

Exhibit F

**Public Correspondence received as of
November 20, 2018**



OREGON HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

Protecting Oregon's Wildlife, Habitat and Hunting Heritage

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

RECEIVED

SEP 04 2018

ODFW
WILDLIFE DIVISION

August 27, 2018

Mikal Cline
Upland Game Bird Coordinator
Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
4034 Fairview Industrial Dr. SE
Salem, OR 97302-1142

Re: Draft Oregon Wild Turkey Management Plan 2018 Comments

The Oregon Hunters Association has reviewed the draft Oregon Wild Turkey Management Plan (OWTMP). Comments and recommendations as follows:

General: A concern is that some ODFW biologists treat and manage wild turkeys primarily as a nuisance. This belief is fostered and encouraged in the Harvest Management Section of the OWTMP (page 29) where it states *“The goal of Oregon’s turkey harvest management is to offer the greatest recreational opportunity while minimizing nuisance and damage from turkeys.”* Reference to nuisance birds and damage should be removed from this primary goal. **The goal should read “The goal of Oregon’s turkey harvest management is to offer the greatest recreational opportunity while ensuring optimal huntable populations into the future.**

Habitat Management: The OWTMP does not support the ODFW mission in its entirety. The mission states “to protect and enhance Oregon’s fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations”. The OWTMP does not include a habitat management section that addresses enhancement and protection of their habitat. **Habitat management should be added as a separate topic area under Management Guidelines to include appropriate strategies.** This comment was provided by OHA in 2004 and no action was taken.

Plan Purpose Development, Page 7: One of the few stated purposes in the plan is “maintaining viable wild turkey populations in suitable areas” and yet this is not addressed in the Management Guidelines Section of the report. Also, the word “viable” should be replaced with “optimal”. **Maintaining optimal populations should be added as a separate topic area under Management Guidelines to include appropriate strategies.** This comment was provided by OHA in 2004 and no action was taken.

Plan Implementation: An overriding concern is that many strategies identified in previous plans are not being implemented by ODFW. The following are just several examples of important strategies from the 2004 plan where little or no action has been taken to date.

Population Monitoring, Pages 34-35: Population monitoring continues to be a challenge and seemingly a low priority for ODFW. The need for improved methods for monitoring was first cited in the 2004 plan and still exists today as the exact same language is repeated in the current draft. *(Page 35: ODFW needs a method(s) that is repeatable and statistically valid for assessing turkey populations and production status. ODFW biologists will continue to seek effective techniques for population inventory.)*

The concern is that little or no progress has been made towards improving population monitoring, yet decisions to increase bag limits have been made in recent years. These decisions were based on population inventories derived from methods where stated improvements were deemed necessary. **Strategy 1 needs to be strengthened to go beyond “seeking” and “staying informed”. This should include a commitment to identify and implement such surveys so that informed management decisions can be made.**

Research, Page 35: The need for additional data and research is emphasized again in this section. Research Strategy 2 reads “*Identify and adopt a cost effective, scientifically valid survey method to monitor wild turkey populations*”. **The word “implement” needs to be added to this strategy.** Again, this is the same language as in the 2004 version and no action has been taken.

Harvest Management, Page 29: Strategy 7 regarding translocating nuisance turkeys should be removed from the Harvest Management/Spring Season Strategies section. This is already addressed in the Nuisance and Damage section under Strategy 4. In addition, birds should not have to be relocated in the spring when there is a valid hunting season in progress.

Nuisance and Damage: Prior to relocating a significant population of turkeys from a localized area, consideration must be given to other landowners and sportsmen in the area. As stated in the plan “*Correspondence and telephone calls to ODFW from individuals thrilled by having seen wild turkeys occurred as their distribution changed and numbers of turkeys increased in some areas. ODFW expects continued interest in opportunities for viewing and general enjoyment of wild turkeys.*” Results of some recent transplant efforts have left hunters and wildlife enthusiasts in the area wondering where all the turkeys have gone only to find out it was the result of capturing and transplanting efforts based on just one landowner’s concern.

Looking towards a solution, Strategy 6 (Page 31) suggests exploring innovative ways and partnerships for addressing urban and suburban birds. **A new strategy should be added to suggest for all transplants where more than one landowner is affected, either positively or negatively, that partnerships be established with local sportsman groups and landowners to determine viable solutions.**

Population Monitoring: **An additional strategy should be added to incorporate an adaptive management tool for district biologists to use during harsh winters or extraordinary circumstances.**

In closing, OHA and the many hunters throughout the state greatly appreciate ODFW’s efforts in supporting turkey hunting as an important aspect of our hunting heritage. Not only does it provide great economic benefits to local communities, but it provides great opportunities for youth and families alike.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss these comments further if desired.

Respectfully Submitted,



Fred Walasavage
OHA State Board, Chair
541.705.0214

cc: Doug Cottam, Wildlife Program Administrator

888-861-1255

890748 #



OREGON HUNTERS ASSOCIATION

WILDLIFE • HABITAT • HUNTERS' RIGHTS

P.O. Box 1706, Medford, OR 97501 • (541) 772-7313 • Fax (541) 772-0964
oregonhunters.org • oha@ccountry.net

August 22, 2017

Dave Budeau
Upland Game Bird Coordinator
Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
4034 Fairview Industrial Dr. SE
Salem, OR 97302-1142

Re: Draft Oregon Wild Turkey Management Plan 2017 Comments

The Oregon Hunters Association has reviewed the draft Oregon Wild Turkey Management Plan (OWTMP). Comments and recommendations as follows:

General: A concern is that some ODFW biologists treat and manage wild turkeys primarily as a nuisance. While it would be inappropriate to provide specific names and instances, this belief is fostered and encouraged in the Harvest Management Section of the OWTMP (page 29) where it states *"The goal of Oregon's turkey harvest management is to offer the greatest recreational opportunity while minimizing nuisance and damage from turkeys."* Reference to nuisance birds and damage should be removed from this primary goal. **The goal should read "The goal of Oregon's turkey harvest management is to offer the greatest recreational opportunity while ensuring optimal huntable populations into the future."**

Habitat Management: The OWTMP does not support the ODFW mission in its entirety. The mission states "to protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations". The OWTMP does not include a habitat management section that addresses enhancement and protection of their habitat. **Habitat management should be added as a separate topic area under Management Guidelines to include appropriate strategies.** This comment was provided by OHA in 2004 and no action was taken.

Plan Purpose Development, Page 7: One of the few stated purposes in the plan is "maintaining viable wild turkey populations in suitable areas" and yet this is not addressed in the Management Guidelines Section of the report. Also, the word "viable" should be replaced with "optimal". **Maintaining optimal populations should be added as a separate topic area under Management Guidelines to include appropriate strategies.** This comment was provided by OHA in 2004 and no action was taken.

Plan Implementation: An overriding concern is that many strategies identified in previous plans are not being implemented by ODFW. The following are just several examples of important strategies from the 2004 plan where little or no action has been taken to date.

Population Monitoring, Pages 34-35: Population monitoring continues to be a challenge and seemingly a low priority for ODFW. The need for improved methods for monitoring was first cited in the 2004 plan and still exists today as the exact same language is repeated in the current draft. *(Page 35: ODFW needs a method(s) that is repeatable and statistically valid for assessing turkey populations and production status. ODFW biologists will continue to seek effective techniques for population inventory.)*

The concern is that little or no progress has been made towards improving population monitoring, yet decisions to increase bags limits have been made in recent years. These decisions were based on population inventories derived from methods where stated improvements were deemed necessary. **Strategy 1 needs to be strengthened to go beyond “seeking” and “staying informed”. This should include a commitment to identify and implement such surveys so that informed management decisions can be made.**

Research, Page 35: The need for additional data and research is emphasized again in this section. Research Strategy 2 reads *“Identify and adopt a cost effective, scientifically valid survey method to monitor wild turkey populations”*. **The word “implement” needs to be added to this strategy.** Again, this is the same language as in the 2004 version and no action has been taken.

Harvest Management, Page 29: Strategy 7 regarding translocating nuisance turkeys should be removed from the Harvest Management/Spring Season Strategies section. This is already addressed in the Nuisance and Damage section under Strategy 4. In addition, birds should not have to be relocated in the spring when there is a valid hunting season in progress.

Nuisance and Damage: Prior to relocating a significant population of turkeys from a localized area, consideration must be given to other landowners and sportsman in the area. As stated in the plan *“Correspondence and telephone calls to ODFW from individuals thrilled by having seen wild turkeys occurred as their distribution changed and numbers of turkeys increased in some areas. ODFW expects continued interest in opportunities for viewing and general enjoyment of wild turkeys.”* Results of some recent transplanting efforts have left hunters and wildlife enthusiasts in the area wondering where all the turkeys have gone only to find out it was the result of capturing and transplanting efforts based on landowners concern.


Looking towards a solution, Strategy 6 (Page 31) suggests exploring innovative ways and partnerships for addressing urban and suburban birds. **A new strategy should be added to suggest that all transplants where more than one landowner is affected, either positively or negatively, that partnerships be established with local sportsman groups and landowners to determine viable solutions.**

Population Monitoring: An additional strategy should be added to incorporate an adaptive management tool for district biologists to use during harsh winters or extraordinary circumstances.

In closing, OHA and the many hunters throughout the state greatly appreciate ODFW’s efforts in supporting turkey hunting as an important aspect of our hunting heritage. Not only does it provide great economic benefits to local communities, but it provides great opportunities for youths and families alike.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectively Submitted



Fred Walasavage
OHA State Board, Chair



September 28, 2017

Dear Mr. Budeau,

The Oregon Chapter of the National Wild Turkey Federation supports the revision of the Oregon Wild Turkey Management plan.

We recognize that over-concentrations of wild turkeys can lead to frustrations from the public and can be burdensome for ODFW's biologists. As such, the NWTF wholly supports the use of "Trap and Transplant" techniques to address these issues, as outlined in Appendix 1. According to Southwick Associates and the WAFWA Wild Turkey Technical Committee, wild turkey hunting in Oregon contributes nearly \$17 million annually to the state's economy. Therefore, any effort that ODFW can make to increase hunting opportunity by transplanting birds that are not accessible to hunters, while potentially addressing nuisance or damage problems, is a win-win situation. This technique is preferable to the issuance of kill permits.

We suggest that ODFW not place unnecessary limitations on places to relocate wild turkeys with the use of the occupied habitat rule (page 47). Because Oregon does not conduct wild turkey-specific surveys, the observation of wild turkey production is largely left to chance. This means that good turkey habitat may be excluded from receiving birds due to this rule. In general, we believe the district biologists should be entrusted to make recommendations on where they believe wild turkeys could survive and provide hunting opportunities for Oregon's hunters, while minimizing potential damage and nuisance situations.

In addition, we suggest that *previously occupied* wild turkey habitat be considered for restocking of birds should the wild turkey flock die-off be attributed to extenuating circumstances, such as a severe weather or wildfire event. We approve of the common sense addition of "logistic efficiency" to release site selection (page 48). This change will make trapping operations more efficient and result in less distress for the birds.

Thank you for consideration of these comments. We commend ODFW on the updated draft plan.

Sincerely,

Mikal Moore
NWTF Pacific Northwest District Biologist

Mikal L Cline

From: Larry Starks <l.starks@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2017 1:51 PM
To: david.a.budeau@state.or.us
Subject: Wild Turkey

Sir,
By asking for our feed back regarding the current status of the wild turkey in Corvallis and the surrounding areas, it is clear the problem(s) these birds are causing were not considered in depth by the individuals involved with their release and subsequent property damage.

The sheer number of birds from proliferation has added to the amount of damage and drama these birds cause. The extremely low number of birds allowed to be killed per tag does not allow for proper attrition. They multiply at a far more greater pace.

Damages and costs are incurred but there is no "oops" or "were sorry" or remuneration provided.

If these birds are on my property (in the county) and doing damage, I should be able to remove them in any manner I chose to protect my assets. I should not be required to pay additionally or put in constraints by the people who inserted them in the area. I would be willing let your organization remove them, thus fixing the problem you created.

Should you wish to discuss the matter further, feel free to contact me, or, stop by with your gun and we can chat while you help fix the problem.

Larry Starks
541-760-5950

Mikal L Cline

From: Lynn Fogus <lfogus@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 8:02 PM
To: david.a.budeau@state.or.us
Subject: Wild Turkey Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to express my turkey feelings.

When the turkeys first moved in they were not a nuisance. Now it is not unusual to see as many as fifty or more toms going down our driveway. They go into the carport, poop everywhere, eat the chicken feed and roost in the trees, leaving inches of thick droppings. I don't know if you have ever personally tried to clean turkey poo from shoes, but it is a very sticky situation and results mostly in spreading it around.

When they are feeling frisky, the toms fight at length for dominance to impress the hens. During the past two years, we have been seeing increasing numbers of turkeys, so the boys are apparently doing what nature tells them to do.

I have talked at length with the wildlife biologist and there is very little we or he can do. We live on about 11 acres, mostly wooded, and no longer hunt for ourselves. Because we have near neighbors, inviting hunters we do not know is not an option due to safety concerns. Scaring them off just causes problems with neighbors and the turkeys come right back. A friend hunted for a week without success. The turkeys, dumb as they are most of the year, have a massive and impressive increase in IQ as soon as someone fires a gun.

I would like to be able to invite hunters known to us to thin the turkeys if possible without the high tag expense ODFW charges. Since the turkeys are not native to Oregon there are apparently no predators able to thin the numbers. The Veneta area is notorious for an excessive number of turkeys for reasons unknown to me.

My favorite fantasy is to deliver these excessive numbers, especially the very large toms, into the office of whoever runs the ODFW, close the door to his office and let him deal with the turkeys on the premise that it takes one to know one.

Lynn Fogus
lfogus@earthlink.net
Biggs Rd.
Veneta area, Oregon

To: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Wildlife Division, Wild Turkey Plan

September 6, 2017

Please consider the following comments regarding the Wild Turkey Plan update. I am assuming these comments will be accepted as there is, to my knowledge, no specific deadline date for comments. Also for the Record these comments come as a private citizen and not as a representative staff member of Oregon Hunters Association although I did review the draft plan and had input on the OHA comment letter.

These comments are from the perspective of a homeowner in a rural subdivision in northern Benton County where the homes are on "oversize lots" of 1 to 2 acres and the turkey population has dramatically increased over my 14 years in this location. As you can guess my concern here is damage and the turkey as a nuisance more than a game bird in this instance. Here in my neighborhood we have all the elements discussed under "*Nuisance – The most common type of complaints (59%) received by ODFW during 2014 – 2016 was "general nuisance"*".

A short list of specifics:

- I have a couple short videos taken next to the parking apron of my garage showing turkey breeding within 20 feet of the house and Tom's fighting over hen favor at the same location.
- All the accompanying feces, feathers noise and unwanted entertainment of spring breeding, hens raising the resulting off spring, gobbling, etc.
- While I once thought some fencing would be an option to discourage deer feeding on the "deer resistant" forage we planted as landscape, the reality was fencing a portion of the yard to discourage turkeys was the reason for spending fencing dollars. Turkeys do fly in but rarely.
- A vet bill of several hundred dollars when our curious pup met an overprotective hen and her brood just off the porch. That is not "fear turkeys will attack pets" when one pays the vet bill.
- Pulled up and damaged landscape driplines and vegetation.

You get the point; all the potential nuisance elements have happened in my yard. Of six homes with property borders common to the access road to my home, all are clustered such that any form of hunting other than possibly bow is impractical. Of the six homes once positive or neutral on the turkeys values, most now actively push the birds off their properties.

So what to do? I believe the ideas of trap and transplant, hazing, specific depredation kill permits, damage hunts, public education on the real effects of feeding wildlife and other efforts are expensive, time consuming for ODFW and for the most part ineffective other than very short term. Each problem spot addressed will be repeated elsewhere, usually near or at the same location after a couple of breeding seasons.

The Idea of focused area hunts with participation of hunters and landowners in the urban/rural locations has merit but again is time consuming for ODFW and takes a major effort to find willing partners while easing the concerns of non-hunters and anti-hunters as well as those who enjoy the turkeys and feel they should be protected. From my long experience with publics, this is very much

easier said than done though worth discussion and consideration in some instances. Local knowledge will be the key here.

Perhaps a reduced-price tag in recognized damage or high turkey population semi-rural areas would be an incentive to hunters seeking a way to work with residential landowners. In any case a turkey tag at essentially the same cost as a deer tag is seems excessive. Especially so where an identified objective is a reduction in a localized turkey population following the complaint and response process. The low numbers of reported 2015 and 2016 damage hunts is an eye catcher for a person who has counted upwards of 75-85 birds in three flocks in the short drive off the main highway into our subdivision.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to comment,

Ken McCall

Corvallis, Oregon

Mikal L Cline

From: zerelda walton <zeewalton@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 9, 2017 8:56 AM
To: ODFW.WildlifeInfo@state.or.us
Cc: david.a.budeau@state.or.us
Subject: 2017 Draft Turkey Plan comment

3 years ago I retired in Portland and moved to Grants Pass. After seeing so many turkeys, I made the decision to become turkey hunter! Bought came clothing, learned to call and have been unsuccessful in 3 years to harvest a tom turkey. The problem is not lack of birds! The problem is lack of public access to hunt turkeys in Josephine County. The majority of the birds are on private property! The 5 people that I personally spoke with all harvested their turkey on private property. Someone they knew let them hunt on their private land.

My point is that I wonder if OFW should not include as part pf mandatory reporting of turkey harvest, not only what game unit the turkey was taken in but also "*was the turkey harvested on public or private land*"! I think this would be important information going forward in future turkey management. I personally believe that as many as half of the turkeys harvested in Oregon are taken on private land!

Also each regional office should have maps that show public hunting areas that contain turkeys! In Josephine County you can drive most any rural road and see turkeys but the land adjacent to the road is fenced, often posted and often blocks public (BLM etc) that is directly behind the private land.

Thank you

Royal DeLand

royaldeland@gmail.com

Grants Pass, Oregon