

**ARCHERY REVIEW PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ARPAC)
SURVEY RESPONSES**

Original Request for Input:

Dear ARPAC Member,

Hello. It's been a while since our last ARPAC meeting, I hope you are enjoying your summer. As we prepare for the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission Meeting in October, we are reaching out to our fellow ARPAC members because we need your input. Below you will find a summary of this input request and a series of four (4) questions.

I would appreciate your response to the 4 questions below by Thursday, August 21, 2014. Please reply to me, Sarah Reif, at sarah.j.reif@state.or.us. If you have any questions about the portability issue, you can contact Mark Kirsch at 541-276-2344 x223. If you have questions about the upcoming Commission meeting, you can contact Tom Thornton 503-947-6330.

Background

As you know, at the final Archery Review Public Advisory Committee (ARPAC) Meeting it was recognized that the issue of tag portability would be difficult to resolve. As noted in the minutes for the meeting, "ARPAC members did not support restricting portability for all hunts, and recognized they could "discuss it for days" and not reach consensus."

Similar sentiment was reflected in the ARPAC 2014 Final Report.

"ARPAC Recommendation: ARPAC did not reach consensus on any direction of change in tag portability since changes would lead to a reduction in opportunity for archers, and because of the lack of data tying animal displacement directly to archer disturbance. ARPAC members did not support restricting portability for all hunts; they also did not feel they would be able to develop a recommendation restricting tag portability they could all support."

At the June, 2014, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission (Commission) Meeting, portability was a significant topic of discussion. In addition to moving forward on consideration of many of the ARPAC Recommendations, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) provided for Commission consideration making the Heppner, Ukiah, and Snake River, Chesnimnus and Sled Springs controlled "One Elk" bow hunts the hunters' only archery elk opportunity.

For your convenience following is an excerpt from the June Commission documents:

Department Archery Season Proposals and Concepts Under Consideration

- Department Archery season and controlled hunt concepts under consideration include:
 - MDI, Warner Unit
 - Deer, maintain controlled hunt, break link with elk tag,
 - Elk, controlled hunt for the entire unit, also good during general season
 - MDI Maury, same as Warner
 - Deer, maintain controlled hunt, break link with elk tag,
 - Elk, controlled hunt for the entire unit, also good during general season
 - MDI Steens Mtn.
 - Break link between deer and elk tags
 - Eliminate controlled deer hunt
 - Sled Springs and Chesnimnus

- Break link between deer and elk tags
- Make "One Elk" hunt the archers only archery elk opportunity
 - Options for a late white-tailed deer hunt
- Department is proposing to make the Heppner, Ukiah, and Snake River controlled "One Elk" bow hunts the hunters' only archery elk opportunity

Those archery hunters present who testified did not support restricting portability in these hunts. At the conclusion of the discussion the Commission directed the Department to initiate additional communications with archery hunters on the topic of portability.

The two part task for the Department is to 1) draft criteria for hunts that would restrict portability and 2) consider those criteria when developing final proposals for consideration at the October Commission Meeting.

A decision to restrict portability needs to consider how this will affect animal displacement and crowding/hunter density (which may be related issues); the number of hunters (the larger the number of controlled hunt tags constricted from portability the more it will reduce the number of hunters hunting in other places during general season); enforcement; the type of controlled hunt, etc.. [For a more thorough discussion see the attached backgrounder.]

As noted in the backgrounder, there are a wide variety of controlled hunts in Oregon and a wide variety of opinions regarding the types of hunts that should or should not have tags also valid during the general season. The Department has heard from archery hunters who believe no tags should be portable, and others who just as firmly believe all tags should be portable. Within the ARPAC members there was enough difference of opinion the group realized a consensus would not be reached. And while ARPAC members did not formally vote in agreement, the Department did solicit input from ARPAC members on when a constriction of portability may be workable. The Department would like to explore those examples in further detail.

Some ARPAC members suggested it might be ok to restrict portability of the high quality hunts (for example, MT Emily, Walla Walla, and Wenaha "One bull elk" hunts, and late season mule deer buck hunts). At the other end of the spectrum, some ARPAC members mentioned the late season cow hunts in western Oregon as hunts that absolutely should be portable. There are other types of hunts that fall between these two examples such as "One Bull Elk" in units where most of the tags are spike only.

The Department needs your opinion (**recognizing some of you represent an organization**) as to where you feel it is appropriate to draw the tag portability line. Answering the following questions will provide some structure to the responses. The attachments all include some level of discussion of the tag portability issue. Please reply to Sarah Reif by August 21.

1. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit

enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.
 - a. _____ Areas where animals have been displaced to private land
 - b. _____ Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
 - c. _____ Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
 - d. _____ Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
 - e. _____ Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist
 - f. _____ Enforcement
 - g. _____
Other _____

 - h. Hunt Quality: Consider summarizing your definition from Q1. _____
3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?
4. Additional comments?

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this email, your thoughtful consideration of the portability issue is much appreciated.

Sarah Reif
Wildlife Restoration Coordinator
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE, Salem, OR, 97302
W: 503-947-6316
C: 503-991-3587

From Craig Starr:

ODFW's Tag Portability Questions

1. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

- Special or unique opportunity to harvest a trophy-quality branch bull elk (e.g., Wenaha, Walla Walla or Mt. Emily branch bull tag) or buck deer.
 - Opportunity to hunt outside of the general archery season (e.g., late-season) for an antlered animal (deer or elk) when the hunt opportunity is at least half as long as the general archery season (e.g., the late Metolius buck deer hunt).
 - Opportunity to hunt a special area (e.g., Hart Mountain hunts).
 - Opportunity to hunt a special game species (e.g., Pronghorn, sheep, goat, etc.).
2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags proposed for a hunt should be portable or not? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.
 - a. 3 Areas where animals have been displaced to private land when the hunt specifically includes the opportunity for ready access to hunting on the private land where the displacement occurs
 - b. _____ Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
 - c. _____ Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
 - d. _____ Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
 - e. 2 Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist when a maximum harvest is biologically desirable for the number of tags being issued (such as to prevent localized or general population overcrowding that could damage habitat)
 - f. _____ Enforcement
 - g. 4 Other: Tag portability restrictions apply only to the antlerless aspect of controlled either-sex tags within the central or eastern Oregon unit for which a tag is drawn, but the tag is also valid as a general archery tag elsewhere

h. _____ Other

i. k. Hunt Quality (or demand): 1 Consider summarizing your definition from Q1.

The tag provides a special or unique trophy opportunity, the opportunity to hunt other than during the general archery season for an antlered animal, a hunt for what might be considered specialty species (i.e., other than deer or elk) or is for any other situation when the tags are in high demand (e.g., 10 preference points or more needed to assure drawing a tag).

3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?

See response to Question 1. The same answer applies here. I am not going to apply for any hunt that is my only hunting opportunity unless it offers some special aspect that I can't get simply by hunting with a general archery tag. Typically, adding the chance to shoot an antlerless animal in a controlled hunt situation would be of no interest to me if the tradeoff is that the tag is my only hunting opportunity. The same is true regarding the existing antlerless controlled deer hunts in the Paulina or Metolius units unless they were to become a 600-series hunt (opportunity to take an additional animal) like rifle antlerless deer hunts typically are.

4. Additional comments?

In general, Oregon's bowhunters, including those of us who participated in the recent ARPAC process, are highly skeptical of restrictions on tag portability. For many of us, tag portability is one of the major factors that allow us a reasonable opportunity for success given the inherent challenges and limitations of hunting with a bow, and limits on the amount of time we can spend away from our life responsibilities (family, work, home, etc.). I think ODFW's goal should be to try to achieve **general acceptance** of any tag portability restrictions that are implemented. To me, that requires that ODFW must always have (and present) a rock solid management rationale when proposing to restrict tag portability. When the rationale is solid, I think acceptance will usually follow, even if sometimes only grudgingly!

While I agree there are many different views about what makes for a "quality hunt", I don't see that those varying opinions have much, if anything, to do with the issue of tag portability. Whether they make for a "quality hunt" or not, I think there are only a very few situations (enhanced trophy quality and opportunity, special or unique seasons, high demand for tags, a significant game management problem to address, etc.) where there might be fairly general agreement that tag portability limits are reasonable if the hunts are designed properly. For my part, the intangibles are where the differences of opinion as to what makes a "quality hunt" exist and I just don't think the intangibles are ever going to drive a general acceptance of tag portability limits. In my view, general acceptance of tag portability limits requires **tangible** benefits, either to bowhunters or the game resource or both!

I didn't rank fire danger because I think the consequences of fire danger should **always** be a cautionary factor when ODFW considers tag portability limits on controlled hunt tags for hunts occurring during the general archery season because of the time of the year when that season occurs. That doesn't mean that tag portability should never be restricted during that time period, but that portability restrictions during that period should only occur when the perceived benefit outweighs the potential risk of bowhunters with non-portable tags losing an entire hunting season. I think that's a pretty demanding threshold, especially in many central and eastern Oregon units!!

The problem I think we had on this issue in ARPAC and that I have again with this questionnaire is that we haven't yet focused down closely enough to define the circumstances when tag

portability limits might be seen as generally acceptable by a substantial portion of Oregon's bowhunters. See my additions in Question 2 as examples of what I mean. It makes no sense to me, for example, to put limits on tag portability for a controlled hunt to address dislocation of game animals onto private property if hunters aren't assured of access to hunt the property where the dislocation exists. Some hunters may apply for a portable tag for a hunt focused on private property and try to gain access knowing they can hunt elsewhere on public land if that doesn't work out. Few are going to apply for such a tag without portability when they don't know whether access to hunt will even be possible. On the other hand, if access for hunting on private property is assured because the private property owners have an interest in having dislocation problems addressed, controlled archery hunts without tag portability might focus hunting effort and could help move dislocated game back onto public lands.

I strongly believe that bowhunters' effort has "migrated" in response to past regulatory restrictions imposed by ODFW, in particular the closing of many central and eastern Oregon units to the opportunity to harvest an antlerless elk while other units still have a general either-sex harvest opportunity. I believe this dynamic is a major factor contributing to the (intangible) concern some bowhunters express regarding "crowding" in some of the units which still have a general either-sex harvest opportunity and probably also contributes to some dislocation problems, especially in the upper John Day River valley. If the antlerless aspect of the hunting opportunity in most central and eastern Oregon units was controlled and non-portable as suggested by my description in 2-g, above, I believe that the "crowding" associated with the current imbalance of hunter effort could eventually be reduced by a reverse "migration". And, bowhunters drawing the tag (as well as those who don't draw) could still enjoy an essentially statewide general season hunting opportunity for bulls only (with general either-sex hunting possible in certain western Oregon units and, maybe, a few lightly-hunted eastern Oregon units).

If ODFW wants to reach an understanding that might mitigate against bowhunters' general opposition to tag portability limits, I think we're eventually going to have to arrive at a list of written criteria describing what ODFW should look for when such limits are being considered. The obvious place to start considering criteria is to look at the situations where tag portability limits already exist, e.g., the trophy elk unit branch bull tags and the late Metolius buck deer hunt, since those limits seem to be fairly well accepted. Other scenarios, such as addressing dislocation of game onto private lands or focusing harvest needs, require specific definitions and assurances that tag portability limits would actually accomplish meaningful biological ends and **not** simply be a drag on bowhunters' hunting opportunities for no beneficial reason.

The current ODFW staff proposals to end portability of the controlled "one elk" archery tags in the Sled Springs, Chesnimnus, Heppner, Ukiah and Snake River units in 2015 are what brought us to having this "discussion". I don't think ODFW should ever restrict tag portability without substantial justification and, to that end, I would still like to hear a meaningful rationale for the current proposals if there is one. The Sled Springs and Chesnimnus "one elk" tags have been around for a while and certainly aren't seen as high-demand or special tags by bowhunters, and that's with the tags being portable! Since this year is the first year for the Heppner, Ukiah and Snake River "one elk" tags, the level of demand for the tags is unknown. However, even if the demand for the small number of "one elk" tags in these units is reasonably high when they are portable this year, I think relatively few bowhunters will apply for the tags if they become a hunter's only elk hunting opportunity. And, what is the real point of restricting tag portability for those tags anyway? Bowhunters haven't been allowed to shoot a cow elk in the Heppner, Ukiah and Snake River units for years. An essentially recreational opportunity for a modest antlerless harvest where nothing about the hunt seems particularly special from either a bowhunter's or game management perspective should never justify restrictions on tag portability!

From Rich Thompson:

Sarah – Mark,

Thanks for getting the ball rolling on the concerns we expressed to the commission on TAG PORTABILITY at their June meeting.

I have copied TAO President, Kevin Thompson but notice that other ARPAC members were not copied. How will you publish results of your questionnaire so we all know what was said and by whom like when we were all present at the meetings earlier this year?

Here is my response to the questions you posed:

**ODFW / ARCHERY REVIEW PUBLIC ADVISORY GROUP
TAG PORTABILITY**

Rich Thompson, TAO
August 13, 2014

The Department needs your opinion (**recognizing some of you represent an organization**) as to where you feel it is appropriate to draw the tag portability line. Answering the following questions will provide some structure to the responses. The attachments all include some level of discussion of the tag portability issue. Please reply to Sarah Reif by August 21.

1. A major point of differing opinions is “what do you consider a quality hunt”. The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

Obviously archery hunters ability to have a successful hunt increases with less interference and favorable timing. Archers applying for controlled hunts with limited portability are losing opportunity to hunt and they expect these two attributes along with chances to hunt mature bucks or bulls.

2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.

k. Hunt Quality: Consider summarizing your definition from Q1.

ODFW's mission is to protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife habitats for use by current and future generations. In the course of discussion, it was brought up by

department personnel that current "TROPHY HUNTS" came into being more by dumb luck than good management.

When the department decides to severely limit hunting, in any way, for any user group, in the name of "TROPHY HUNTING", the department needs to clearly define what characteristics & attributes make a trophy hunt and be able to apply advanced management techniques & actions to sustain that level of hunt quality.

As noted in 3/22/14 Meeting Minutes ARPAC discussion did include many considerations for designating quality hunts but ARPAC Members were totally against limiting tag portability. Key elements of those management techniques and actions should certainly include:

- Biological conditions and concerns*
- Habitat improvement*
- Predator control*
- Very limited hunting by all weapons types in designated units*

With the proper management techniques and actions, the following will most likely take care of themselves:

- Crowding*
- Displaced animals*
- Enforcement (legal participants will be dedicated hunters, although some level of poaching will always occur)*

Other reasons for distaste of limiting portability are limiting entry for potential wildfire closures and the ability for short hunts, close to home, after work or on short weekends. Other truly dedicated archers (get lots of vacation or retired) may have more time to enjoy hunting in more than one area.

3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?

The Wenaha elk and Metolius type hunts are good examples.

Chesnimnus is NOT! (330 archery tags -vs- 770 Rifle tags)

4. Additional comments?

From the March 22 Meeting Minutes:

The group did not feel they would be able to develop a recommendation restricting tag portability they could all support.

NOTE: ARPAC members did not support restricting portability for all hunts, and recognized they could "discuss it for days" and not reach consensus.

Keep in mind unintended consequences – may solve a problem in some areas but create problems in other areas.

Could give up opportunity for a great experience. If you give up opportunity, you need good management by ODFW to have a good experience.

If ODFW wants to limit tag portability of archery hunters to specific hunts then it needs to answer the question – Why would I want to hunt anywhere else?

BOTTOM LINE AND WHERE TO DRAW THE LINE:

**ARPAC MEMBERS REPRESENTING A WIDE CROSS-SECTION OF
OREGON'S ARCHERY HUNTERS**

**OBVIOUSLY HAVE A STRONG DISLIKE OF REDUCED TAG
PORTABILITY IN ANY FORM AND**

**ODFW WOULD BE WISE TO LISTEN TO WHAT THEY HEARD AT THE
MARCH MEETING!**

From Fred Walasavage and Don Backman:

On behalf of OHA, Don Backman and I are providing the following comments.

The nature or intent of the inquiry from the Commission is unclear. Based on the line of questioning in the survey, it appears to be centered around social issues. It is our understanding that ARPAC was established in response to the bow hunting community's request to address lost opportunities. In fact, specific side boards were set for the group suggesting that social issues would not be addressed. With that said, the group did touch on some issues that could be deemed social. To no one's surprise there were varying opinions and such issues were quickly tabled.

Now the focus appears to have shifted solely on social issues based on the request to define quality and the references to overcrowding. OHA does not believe that it is in the best interest to address social issues at this time. OHA's primary interest regarding tag portability centers around sound science and the biological effects or implications, both positive and negative. In order to comment on the issue of portability the following information should be provided.

Is there an established pattern or data showing the flow of hunters from one specific unit to another?

Are there specific units where it can be demonstrated that there has been an increased harvest due to portability. And if so, are any of these units below MO?

The overlying concern is that if the Department or the Commission wants to begin addressing social issues, in fairness, all weapon types should be looked at equally. We are all aware that there is some level of friction between archery and rifle hunters. There is a belief (whether real or perceived) that archers have many advantages. By suggesting (through the line of questioning on the survey) that these efforts will address quality or reduce over-crowding for archers, it will further reinforce the beliefs or concerns of the rifle community. The last thing that we want to do as hunters and wildlife managers is to place further distance between these groups.

If we put personal needs and public wants and outcry's aside and focus on wildlife management, all hunters will benefit.

This response was also included on question 4 of the survey (below) so that it could be included in the official responses.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input!

Fred Walasavage
OHA Board

From Kevin Thompson:

Hi Sarah,

Attached is my feedback, mix of personal and representation on behalf of Traditional Archers of Oregon.

Thank you for collecting our input and readdressing this topic!

Kevin Thompson
President, TAO

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

The top attributes of a Quality Hunt:

- 1) Opportunity encounter – for traditional archery especially, quality of hunt is really defined by the opportunity to HUNT animals. They are located in public access, consist of expected management objective numbers and are not overly pressured by predators (Wolf/Bear/Cougar/Coyote and human).
 - 2) Favorable time period – Increased opportunity for successful harvest requires favorable time period when comparing archery success with modern equipment success. Again, even more important for the Traditional Equipment user given self-restriction of range and draw timing.
 - 3) Social – “Hunting Partners” ... Friends and family are diverse in location and life responsibilities..... one of the best benefits of our current and past tradition of Oregon Archery is the freedom to hunt statewide (**NO PORTABILITY RESTRICTIONS**)..... Retention and recruitment of younger generation (mentorship opportunities) increase with the flexibility this season brings.
2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you
- 3.

On Behalf of the Traditional Archers Of Oregon, July 2013 Summer business meeting:

- **The TAO membership does not support Tag Portability restrictions.**

Speaking for myself and the ARPAC process, I am quite stunned that tag portability restrictions has surfaced, after it was clearly stated, with overwhelming opposition, the archery hunting organizations did not support tag portability restriction – **this is a major loss of opportunity.**

- By default and hunting behavior, the premium hunts are already “only opportunity”. When it takes 13 to 20 years to draw a tag, you will hunt that area.
- Let’s start here (as we discussed shortly in ARPAC)
 - o MBO’s by reducing loss to illegal harvest
 - o MBO’s by reducing loss to predation
 - o Continuation of tag issuance in support of biological feasibility
 - o Implement ARPAC recommendations (either sex bag limits), break w/PDP...

It is clear that that Tag Portability is pushed by the Department without archery support.... **It was clear in the meeting when Mark received a cool response when he first suggested Tag Portability restrictions. Is this a position of the department to appease the Rifle Community (i.e. the Royal Johnson speech at ARPAC)?**

Tag Portability is and will be received very unfavorable in our organization.

What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?

4. Additional comments?

TAO does not support "only opportunity" in Archery.

Personally, I would be very disappointed if the department implements "only opportunity" as proposed. Let's try other approaches to increase the "Quality" of our experience in these units. I believe the items that we have already covered in ARPAC, coupled with more focus on predation are key's to increase the quality of hunt.

From Tim Logue:

1. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

Bull Elk- Score, bull ratio, timeframe and limited number of tags.

Buck Deer- Score, buck ratio, timeframe and limited number of tags.

Cow Elk/ Doe Deer- access and population.

2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.

- a. 4 Areas where animals have been displaced to private land
- b. Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
- c. Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
- d. 2 Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
- e. 1 Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist
- f. 3 Enforcement
- g.
- Other _____

- k. Hunt Quality: Consider summarizing your definition from Q1

3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?

4. Additional comments?

The ARPAC committee could not support portability for a variety of reasons, much more complex than simply checking one or all of the boxes above. I was personally very disappointed that the department did not provide any statistical data regarding the Archery units in which portability had been reduced some years ago. The public land hunter is facing more challenges than ever before, many timber companies are closing up access for fear of fires and or charging a premium trespass fee. The only reduced portability that ARPAC would support was for the absolute premium units of Mt Emily, Wenaha and Walla Walla and even then it was a somewhat divided decision. While I certainly do not condone illegal take, it was hard to support reducing opportunity for what I would call a limited number of infractions. I caution Oregon's quest to have controlled hunting during archery, it certainly didn't help hunting opportunity with rifle, in fact many rifle hunters started bowhunting. The state has a revenue problem, more controlled hunts will reduce revenue and potentially push hunters out of state. I for one am more than happy to travel to states like Idaho where I can have great opportunity over the counter every year, I don't have to worry about "drawing a tag", I can plan out my hunts ahead of time and enjoy what is to come instead of anxiously waiting to be disappointed in my home state.

Regards,

Tim Logue

From Tom Vanasche:

Sorry for no earlier response as I have been in Alaska.

1. Quality hunt

To me what makes a quality hunt is a GREAT EXPERIENCE, not an OPPROTUNITY. There could be a thousand hunters in your unit and you have opprotunity but an awful experience. There should be lots of game and little chance of running into other hunters. I have hunted several states ,ie, Wyoming, New Mexico and Arizona. There may be fewer tags available but the experience was outstanding as lots of critters and few hunters. For those that hunt different states, Oregon is considered not worth applying for tags. Several of the OSP officers I talked to at our meetings apply elsewhere, as their experiences in other states is far better than here. I have said several times I would be glad to be restricted to have a tag every other year and pay twice the fee [to be revenue neutral], to have half the archers in the woods. Hunting on private land in Oregon can be VERY good if you have the money or connections but public land hunting has fallen on hard times in my opinion. Obviously lots of antlers and the rut would be good but for me some antlers and few hunters would be best.

2. Portability

K. If you have a "quality" hunt , such as Wenaha, Metolius etc. I don't think there should be portability.

- a.
- b.
- c.

3. Essentially as described in number one.

4. I think ODFW is focused on selling FAR too many tags to generate income resulting in a poor experience. I have tried to bring several new YOUNG hunters into our sport but they have been disappointed by lack of game and overcrowding. They need a good EXPERIENCE not just an opprotunity with the masses or we will lose them .I have sent them to Wyoming where they have been successful but that is too expensive for them to do routinely.

I suspect that Oregon is heading down the road to archery hunting by unit only, or small groups of close units, without portability and limited numbers. That is what most states do. Frankly that is what I think will need to be done to preserve any kind of quality hunt here.

Thanks for listening,

Tom Vanasche

From Tony Hilsendager:

Hi Sarah,

1. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

1. A "quality hunt"; a hunt that allows an average hunter an above average chance of harvesting their desired quarry.

It is true that what constitutes a "trophy" or a "successful" hunt is very subjective. It's different for every hunter and even changes from year to year within ourselves. It is not imperative that the Department has a black and white definition laying out specific antler size, success ratio, hunter numbers, ect. to dictate what a quality hunt is. What is imperative is that the Department manages a diverse range of "quality hunts" reflecting the many different ideals that hunters have.

For me personally, I have had many "quality hunts" on over the counter archery tags. However with that said a premiere elk hunt like that of the Wenaha or Walla Walla is what I hope to be fortunate enough to draw some day. Multiple opportunities at 330+ bulls in a remote wilderness area that receives little hunting pressure!

Enhanced bag limits rarely define a quality hunt but may make a mediocre hunt more palatable. If a hunt is truly a "quality hunt" it can stand on it's own merits and the tag holder will certainly not need to be "enticed" with the additional offer of portability.

2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.

- a. ____ Areas where animals have been displaced to private land
- b. ____ Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
- c. ____ Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
- d. ____ Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
- e. _ #1_ Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist
- f. #2 ____ Enforcement
- g. ____

Other _____

h. _____

Other _____

i. _____

Other _____

j. _____

Other _____

k. #3 Hunt Quality: Consider summarizing your definition from

Q1. _____

3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?

Archery Bull Elk:

Wenaha

Walla Walla

Mt Emily

Archery Mule Deer:

Metolius - Late Season

West Beulah - Late Season

4. Additional comments?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions feel free to contact me.

Tony Hilsendager

From Matt Radinovich:

Sarah,

Here are my answers to the archery review board questions.

Matt Radinovich

1. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

The factors that contribute to a quality hunt for me would be less hunter crowding, Bull ratio management objective and favorable time period, Sept 1st - Sept 30th every year.

2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.

- a. 2 Areas where animals have been displaced to private land
- b. Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
- c. 1 Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
- d. Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
- e. 3 Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist
- f. 4 Enforcement
- g.

Other _____

k. Hunt Quality: Consider summarizing your definition from Q1. Quality hunt for me would be seeing less of the big crowds in one area. If we had more of a road closure system for "archery season only", it would reduce crowding and 4 wheeler activity, and theft of game cameras and tree stands.

3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species? Archery elk & deer in units near my home

4. Additional comments? I would like to see a West Murders Creek archery draw for trophy elk.

Submitted by Matt Radinovich

From Todd Crawford:

1. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

For me personally I think a quality hunt is going to vary with the odds of drawing the tag. On a hunt that is difficult to draw...the percentage of mature animals is what I would be looking for along with some ability to hunt these animals without the presence of alot of other hunters. On an easy to draw permit...I think the chance at a animal would be all that would be required...

2. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether or not to propose tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.
 - a. 2 Areas where animals have been displaced to private land
 - b. _____ Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
 - c. _____ Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
 - d. _____ Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
 - e. 1 Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist
 - f. _____ Enforcement
 - g. 3 Other _____ When the tag is specifically to reduce herd numbers and is specifically an antlerless tag...I think they should ALWAYS be portable

3. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species?

Any late season tag for buck deer....Any limited premium archery elk tag where the presence of mature animals was in balance with herd numbers (I would think the same for a rifle bull tag as well)

4. Additional comments?

Again personally...I think additional opportunities should be made for some youth hunting that have a reasonable chance of success with a little hard work.

From George Johnson:

Hey Sarah,

Thanks for the opportunity for input.

I. Quality Hunt means seeing animals and chances to Harvest.

Trophy Hunts with length of time equitable.

Late season Buck Hunts in the rut.

2. a. 3 Areas where animals have been displaced to private lands/ when the hunt specifically provides private land access to mitigate the displacement

e. 2 Focuses intended level of harvest where available

g 4 Other: Tag portability restrictions only for the antlerless aspect of the controlled either sex tag for the specific unit
tag is also good for general season elsewhere

K. 1 Hunt Quality: Tag provides a unique Hunting Trophy opportunity for an Antlered animal. Species other than deer or elk.

3. I will not apply for a hunt that is my only opportunity unless it provides something more than a general season tag already provides. An antlerless opportunity is not enough.

I would apply for the Paulina or Metolius antlerless tags if they were a 600 series additional tag like most rifle antlerless deer are.

4. From my conversations with a number of bowhunters there is not support for restrictions on tag portability. There was interest in Antlerless opportunities in specific units if the tag remained portable for General season hunts; (Antlerless opportunity limited to specific unit).

Thanks again. If you have questions or need more info please call or email.

George R.. Johnson

From Jim Akenson:

ODFW's Tag Portability Questions

4. A major point of differing opinions is "what do you consider a quality hunt". The Department recognizes this is subjective; some hunters expect chances at multiple mature bucks or bulls, others are happy if they are seeing animals, for some hunters it is a quality hunt if they take any elk, bull or cow.

What factors contribute to a Quality Hunt for you? For example, antler score, Bull Ratio Management Objective, hunter success, % of branch bulls in the harvest, bag limit enhanced beyond the standard for the area (for example the addition of branch bulls or antlerless animals), favorable time period (late season or rut), less hunter crowding, etc.

- ***Having a special or unique opportunity to harvest a trophy-quality branch bull elk – such as in the Wenaha, Walla Walla or Mt. Emily branch bull tag areas OR a trophy buck deer – in any number of places.***
- ***A chance to hunt a special area (e.g., Metolius or Hart Mountain hunts).***
- ***A chance to hunt a unique species like pronghorn, bighorn sheep, goat, etc.***

5. What do you believe are the most important factors for the Department to consider when deciding whether tags for a hunt should be portable? Select up to four, numbered in order of importance to you.

- a. 3 Areas where animals have been displaced to private land.
- b. Areas where crowding needs to be reduced
- c. Contributes to reduced crowding in general season areas
- d. 4 Fire danger – Areas where access is not likely to be eliminated during fire season
- e. 1 Focuses intended level of harvest where available and prescribed by the District Biologist
- f. 2 (tie) Enforcement
- g. Other _____

- k. Hunt Quality 2 (tie) Consider summarizing your definition from Q1.

****See Q1 –same applies**

6. What type of hunting opportunity, feel free to name specific hunts or Units as examples, would you apply for if it would be your only opportunity to hunt for that species? **** Again see Q1. But in addition, could you(ODFW staff) re-visit some old hunts that have been**

discontinued...the Pine Grove Area (White River Unit), a late hunt at Canyon Creek (Murderer's Creek). Or, how about something new - such as Wenaha white-tails:a high quality late-hunt. Please keep in mind that Oregon has a huge bowhunting heritage and it would be beneficial to both ODFW and bowhunters to keep that heritage alive.

7. Additional comments?

I can't imagine that any of Oregon's bowhunters, including those of us who participated in the recent ARPAC process, are supportive of tag portability restrictions. Looking at a broader picture, which I have to do as a president of a national organization, why would people – who are wanting to bowhunt the west - pick Oregon? They would pick it because of the opportunity to hunt various parts of the state at various times, especially in the case of deer species...early hunts east side (mulies), Nov. hunting on the west side (blacktails). And with a limited east side (late controlled hunt)...we could have (white-tails) in the mix too. Don't give up Oregon's uniqueness advantage just to be consistent with other forms of hunting...or criteria that is not based on the biological situation!