

Exhibit B

**Supplemental
Public Correspondence received as of
January 19, 2017**

Roxann B Borisch

From: Colin Gillin <colin.m.gillin@state.or.us>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2017 11:10 AM
To: Maryeli Rodriguez
Cc: Kevin Blakely; Rick Boatner (rick.j.boatner@state.or.us); Roxann B Borisch
Subject: RE: Public comment for: PROTECTED WILDLIFE HOLDING AND PROPAGATING

Dear Ms. Rodriguez

Thank you for your email and request for clarification.

The language proposed under the revised Division 44 rules you refer to only addresses native wildlife in Oregon. Non-native wildlife, inclusive of Indigo Snakes, are regulated under OAR 635 Division 56 rules. If you have questions regarding non-native wildlife, non-native T & E species and how Division 56 rules regulate the holding of those species, I invite you to give our coordinator involved in those rules and species a call or email him. His name is Rick Boatner and he can be reached at 503-947-6308 and I've copied him on this email.

Under the proposed revised rules, if a person legally holds native T & E species, including Oregon listed or federally listed native Oregon species, they will be required to hold those species with the appropriate federal permit and / or Oregon permit or Letter of Authorization issued by the department. All other rules in this Division then apply to the legal holding of those animals (care, caging, reporting, etc.). If you would like to discuss further on the phone, I can be reached at the numbers below. Thanks again for your question.

Colin Gillin
541-757-5232 (office)
541-231-9271 (cell)

From: Maryeli Rodriguez [mailto:coolflm@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 7:56 PM
To: colin.m.gillin@state.or.us
Subject: Public comment for: PROTECTED WILDLIFE HOLDING AND PROPAGATING

Hi,

Thanks for making changes that were petitioned before by the reptile keeping community. From what is left, there are some points the community doesn't agree. One is prohibiting the breeding of endangered species. One good example on how this can affect is Indigo Snakes, they are already protected under ESA and as such, current keepers already have legislation in place to protect such animal. Now, with the current way the new regulations are being planned, any keeper in Oregon would not be able to help with the captive breeding of said animals. This is not helping the species.

Also, the above regulation would be an over-reach by the department on species that are not native to the USA. Prohibiting the keeping, breeding and "propagation" of this species in the states does little to save their habitats in their natural range. If conservation is the real goal, the money that comes from permits, which I hope are actually given, should be sent directly to the countries/states where these species are native too. And it should be used to buy, protect or restore habitats.

One last point I want to touch, please, give permits to people that work for them, we are tired of hearing BS from other states that negate permits under pressure from political groups.

Thanks.

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: Question regarding Division 44 proposed rule change

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

From: Phil Goss [mailto:President@USARK.org]

Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2017 11:27 AM

To: Colin Gillin <colin.m.gillin@state.or.us>

Cc: colin.m.gillin@state.or.us; curt.melcher@state.or.us; Kevin Blakely <kevin.l.blakely@state.or.us>;
odfw.comments@state.or.us; ODFW Commission <odfw.commission@state.or.us>;

odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us; Rick Boatner (rick.j.boatner@state.or.us) <rick.j.boatner@state.or.us>;

Roxann B Borisch <roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us>

Subject: RE: Question regarding Division 44 proposed rule change

Colin,

Thank you greatly for the clarification that the proposed Division 44 rule changes only apply to Oregon native species. I'm thankful to see that this is not a misunderstanding and misuse of ESA. Have a good day.

Phil Goss

President of USARK

United States Association of Reptile Keepers Protecting Your Freedom to Responsibly Keep Reptiles and Amphibians as Pets www.USARK.org

www.facebook.com/UnitedStatesAssociationOfReptileKeepers

President@USARK.org

On Sat, January 14, 2017 2:00 pm, Colin Gillin wrote:

> Mr. Goss

>

>

> Thank you for the email and your request for clarification.

>

>

> The language proposed under the revised Division 44 rules you refer to

> > only addresses native wildlife in Oregon. Non-native wildlife are regulated under OAR 635 Division 56 rules.

>

> Under the proposed revised rules, if a person legally holds native T &

> E species, including Oregon listed or federally listed native Oregon

> species, they will be required to hold those species with the

> appropriate federal permit and / or Oregon permit or Letter of Authorization issued by the

department. All other rules in this Division then apply to the legal holding of those animals (care, caging, reporting, etc.). If you would like to discuss further on the phone, I can be reached at the numbers below. Thanks again for your question.

>

> Colin Gillin

> 541-757-5232 (office)

> 541-231-9271 (cell)
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Phil Goss [mailto:President@USARK.org]
> Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 6:43 PM
> To: colin.m.gillin@state.or.us
> Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us; odfw.comments@state.or.us;
> curt.melcher@state.or.us; ODFW Commission;
> odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us
> Subject: Question regarding Division 44 proposed rule change
>
>
> Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife officials,
>
>
> Please clarify regarding the proposed language found below. Hopefully
> there was an error, but as written it seems the proposed language
> makes it illegal to possess any species listed as threatened or
> endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act ("ESA"). Was this
> meant to include only species native to Oregon which are listed under
> ESA? ESA includes many species non-native to Oregon, and many others
> non-native to the U.S., which have been captive bred for decades and
> these species are no longer collected from the wild and imported. For
> many reasons, which I'll withhold until a response is received,
> banning all species listed under ESA is nonsensical and actually counterproductive to conservation.
>
> To rephrase, does the language "federally listed threatened and
> endangered listed species" include all ESA-listed species, or only
> Oregon native species listed under ESA? When referring to the
> definitions for "threatened species" and "endangered species" under
> Oregon § 496.004 (as referenced in the definitions for this proposed
> rule change), these terms of threatened and endangered apply only to Oregon native species.
>
> 635-044-0430
>
>
> Protected Wildlife
>
>
> (1) Except as provided by Oregon statute or rule or letter of
> authorization, it is unlawful for any person to take, capture, hold,
> release, or have in possession, either dead or alive, whole or in
> part, any wildlife listed in this section:
>
> (a) Threatened or Endangered animals as provided for in 635-100-0125,
> Sensitive Species of Oregon as provided by 635-100-0040, species
> listed by Oregon Biodiversity Information Center (ORBIC) as "rare,
> threatened or endangered" in Oregon in the ORBIC published book (2016)
> and federally listed threatened and endangered listed species;
>

- >
- > Thank you for your time and response. Have a good day.
- >
- >
- > Phil Goss
- > President of USARK
- > United States Association of Reptile Keepers Protecting Your Freedom
- > to Responsibly Keep Reptiles and Amphibians as Pets www.USARK.org
- > www.facebook.com/UnitedStatesAssociationOfReptileKeepers
- > President@USARK.org
- >
- >
- >

Roxann B Borisch

From: Marie <wakefieldm_2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 10:55 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us; odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Proposed New Rules for Captive Wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message strongly to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Marie Wakefield
3054 Hwy 20
Newport , OR 97365
wakefieldm_2000@yahoo.com

Roxann B Borisch

From: shayne o'brien <shayneland@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 11:06 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Rules regarding wildlife in captivity

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.
Shayne O'Brien

Roxann B Borisch

From: Brian Posewitz <brianp@humaneoregon.org>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 6:34 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Subject: Comments of Humane Oregon on Proposed Division 44 Rules (for Jan. 20, 2017 Commission meeting)
Attachments: 170116 Comments of Humane Oregon on Proposed Rules for Wildlife Holding and Propagation (Division 44).pdf

Greetings,

Please see the attached comments on the above. Thank you.

Regards,

Brian Posewitz

Secretary | Treasurer | Administrator
Humane Oregon | 8508 S.E. Eleventh Avenue | Portland, Oregon 97202
Phone: 503-946-1534 | Fax: 503-433-1004
Email: brianp@humaneoregon.org | Website: www.humaneoregon.org
Facebook: www.facebook.com/humaneoregon.org

Click [here](#) to help Humane Oregon and Humane Oregon PAC advocate for animals in Oregon's political process.



HUMANE|OREGON

8508 SE 11TH AVE.
PORTLAND, OR 97202
503.946.1534
INFO@HUMANEOREGON.ORG
WWW.HUMANEOREGON.ORG

January 16, 2017

Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE
Salem, OR 97302

Re: Proposed New Rules on Wildlife Holding and Propagation (Division 44)

Dear Commissioners:

Humane Oregon is a non-profit organization formed in 2014 to help advocate for animal welfare in Oregon. Although we have existed only a short time, we enjoy an excellent reputation as a moderate but progressive animal welfare group, with many of Oregon's leading animal welfare advocates on our board of directors.

We have reviewed the proposed new rules on wildlife holding and propagation (made available online January 11, 2017) and offer the following comments:

General Supportive Comments

In general, we believe the rules are a step in the right direction. They would protect more species of wildlife from capture and holding without a permit, reduce captive holding of large carnivores, reduce captive breeding generally, and improve requirements for the care of wildlife in captivity.

General Continuing Concerns

We recognize that some capture and captive holding of wildlife will continue in the immediate future. However, we also want to be clear that, while there may be a place for captive holding of wildlife that cannot live in the wild, we generally do not support the taking of healthy animals from the wild for confinement in cages and containers, nor the breeding of wild animals for a life of captivity, especially when this is done for commercial or entertainment purposes, or to try to turn wildlife into pets. In our view, wildlife belongs in the wild, and our public policy should reinforce that message instead of sending a mixed message that it is okay to take some animals from the wild but not others. Instead of creating opportunities for people to see and hold wildlife in captivity, we should focus on ensuring adequate wild habitat and opportunities for people to see wildlife in its natural setting. Confinement of wildlife in captivity will too often lead to abuse and neglect of the animals. Even if some holders of captive wildlife treat the animals well, many (including members of the general public) will lack the knowledge and resources necessary to care for wildlife properly, and some will even lack the necessary concern. The Department will lack the resource for comprehensive inspection and enforcement, and the result will be too many animals deprived of basic needs for food, shelter, space, freedom and enrichment.

Specific Changes We Support

Some of the specific proposed changes we support include: (a) requiring a permit for holding three or more of any species instead of some species being entirely exempt from permit requirements; (b) requiring a separate permit and additional oversight for facilities using wildlife for exhibition and entertainment, or operating as a wildlife sanctuary; (c) restricting captive holding of additional black bears, cougars, bobcats and wolves to only certain permit holders; creating specific requirements for animal enclosures and care; and (e) restricting captive breeding of wildlife.

Additional Comments

1. Continued Capture of Animals from the Wild.

The proposed rules would continue to allow certain species of wildlife, deemed sufficiently abundant, to be taken from the wild and held in captivity, including up to two of each species without any permit whatsoever. While perhaps giving due consideration to the survival of species overall, and while honoring what some see as family tradition, we believe the continuation of permitted wild capture shows too little regard for the welfare of the individual animals involved, most of which are likely to be held with little if any regulatory oversight by people who, while perhaps acting with best intentions, lack the knowledge and resources to properly care for wildlife. Moreover, we doubt the public will learn or remember which species of wildlife can be captured and which cannot, resulting in all wildlife being subject to capture and holding. A general rule against taking wildlife from the wild would make more sense. It would be easy to understand and administer, it would communicate the right message to the public, and it would allow more wild animals to live out their natural lives in their natural homes.

2. Requirements for Care of Wildlife in Captivity.

We support the proposed new specific requirements for animal care (replacing a general requirement that animals be treated “humanely”). We are also pleased to see that the requirements apply to all wildlife held in captivity, not just to wildlife held under the various classes of permits. However, it is worth noting that the requirements for care concern themselves exclusively with the physical needs of the animal (food, water, shelter etc.). While these physical requirements are crucial, we would like to see the care requirements also address the need that animals have for enrichment (social interaction, mental stimulation, etc.). These are also widely considered important to the health and well-being of most animals.

3. Application Requirements and Permit Criteria.

The draft rules provide good application requirements for Exhibitor/Entertainment and Sanctuary permits. The rules also should provide detailed application requirements for Holding permits, including background information on the applicant and reasons for requesting a permit. The rules also should provide clear standards and criteria for determining if an application should be approved or denied. The rules should require some showing of justification and/or need for holding wildlife in captivity, and should require a determination, based on the application and other known information, that the applicant is likely to follow the rules and treat the animals humanely. The rules also should provide standards and criteria for renewals and revocations, including conditions under which revocation of a permit is mandatory. Finally, the rules should provide for public notice and comment on applications for permits and permit renewals, and for public notice of agency decisions regarding permit applications, renewals and/or revocations. The public is legitimately interested in the capture and holding of Oregon’s wildlife.

4. Disposition of Wildlife Upon License Revocation, Nonrenewal or Denial.

Under proposed OAR 635-044-0580, a person may be compelled to dispose of the animals they are holding by transferring or euthanizing them. The draft regulations require that wildlife being held for disposal must be treated “humanely.” However, one of the options for disposal is to euthanize the animals. We believe the animals should be euthanized only after exploring, and exhausting, other alternatives, including transfer to another licensed facility. That may happen in practice, but we think it should be required by the rules to ensure it happens in the future and to give the Department authority to require it if a permit holder for some reason wants to do otherwise. Moreover, there are no protocols for how euthanasia may take place. This problem could be solved with a definition for “euthanize,” with input from qualified experts.

5. Shipping Requirements.

We are also concerned that the shipping requirements in OAR 635-044-0550 do not specify any requirements of care (regarding food, space, water, etc.) for wild animals being shipped within or outside the state.

6. Exceptions by Department.

Many requirements of the proposed rules provide for exceptions if approved by the Department. In most if not all of these instances, there are no standards or criteria for the Department’s approval. While likely motivated by a good faith desire to respond to unique situations, such open-ended exceptions risk arbitrary and inconsistent decision-making.

7. Clarity in Structure and Wording of the Rules.

We believe the rules could be more clearly structured and worded. Some core questions are difficult to answer from the rules, including which species (if any) may not be taken from the wild and held under any of the permits described in the rules, and which species (if any) may continue to be taken from the wild and held in captivity.¹ Similarly, we understand that these rules apply only to species native to Oregon, and that other rules apply to the holding of non-native animals. However, we do not think the draft rules say that clearly enough.

* * * * *
* * * * *

¹ OAR 655-044-00430 implies that “protected wildlife” cannot be captured and held, but begins with the caveat, “[e]xcept as provided by Oregon statute or rule or letter of authorization,” leaving one to wonder if, for example, having one of the permits allowed under Division 44 creates an “except[ion].” OAR 655-044-0450 says “[n]o person shall capture or hold three or more animals listed in OAR 635-044-0480 without a valid Wildlife Holding Permit,” but it is not clear if *only* those species may be captured and held under a holding permit. OAR 635-044-0480 says, “[o]nly nongame species from the following list are permitted to be held,” but is not clear as to whether that applies to just holding permits or leaves room for holding game animals (and we know from elsewhere in the rules that some people are allowed to hold bears, cougars, etc.). Similarly, OAR 635-044-0480 implies, but does not clearly state, that anyone may capture and hold up to two of the species listed in that rule without a permit.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Brian Posewitz

Brian Posewitz
Board Member/Administrator

Roxann B Borisch

From: Amy Adams <aadams@lclark.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:13 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Wildlife Rule

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I wanted to let you know that I support the proposed additional restrictions on capturing wildlife, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I also implore you to restrict the breeding or capturing of healthy wildlife. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Best,

Amy Adams
Lewis & Clark Law School
J.D. Candidate, Class of 2017
aadams@lclark.edu

Roxann B Borisch

From: Michelle Newmark <newmm101@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 7:43 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Captive wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Roxann B Borisch

From: Philip Mandel <phmand@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 7:17 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Proposed New Rules for Captive Wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Regards,

Philip Mandel
6135 SW Erickson Ave
Beaverton OR 97008

Roxann B Borisch

From: Sandy Miller <mayfly52@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:43 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Rules for holding wildlife in captivity

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sandra K. Miller
2924 SE Alder Street
Portland, OR 97214

Roxann B Borisch

From: Michelle Mintmier <mmintmier@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 6:03 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us; odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Wildlife in Captivity

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Michelle Mintmier
Beaverton, OR

Roxann B Borisch

From: Niko Morozov <nmorozov@willamette.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:28 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: New rules

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

--

Niko Morozov
Willamette University Class of 2018
BA International Studies
(619) 415-2887

Roxann B Borisch

From: Andrea <andreasher_2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:23 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: holding wildlife in captivity

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding.

Yet I am concerned about the breeding of wildlife and ask you to please reverse the part of the proposed plan that allows people to add black bears, cougars and bobcats to their captive holdings (as well as the wildlife deemed "abundant") as long as they come from out-of-state breeders, thereby encouraging more breeding of wild animals for life in captivity (even if the breeding happens in other states).

It should be illegal to take wildlife from the wild or to breed wildlife for exhibition, entertainment or pets.

Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Andrea Kozil
3346 SE Waverleigh Blvd
Portland OR 97202

Un-chain a dog today!
www.fencesfordido.org

Roxann B Borisch

From: Emily Jenkins <esjenkins@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:09 PM
To: colin.m.gillin@state.or.us
Cc: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Subject: Division 44

Hello Dr. Gillin,

Thank you for reaching out and making sure we had a chance to preview the latest draft. You've been truly helpful and open to hearing our input and that has helped put a lot of fears to rest.

Deborah Cipriani of Skunkhaven (www.skunkhaven.net) has asked me to sign on as an official Skunkhaven Rep for Oregon.

Skunkhaven is USDA licensed and a 501(C)3 nonprofit shelter. It is the only fully licensed/permitted skunk rescue facility in the country and probably the largest skunk rescue in the whole world. I believe Deb said she has 60 or more skunks at her own home, and I know that there are a handful of reps around the country with rescued animals in their own homes.

This puts me in a position to be the primary contact if a skunk in Oregon is in an emergency rehoming situation.

Aside from my new volunteer position, things have been a bit hectic for me so I only had a chance to look at the new draft a couple nights ago, overall it looks very workable to me, I just have a few questions and clarifications that I feel would protect us from misinterpreting the rule in the future.

The first being that skunks are still listed in section 470 under "grandfathering." Since the laws are the same, is it necessary to even include skunks in this section?

In 470(2)(c) the last sentence still states that we are to provide a signed and notarized affidavit. Why is this necessary if we have already provided our import permits, health certificates and receipts from the breeder? Besides being redundant, Melinda Hodge actually consulted a notary and was told she could not have such a statement notarized.

In Section 460 its tough at first glance to tell which items apply to skunks, and which do not. Could we copy all the pertinent information for us and re-group it into one heading under "skunks and raccoons" ?

In 460(3) there is a specific line addressing bears, cougars, bobcats and wolves acquired after January 20, 2017. This ties back to the notion of "grandfathering" our current pets. How about a similar statement regarding skunks and raccoons, for the sake of additional clarification.

Regarding the permits:

490(6) says we need prior approval by the department biologist to add skunks to our permits. I'm sure this is intended to apply to people who would collect wildlife, can we somehow differentiate our pets?

Also, on the note of adding animals to our permits: Skunks only breed once a year. Most babies are purchased in late May or early June (based on when they are old enough to be separated from their mother). How long

after acquisition do we have to declare our new pet? If you need the microchip number, we would prefer to wait until they are old enough to spay or neuter.

490(5) regarding a change of address - if we move, we have to apply for a new permit? I'm wondering what the reason is for this? Does it require paying the fee again?

I have one last question that has come up since I agreed to be the Oregon Skunkhaven Rep: Last spring someone forwarded me a craigslist ad for a woman trying to rehome her skunk. I contacted her, she said the skunk had been a gift, purchased by a friend who she was no longer in touch with. She had no import paperwork and no idea which breeder the skunk came from, but he was a chocolate color so I am certain he was captive bred.

He was not in a good living situation, but I was afraid of what consequences might befall my own pet if I were caught with an "undocumented" skunk, especially with the first draft of Div 44 looking so terrifying, so I didn't take him in.

So here's my question: If I am called to rescue a skunk who has no paper trail, but is obviously captive bred, can I contact the department and request a letter of authorization in place of an import permit? Then I could go through the proper steps of microchipping and sterilization to complete the permit process. Does there need to be a line in Div 44 that states "or with department approval" in order to do this?

I think that sums up my thoughts on Div 44 for the moment. Thank you again, and I will see you Friday.

Emily Jenkins
Skunkhaven Rep/Oregon Skunk Owner

(503) 910-5507

Roxann B Borisch

From: Roxann B Borisch
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 8:55 AM
To: Roxann B Borisch
Subject: FW: Proposed New Rules for Captive Wildlife

From: Raj Reddy [mailto:rajreddy@lclark.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:58 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Proposed New Rules for Captive Wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I have come to learn that you are considering new rules regarding the capture and holding of Oregon wildlife. As a law student with a strong interest in animal-related issues, I strongly support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I also encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments. I appreciate your efforts.

Best,

Rajesh K. Reddy

--
Rajesh K. Reddy
JD Candidate, 2017
Lewis & Clark Law School
rajreddy@lclark.edu

Roxann B Borisch

From: Richard F. Hoyer <charinabottae@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Colin Gillin; Alan St. John; Robert T. Mason; Dan Edge; Chris Rombough; jay bowerman; Richard F. Hoyer; Christina E Donehower; Roxann B Borisch
Subject: Div. 44 regulations

Colin,

Recently I was informed that on Jan. 20th, the Wildlife Commission will take up the issue of the revised Div. 44 regulations. Most likely, you are the one person that can potentially correct mistakes in the proposed regulations and hence this message.

With having a background in a science related field, I assume you value a science based approach to wildlife management versus an approach that relies on subjective, anecdotal information such as personal opinions. Consequently, I call your attention to the fact that none of the snakes currently in a protected status in Oregon, and none being proposed for adding to the protected list have any scientific evidence in support of such listings.

I noted during your presentation last June that you relied on the ORBIC / NatureServe ranking information. What you and ODFW biologists have likely not done is investigate how NatureServe arrives at their status accounts and rankings. I have done so twice, once about 10 – 12 years ago and then again just this past spring which included exchanging messages with Eleanor Gaines of that organization.

NatureServe incorporates what can be regarded as a quasi, science-based process. Their write-ups on distribution, ecology, life history are pretty much what one finds in herpetological field guides so basically is a summary from published research. But their ranking information is only personal opinion, imaginary, and thus fiction.

The reason I know that to be the case for the snakes in Oregon is that with just one exception, there is no published scientific studies of those species that pertain to the status of their populations in this state. In fact, other than some scientific notes on diet, distribution, reproduction, etc., I do not believe any of those species have been the subject of research in Oregon. Consequently, there is a total void of evidence that would support the NatureServe rankings. In searching all of that organization's web sites, there is no cited scientific evidence in support of the rankings of those species of snakes. Consequently, there is no valid evidence in support of ODFW placing any of those snakes in a protected status.

I hope you would agree that claiming species are at risk and placing them in a protected status without having any valid evidence is unprofessional and unethical. Informing the public that these species are at risk without having valid evidence is also a violation of the public trust.

Now the one exception where there is published information on the relative status of a species is the Common Sharp-tailed Snake (*Contia tenuis*).

ODFW has the reported collection data during the 4 year study of that species in Oregon. Did ODFW biologists provide you with that information? Did ODFW access the scientific publication on the status of *C. tenuis* in Oregon? (Current Distribution and Status of Sharp-tailed Snakes (*Contia tenuis*) in Oregon. Hoyer, R.F, Ryan P. O'Donnell, Robert T. Mason. Northwestern Naturalist 87:195-202 Winter 2006)

About 35 years ago in the 1980s, that species was known only from the three counties of Jackson, Douglas, and Benton. There were something like 40 locality records. By the end of the 1980's, herpetologists Alan St. John had increased the number of counties to 8 in which *C. tenuis* had been documented and increased the locality sighting to about 67. Now the species has been documented in 12 counties and has over 600 locality sightings.

Not published is information on the Rubber Boa (*Charina bottae*) in Oregon. However, the species has been documented in almost all counties in Oregon. In a presentation I gave this past May 19 at the U. of Montana in Missoula, I mentioned I have recorded data on over 4500 specimens of the species with something over 3500 being from the state of Oregon. (I can supply such data on request.)

As is my common practice, feel free to forward this message to others. And because I could have made errors, I have included professionals that can inform you of any such errors. I have included ODFW's Christina Donehower as one species of snake is listed at a 'Strategy Species'. I have also included Roxann Borisch in case the information above might be transmitted to the Wildlife Commissioners.

Richard F. Hoyer (Corvallis, Oregon)

Roxann B Borisch

From: Lora Meisner <lmgb@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:24 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Subject: re: captive wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding. I encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Also the DFW should make further changes and not allow numerous animals (deemed sufficiently "abundant") to be taken from the wild and held in captivity, including several species of amphibians and reptiles, and mammals such as ermine and ground squirrels; NOT allow two of the "abundant" species to be taken from the wild and held in captivity without a permit; NOT allow permit holders to add black bears, cougars and bobcats to their captive holdings (as well as the wildlife deemed "abundant") as long as they come from out-of-state breeders, thereby encouraging more breeding of wild animals for life in captivity (even if the breeding happens in other states).

Thank you for considering my comments.

Lora Meisner
Coalition Advocating for Animals (CAFA)
www.cafaoregon.org
Salem, Oregon
Get it done while it's only one, spay a stray

Roxann B Borisch

From: Andrea <andreasher_2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:23 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: holding wildlife in captivity

Categories: Red Category

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding.

Yet I am concerned about the breeding of wildlife and ask you to please reverse the part of the proposed plan that allows people to add black bears, cougars and bobcats to their captive holdings (as well as the wildlife deemed "abundant") as long as they come from out-of-state breeders, thereby encouraging more breeding of wild animals for life in captivity (even if the breeding happens in other states).

It should be illegal to take wildlife from the wild or to breed wildlife for exhibition, entertainment or pets.

Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Andrea Kozil
3346 SE Waverleigh Blvd
Portland OR 97202

Un-chain a dog today!
www.fencesfordo.org

Roxann B Borisch

From: Courtney L Dillard <cldillard@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 5:39 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Proposed new rules on captive wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding.

I do however encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Public perspective is changing on this as clearly demonstrated by recent changes to and closure of operations such as Sea World and Ringling Brothers. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Courtney Dillard

Portland, OR

Roxann B Borisch

From: Corinne Vostal <vostal7790@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 7:46 AM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Fwd: Comment on Proposed New Rules for Captive Wildlife

Begin forwarded message:

From: Corinne Vostal <vostal7790@comcast.net>
Subject: **Comment on Proposed New Rules for Captive Wildlife**
Date: January 18, 2017 at 7:44:19 AM PST
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon.

I totally support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding.

I encourage you to go further by making it **illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets.**

Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Corinne Vostal

Roxann B Borisch

From: Courtney L Dillard <cldillard@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 5:39 AM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Proposed new rules on captive wildlife

Dear Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

I understand you are considering new rules for the capture and holding of wildlife in Oregon. I support the proposed additional restrictions on this practice, including more requirements for permits, specific requirements for animal care, and restrictions on breeding.

I do however encourage you to go further by making it illegal to take any healthy wildlife from the wild, or to breed wildlife, for exhibition, entertainment or pets. Public perspective is changing on this as clearly demonstrated by recent changes to and closure of operations such as Sea World and Ringling Brothers. Wildlife should stay in the wild, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife should be sending that message to the public.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Courtney Dillard

Portland, OR

Roxann B Borisch

From: Kelly Levenda <kellylevenda@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:08 PM
To: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Comment on Proposed Wildlife Rule

Hello,

I wanted to send in a comment on the new rules the agency is considering for the capture and holding of wild animals in Oregon.

I am glad to see additional restrictions on capturing and holding wildlife, especially the additional requirements for permits, specific requirements for care for animals, and restrictions on breeding wild animals.

I believe the rules should also ban taking healthy animals from the wild. If they are healthy, there is no reason to put them into captivity. They should be able to spend their lives in the wild. I also think the rules should ban breeding wild animals for pets, entertainment, or to exhibit them.

Thank you for your time,
Kelly Levenda

Roxann B Borisch

From: Colin Gillin <colin.m.gillin@state.or.us>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:30 AM
To: Emily Jenkins
Cc: Carol Turner (carol.d.turner@state.or.us); Kevin Blakely; roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Subject: RE: Division 44

Hi Emily

Thanks for the comments and congratulations on your new position with Skunkhaven. I'll try to answer your questions but feel free to call me anytime for further clarification.

We discussed removing skunks and raccoons from the grandfathering language but thought it better to leave in to provide a foundation or starting point for those that are holding skunks legally and with documentation that they were legally acquired. The grandfathering provision covers a relatively short period of time and provides a starting point for other or new requirements adopted by the commission. It may seem unnecessary for skunks, but we are able to regulate all held mammalian wildlife more equitably if we limit the exceptions for individual species or circumstances. The provision will not make any difference for legally held skunks, and staff felt it appropriate to include skunks with the other legally held carnivores and other mammals.

On 470 (2) (c), we use the notarized signature documentation attached to a statement of legal acquisition of the animal for many permit holders including those that hold prohibited species, crayfish, and others. If Melinda's notary person has some confusion about notarizing the signature attached to the statement, please have Melinda or the notary contact us and we will address the issue and provide further direction.

We reorganized the rule language so it better follows process and not species which works much better for rule application and enforcement. That said, we are also putting together a species-specific *Frequently Asked Questions* document that will address many of the issues and questions specifically related to skunks. This sort of document will cover all the issues by question and category and make the complexity of the rules less onerous for the skunk owner. It will be sent to all permit holders.

On your question about 460 (3), this refers to the placement of large carnivores after January 20th in AZA accredited facilities or one of the professional businesses permittees. I don't think you want that applied to skunks or all newly acquired skunks could only be held at one of these facilities. We added this because of concerns your industry brought up at the June meeting. Call me if I'm not explaining this well enough.

"490(6) says we need prior approval by the department biologist to add skunks to our permits. I'm sure this is intended to apply to people who would collect wildlife, can we somehow differentiate our pets?" The language is intended to document legal acquisition of held wildlife as it is added to a permit. This includes other species such as raccoons. The advisory group and department feel this level of documentation is critical to providing oversight of held wildlife and equitable application of the rules across species. For legally held wildlife acquisitions, this will be a minor step for the permittee and insure wildlife held by the public is legally acquired before it is added to a permit. Also, the regulatory language does imply that all your skunks (or raccoons) held on a Wildlife Holding Permit are considered "Wildlife held as pets" as defined in section 420.

"How long after acquisition do we have to declare our new pet? If you need the microchip number, we would prefer to wait until they are old enough to spay or neuter." You should declare your new animal with documentation that your acquired it legally as soon as the acquisition occurs. Your new skunk will need to be either 6 months of age (approximately) to spay or neuter, many do this at 4-6

months. That's the time to apply the microchip or any other permanent marking. If you acquire an animal 6 months or older, the rule states within 30 days.

490(5) regarding a change of address: Your permit is associated directly with a facility (or a residence for skunks). As with other held wildlife (raccoons, bobcats), when your facility location changes your permit needs to be updated. Again, the rules are written to avoid a multitude of exceptions (which can lead to other interpretation problems including loopholes) for individual species. We provided more latitude (residence as an enclosure, number of held animals, etc.) in the holding of skunks than for any other species. 490 (5) is a general reporting rule and does not require another payment in addition to your annual fee.

As for your last question, having an animal held with no documentation of legal acquisition does not necessarily present an insurmountable issue for you or the original owner. The Department (your biologist or headquarters staff) may be able to determine from the information provided that the animal is captive bred and born from an out of state source or you might find another out-of-state sanctuary for it or some other acceptable placement. I don't see this sort of scenario as occurring often and I am sure the options are available to come up with an acceptable solution for in-state animals although we should be working through most of these issues fairly quickly. Several months or by 2018/19 this should not be an issue as all owners and animals should be accounted for.

However, I think you are referring to bringing undocumented animals into the state. That is actually what we are trying to keep from happening. All pet skunks coming into Oregon will need a Certificate of Veterinary Inspection and an Import permit which will lead to proof of documentation that the animal was captive bred by a USDA breeder. We also apply this rule to other sanctuaries when bringing in captive bobcats, cougars and other wildlife. Without appropriate documentation that the animal was captive bred from a legal facility and is healthy, we have denied importation into the state.

One final note, if you are serving as a repository or sanctuary for in-state skunks and documented captive bred skunks as an official Skunkhaven Rep for Oregon, we will want to think about how the wildlife sanctuary rule requirements apply to your official capacity as a skunk sanctuary. Just something to think about.

Thanks again for the email and please email or call if you have further questions.

Best regards,

Colin Gillin
State Wildlife Veterinarian
Wildlife Health and Population Lab Program Manager
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
Ph 541-757-5232
Cell 541-231-9271



www.ODFW.com

http://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/health_program/index.asp

From: Emily Jenkins [mailto:esjenkins@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 9:09 PM
To: colin.m.gillin@state.or.us
Cc: roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Subject: Division 44

Hello Dr. Gillin,

Thank you for reaching out and making sure we had a chance to preview the latest draft. You've been truly helpful and open to hearing our input and that has helped put a lot of fears to rest.

Deborah Cipriani of Skunkhaven (www.skunkhaven.net) has asked me to sign on as an official Skunkhaven Rep for Oregon.

Skunkhaven is USDA licensed and a 501(C)3 nonprofit shelter. It is the only fully licensed/permitted skunk rescue facility in the country and probably the largest skunk rescue in the whole world. I believe Deb said she has 60 or more skunks at her own home, and I know that there are a handful of reps around the country with rescued animals in their own homes.

This puts me in a position to be the primary contact if a skunk in Oregon is in an emergency rehoming situation.

Aside from my new volunteer position, things have been a bit hectic for me so I only had a chance to look at the new draft a couple nights ago, overall it looks very workable to me, I just have a few questions and clarifications that I feel would protect us from misinterpreting the rule in the future.

The first being that skunks are still listed in section 470 under "grandfathering." Since the laws are the same, is it necessary to even include skunks in this section?

In 470(2)(c) the last sentence still states that we are to provide a signed and notarized affidavit. Why is this necessary if we have already provided our import permits, health certificates and receipts from the breeder? Besides being redundant, Melinda Hodge actually consulted a notary and was told she could not have such a statement notarized.

In Section 460 its tough at first glance to tell which items apply to skunks, and which do not. Could we copy all the pertinent information for us and re-group it into one heading under "skunks and raccoons" ?

In 460(3) there is a specific line addressing bears, cougars, bobcats and wolves acquired after January 20, 2017. This ties back to the notion of "grandfathering" our current pets. How about a similar statement regarding skunks and raccoons, for the sake of additional clarification.

Regarding the permits:

490(6) says we need prior approval by the department biologist to add skunks to our permits. I'm sure this is intended to apply to people who would collect wildlife, can we somehow differentiate our pets?

Also, on the note of adding animals to our permits: Skunks only breed once a year. Most babies are purchased in late May or early June (based on when they are old enough to be separated from their mother). How long

after acquisition do we have to declare our new pet? If you need the microchip number, we would prefer to wait until they are old enough to spay or neuter.

490(5) regarding a change of address - if we move, we have to apply for a new permit? I'm wondering what the reason is for this? Does it require paying the fee again?

I have one last question that has come up since I agreed to be the Oregon Skunkhaven Rep: Last spring someone forwarded me a craigslist ad for a woman trying to rehome her skunk. I contacted her, she said the skunk had been a gift, purchased by a friend who she was no longer in touch with. She had no import paperwork and no idea which breeder the skunk came from, but he was a chocolate color so I am certain he was captive bred.

He was not in a good living situation, but I was afraid of what consequences might befall my own pet if I were caught with an "undocumented" skunk, especially with the first draft of Div 44 looking so terrifying, so I didn't take him in.

So here's my question: If I am called to rescue a skunk who has no paper trail, but is obviously captive bred, can I contact the department and request a letter of authorization in place of an import permit? Then I could go through the proper steps of microchipping and sterilization to complete the permit process. Does there need to be a line in Div 44 that states "or with department approval" in order to do this?

I think that sums up my thoughts on Div 44 for the moment. Thank you again, and I will see you Friday.

Emily Jenkins
Skunkhaven Rep/Oregon Skunk Owner

(503) 910-5507

Roxann B Borisch

From: Jerry & Arden <ardenr@proaxis.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 8:23 AM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Division 44

Jerry C. Ray
800 NW Meadow View
Corvallis, Oregon 97330
541-745-7311
January 18, 2017

Dear Commissioners,

I regret that I will not be able to attend your commission meeting January 20, 2017. My absence will be due to the fact that I have to set up and prepare for the annual "Small Game Hunting Clinic" called "Hunting Rabbits with Beagles" to be held the next day, Saturday, at the E.E. Wilson Wildlife Area. This event is held in cooperation with Mary's Peak Hound Club and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife through ODFW's department of Information and Education. We have a proud history of success teaching new hunters the sport of beagling for over fifteen years. It's unfortunate the dates for our clinic and your commission meeting conflict but I hope the following will express my concerns.

I am deeply concerned that you might pass the draft of Division 44 even with revisions to date.

The advisory committee which brings this draft to you put in hours of work but its efforts were biased and heavily slanted with an ODFW agenda. That agenda as written is to take wildlife out of the hands of Oregon citizens. In the two-previous public testimony concerning the issue we never heard a reason why such a large over reaching review was necessary. At those meetings, you heard from many Oregon citizens expressing concerns about the proposed draft. Stakeholders were held at bay by not being invited to be part of the advisory committee. Stakeholders such as: The movie industry, educational institutions (both public and private), animal rehab facilities, skunk holders, animal research, houndsmen and so on.

Houndsmen, for example, were not invited to participate on the committee. We were told the reason for that was the department didn't know how to get ahold of the houndsman. I am a houndsman and am very well known by department personnel. Don Gilbert, a houndsman out of Roseburg, was a committee member on the Division 46 review committee. David Walker is President of the Oregon United Sporting Dog Association and is well known by ODFW. Then there is Ted Craddock from eastern Oregon who has done years of extensive work with bear and cougar studies conducted by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and he is a houndsman. What did they mean, "couldn't get ahold of the houndsmen and why didn't they want houndsmen on the committee?"

No, the advisory committee which has produced this draft of the revision of Division 44 did not represent stakeholders of Oregon concerning this matter. I urge you NOT to pass this document.

As I said in a previous letter. If it is necessary to review and revise Division 44 do it with a facilitated committee, and outside facilitator and a proper representation of stakeholders.

Sincerely

Jerry C. Ray

Roxann B Borisch

From: BenjiOtter1@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:43 AM
To: ODFW.Commission@state.or.us
Subject: Exhibit B: PROTECTED WILDLIFE HOLDING AND PROPAGATING

For the Commission and to Dr. Gillin:

Oregon has a small population of exotic animal-keeping enthusiasts. We as a whole value individuality- that is what made this state so special. Oregon is a home of pioneers, and whether our ancestors came over the Great Divide in Connestoga wagons or more recently as transplants, many people here live and let live. The animals we keep are not necessarily limited to the species ordained as acceptable by a higher order, just because a majority think of them to be inappropriate for keeping in captivity. Zoos have gotten around this concern, considering themselves as living gene banks for the world's imperiled wildlife species. The entertainment industry has it well played too, that they are involved with bringing the wild into our living rooms and at wild animal parks. All are important in today's world of shrinking habitats. But as a rule, there is only the brief glimpse of an exotic animal behind a well-designed barrier, or the scene of professional actors working around some great beast and really looking so special because the audience can only watch, to never experience it themselves no matter how badly they wish for it all their lives. Exotic animal keepers in this state from the late Don Kerr, founder of Oregon's own High Desert Museum, to the pet skunk keepers and myself seated before you now, all have shared in this wish of being able to keep non-customary animals in their own homes.

Oregon is a state that has a reputation of bucking the established and traditional attitude of the rest of the West coast, allowing it's citizens to live a lifestyle, benign to everyone but naysayers, that identifies this state as a place of opportunity and enjoyment of something important to each of us, whether it's hunting, fishing, or animal keeping. All should be sensibility regulated for everybody regardless of class status and not forbidden to the people.

Thank you.

Roxann B Borisch

From: ODFW Commission
Subject: FW: Exhibit B: PROTECTED WILDLIFE HOLDING AND PROPAGATING

From: BenjiOtter1@aol.com [mailto:BenjiOtter1@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:43 AM
To: ODFW.Commission@state.or.us
Subject: Exhibit B: PROTECTED WILDLIFE HOLDING AND PROPAGATING

For the Commission and to Dr. Gillin:

Oregon has a small population of exotic animal-keeping enthusiasts. We as a whole value individuality- that is what made this state so special. Oregon is a home of pioneers, and whether our ancestors came over the Great Divide in Connestoga wagons or more recently as transplants, many people here live and let live. The animals we keep are not necessarily limited to the species ordained as acceptable by a higher order, just because a majority think of them to be inappropriate for keeping in captivity. Zoos have gotten around this concern, considering themselves as living gene banks for the world's imperiled wildlife species. The entertainment industry has it well played too, that they are involved with bringing the wild into our living rooms and at wild animal parks. All are important in today's world of shrinking habitats. But as a rule, there is only the brief glimpse of an exotic animal behind a well-designed barrier, or the scene of professional actors working around some great beast and really looking so special because the audience can only watch, to never experience it themselves no matter how badly they wish for it all their lives. Exotic animal keepers in this state from the late Don Kerr, founder of Oregon's own High Desert Museum, to the pet skunk keepers and myself seated before you now, all have shared in this wish of being able to keep non-customary animals in their own homes.

Oregon is a state that has a reputation of bucking the established and traditional attitude of the rest of the West coast, allowing it's citizens to live a lifestyle, benign to everyone but naysayers, that identifies this state as a place of opportunity and enjoyment of something important to each of us, whether it's hunting, fishing, or animal keeping. All should be sensibility regulated for everybody regardless of class status and not forbidden to the people.

Thank you.

Bill Ahlquist

Roxann B Borisch

From: Colin Gillin <colin.m.gillin@state.or.us>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 9:32 AM
To: Kevin Blakely; roxann.b.borisch@state.or.us
Subject: Fwd: Division 044 changes

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mark Armstrong <markarmstrong348@gmail.com>
Date: January 18, 2017 at 19:01:45 PST
To: <colin.m.gillin@state.or.us>
Subject: **Division 044 changes**

Unfortunately my work schedule and my wife's health are conspiring to prevent us from attending the January 20th meeting to discuss the Division 044 rules changes.

My wife and I would both like to state that we however endorse the concerns of Emily Jenkins as outlined in her 1/17/17 e-mail which we understand has been sent to your attention.

We also consider her to be speaking on our personal behalf as well as on the behalf of all Oregon skunk owners.

Mark and Nikki Armstrong
Newberg, OR