion was carried
36 unanimously.

37
38 **Exhibit G: 2015-2017 PROPOSED AGENCY BUDGET**

39
40 *Staff Presentation: Debbie Colbert, Deputy Director for Administration*
41 *Ron Anglin, Wildlife Division Administrator*
42 *Ed Bowles, Fish Division Administrator*
43 *Aaron Jenkins, Economist*
44

45 *Expenditure report: The Commission Financial Report for the 2013-2015 biennium as of April*
46 *30, 2014 is provided as an attachment. Department wide, revenues and expenditures are*
47 *within budgeted projections for the biennium. As previously discussed, the Department is*

1 continuing its efforts to ensure sufficient cash flow to meet day to day expenses. This includes
2 efforts to reduce expenditures, improve timeliness of reimbursements, and pursue short term
3 options for addressing cash flow issues.

4
5 Debbie Colbert provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining her briefing for the 2015 – 2017
6 budget. Aaron Jenkins spoke on the public engagement process done regarding the
7 recreational licensing fee adjustment. This presentation is available in the meeting materials
8 and at http://www.dfw.state.or.us/agency/commission/minutes/14/06_june/index.asp
9

Public Testimony:

Al Elkins, OHA	<p>Our two priorities are keeping the biologists and the game enforcement in the field. Anytime you bring up the topic of changing the fee on the Pioneer License you'll fill a stadium full of people that would like to participate in that conversation.</p> <p>We are still concerned about the things we are hearing, our priorities have not changed, but we continue to work with Mr. Anglin and the Wildlife Division to determine what they need and what we will get for an increase of what they will be asking for or no increase and what will happen.</p>
Stan Steele, OOC	<p>People want more and what that is are enhanced opportunities for families, for seniors and for the folks who have discretionary spending.</p>
Joe Rohleder, Seafood Oregon, Waldport, Oregon	<p>When we started the commercial fishing part of the EBAC, it was a very small group. We had three ways to get to the revenue or the ending balance that we needed to have in six years. We choose to take the fee and the ad valorem increase and have them be current for the whole six years. We recommended cuts, fund shifts and increased revenues. One-third of the commercial fish fund revenue come from the license fees that we pay on our boats and for ourselves. The other two-thirds come from the ad valorem fee, which is similar to a sales tax. We know that the prices will increase in the fisheries, along with the amount of fish we land and the percentages in sales tax will increase. Our goal was to end the six-year period with an ending balance that all involved were comfortable with. We really appreciated the staff for helping us work our way through this and they were willing to work with us to come up with something that works for our businesses and also works for the department.</p>
Blaine Ackley, Hillsboro, Oregon	<p>Support the nominal fee for the Pioneer License because it will bring in federal dollars. I support the \$10 juvenile license because that will allow families to hunt and fish. Shifting funds from the non-game wildlife to the General Fund makes good sense because the nongame fund supports everyone in Oregon.</p> <p>Support shifting more of the OSP funding back to the General Fund so</p>

	<p>that it is a 50/50 contribution. Like the idea of the multi-year license and that preserves the current year's fees -- it's a very attractive incentive. . Research indicates that any time you increase a fee, participation will drop for three to five years depending on the size of the increase. At a public meeting, Director Elicker states that it was an economic model that was able to forecast the reduced participation and loss of revenue, but I don't see that model predicting the possible increase to poaching by such a fee increase.</p> <p>If you raise a fee and can demonstrate to the prospective licensee an increased opportunity, they will support. However the increased fees just going in the big pie won't do that. Just as an example, the Columbia River fee, the new Ocean Endorsement and my own license, those fee increases total a 75% increase. If you increase the fees by 75%, then let's see something for it.</p> <p>A proposal you could consider is a market based approach, where you go to the vendors who sell these things and set sales goals. When I buy a new rod I'm never asked if I have an Oregon fishing license and they have no incentive to do that.</p> <p>There are many venues you can use within the arena to market the conservation stamp.</p>
<p>Tom Wolf, Trout Unlimited, Hillsboro</p>	<p>Supports the proposed license fee increases, the increase in General Funds, part of the budget and more special fees such as the wild bird seed tax proposal. Also supports ODFW's cost cutting efficiencies. Oppose the cutting of the six assistant district biologists. We feel that this would severely limit the ability of ODFW to do conservation projects.</p> <p>A way to save the department money is to continue to look at ways to improve efficiencies in hatcheries, using volunteers, consolidating positions in the hatchery program etc.</p>
<p>Peggy Lynch, Natural Resources Coordinator with League of Women Voters</p>	<p>Support General Funding of Water Quality/Quantity/Instream Flow Program.</p> <p>Support General Funding of Fishery Research and Monitoring Program and any other programs that provide the data to be able to make the policies and permitting decisions that have to be made.</p> <p>Support general funding of Nearshore & Estuarine Management.</p>
<p>Larry Sowa, Oregon City, Oregon</p>	<p>People will be more accepting of a fee increase if they come at small increments and if they know what they will be getting for the fee increase.</p>

<p>Jim Myron, Native Fish Society, Canby, Oregon</p>	<p>Supports the fee increases, in fact we think there is some room in that fee increase to go even higher if necessary. We did some calculations and it cost the recreational resident angler about \$30 a year to fish that's \$0.09 a day. Your proposal would increase that to just \$0.12 a day.</p> <p>Supports the youth license fee, and I think that will draw more future hunters and anglers to this agency than any other PR campaign you've had or will have in the future.</p> <p>Supports the General Funding shifts and would like to see the programs that can't get license revenues be the beneficiaries of the General Fund allocation. It would go to conservation programs that benefit wildlife and public at large rather than particular user groups.</p>
--	---

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Questions by Commissioners:

Commissioner Webber -If people would receive a deer tag with the Pioneer License by paying a \$6 fee, would that keep people happy?

Al Elkins - Here's my personal opinion, it's free. It's engrained in the society, and I think that any time you change that to something that was free to something that's not so free, you'll have a problem. You can window dress it as much as you want but I don't think you'll get those folks there.

Commissioner Finley - In reading the public correspondence that came in I saw a letter that came in from a nationwide group that rates states on fish and wildlife management and the quote said, "Oregon manages for opportunity rather than quality." I wanted to understand that from an outside view. Would you respond to that quote?

Al Elkins - I used to think sighting an animal through the scope or end of an arrow was opportunity. The people I represent feel differently in that for them the opportunity is to be in camp and see wildlife and that opportunity is not there.

Stan Steele - During the Columbia River visioning process, a commercial fisherman stated, opportunity with a probability, that's the driver. When we have a reasonable probability to know that success is going to be there at the end of the next cast, flush or canyon, you'll hunt many dry canyon's and make many dry casts. Opportunity in Oregon might still exist, but the probabilities with those opportunities have really diminished.

Commissioner Anderson – In my opinion, the fee increases that will affect the commercial fisheries (20 to 25% on a business industry), seem like a pretty nominal increase. My concerns are that commercial fisheries have been characterized as not pulling the full weight of the demands they put on the department in terms of management. You have an opportunity to step-up. We need to go beyond what the department is asking of us meeting a goal of one million dollars in a budget category at the end of three years. Especially if we want to continue

1 to ask the department to reach the kind of research and management objectives that we
2 expect from them.

3
4 **Joe Rohleder** - We have a lot of other fees that we pay that also go to the department. That
5 needs to be considered. We pay a restoration and enhancement fee, which is another excise
6 tax on our salmon fisheries. We think we pay for what we get from the department and we're
7 going to ask for more, in ways of research. For example, how can we catch more fish? We've
8 also done a lot of research on marketing and processing and we assess ourselves through our
9 commodity commission for that at another one percent. Fishermen feel like they are the bearer
10 of the weight of all of the funds that go to ODFW. Here's why, when I sell a fish to a processor
11 at \$4 to \$9 a pound, by the time it gets to the end user it's worth four or five times that amount.
12 None of those other people pay into the department for that and this is why we are asking for
13 more General Fund. We catch fish for other people when our fees and prices go up we will
14 have to raise the end product cost to our users. Commercial fishermen say that they want to
15 pay their share and they will be very clear as to what they need and they expect to get that.

16
17 **Commissioner Finley** -I'd like to hear your thoughts on monitoring under the aspects that
18 we're considering under the coastal management plan.

19
20 **Tom Wolf** - I think that there needs to be adequate funding for monitoring and research. I
21 mentioned in my six pages of earlier testimony that without adequate funding for monitoring,
22 for being able to tell what's going on, what's being done and the research to back that up
23 you're not going to get the things done especially with the coastal management plan because
24 without that monitoring and research I think that whole plan falls apart.

25
26 **Commissioner Finley** - I'd like to get your view on the same request I asked Tom and that is
27 monitoring regarding the costal management plan

28
29 **Jim Myron** - We support monitoring and rely on existing monitoring. I saw a policy option
30 package that would allocate additional funds and we would support that.

31
32 **Discussion:**

33 **Commissioner Finley** - How did the staff respond to the public correspondence in regards to
34 the fee increases?

35
36 **Director Elicker** - As a result of the town hall meetings, I was going to take the next two
37 weeks and take a hard look at the revenue side. We had questions of the revenue and how do
38 you do that with the federal match. I'd like to take a look at preference points that was one
39 issue brought up.

40
41 **Commissioner Webber** - Multi-year license and lifetime license, only applies to license, but
42 not tags, can you explain?

43
44 **Ron Anglin** - Currently if you buy a license and then move out of state you still get to use that
45 license. When it comes time to buy your tag, you no longer qualify for a resident therefore
46 would have to purchase a non-resident. The multi-year license would work the same way, but
47 any tags would be at the non-resident rate.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Commissioner Wolley - Could you elaborate on the Pittman/Robertson's in terms of the duration of funding and the process for obtaining and clarify how that works?

Debbie Colbert - We get annual appropriations from the US Fish and Wildlife Services under the formula they use among the different states for distributing the excise taxes. Once we know how much we've been appropriated, we apply for grants from the federal government. We have a scope of work we have to include and they have to approve it and ensure that we are within the allowable use of those funds. Even though we can plan on those revenues, we have to go through a formal approval process.

Chair Levy - How do the youth preference points work?

Ron Anglin - The youth can certainly purchase preference points right now for those who live out of state. For the \$8 application fee we have a point saver, so with their youth license, which is \$14, they can buy that point saver.

Action: Informational

OTHER BUSINESS

None

Chair Bobby Levy adjourned the meeting at 5 p.m.

