



**Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife**

**External Budget Advisory Committee (EBAC)**

**Online Comment Form**

**Feedback Received**

## Admin

I think the online app and ELS are excellent steps forward. I recommend you continue development and, as possible, add tools for anglers and hunters. An example would be the online fish ID app being developed by WDFW for marine anglers, where fish ID and restrictive regulations are a challenge. The more these new tools that are integrated, the better for next gen recruitment and retention. **(MRD)**

ODFW organizational structure diagram. Should the new Conservation and Recreation Advisory Council be added to the the diagram? **(Director's Office)**

Good brief overview. Another bullet should be developing/re-establishing the Habitat Division. **(Director's Office)**

Preparing for our changing climate and conservation programs are a priority for LWVOR. With an expected significant drought throughout Oregon in 2020 (hopefully not as bad as 2015), ODFW will need to help manage streamflows and other actions to protect Oregon's fish and wildlife. **(Director's Office)**

The continued use of license sales as a crutch for ODFW while decreasing and declining opportunity can only go poorly for everyone. The department can't just raise license fees forever. Eventually the cost of a one day license will be so high that nobody will buy them. We appreciate that the daily license price now includes the opportunity to harvest shellfish, but no daily licenses should have been through the final raise in the last 6 year plan anyway. We understand that we may get a short break, but we fear constant subsequent raises in the near future - especially surrounding the daily licenses. Remember the value of a daily license vs the value of an annual license. Anglers have 365 days to get value from their \$44 annual angling license, but only 1 single day to get value from a \$23 daily angling license. **(ASD)**

PP slide 9 refers to VEM and project goals. Has the agency tracked a noticeable attrition rate of volunteers as Phase I has been implemented? If so, what has been done to mitigate this loss? Each lost volunteer represents a significant loss in the volunteer hours of in-kind match contributions. **(MRD)**

PP slide 29 refers to the impacts of Covid 19 on the delivery of Hunter Education and states that I&E staff are working on ideas to provide opportunities in the summer and fall. Is this a collaborative effort with the volunteers in communities across the state or will it be a paid staff (recruitment specialists) delivering courses. If so, what are the budgetary impacts of the loss to grant matching in-kind contributions for volunteer hours? **(I&E/MRD)**

Page 28 of the white paper refers to an effort by ODFW regarding R3. It does not include any budget information as to the cost of the program. Are there budgetary implications? If so, what is the cost and what are the expected returns? PP slide 70 states that sale projections do not indicate any rebound in the number of licenses sold between now and 2030. With this information, are R3 programs worth the expense? **(I&E/MRD)**

I believe R3 programs can and will generate additional license dollar contributors to ODFW but the agency may need to think outside of the current management perspective to find success. In a post covid-19 climate, tax dollars are going to be extremely difficult to secure and every effort by the agency to generate revenue must be explored. I encourage agency management to consider not only financial budgets to achieve objectives but also cultural shifts within the agency to achieve goals. Cultural shifts that provide enhanced relationships with volunteers will pay dividends not only in this budget cycle but in all future cycles if managed properly. **(I&E/MRD)**

I have been an EBAC member for multiple budget cycles and attended town hall meetings in Bend before that as the president or board member of Central Oregon Flyfishers. The primary theme in all these meetings has been the same: a lack of adequate funding to meet ODFW's goals due to declining hunting and fishing license sales even while the population of Oregon continues to increase. In order to make up for budget shortfalls in the past ODFW has increased license fees. A top priority this year is to not request further increases, a goal I question.

Tapping into \$4M of reserve funds will leave only 2-2.5 months of operating cash at the end of 2023, a dangerously low level. This is before any budget cuts that may come due to the economic impact of the pandemic. Also, while I understand that licenses are not cheap, they are not expensive relative to all the other costs of fishing, hunting, and related travel. More importantly, ODFW's own economists have determined that there is little or no price elasticity for license sales. In other words, keeping prices flat will not increase sales and modestly increasing fees will not decrease sales.

As you know, the real issue is not license fees, it's that a declining percentage of Oregonian's have interest in hunting and fishing for a wide variety of reasons. The proposal to reorganize the agency into three divisions, fish, wildlife, and a new habitat division, is an intriguing strategy for addressing this decline. Clearly, one way to increase participation is to increase opportunity. Improved habitat is central to this effort. It will also help to engage the majority of Oregonians who want to view wildlife but have no interest in fishing or hunting.

Stating the obvious, the big hole in this plan is lack of funding. The Habitat Division is contingent on additional funding from the legislature via a Policy Option Package. The Habitat Division seems important enough to warrant increasing fees to pay for it. After all, without habitat, we have nothing. **(ASD/MRD)**

Page 72 -76. License revenue. Has an analysis been performed of a license/Tag fee increase in 2022 vs. deferring an increase for one or two years. I am concerned that deferring the 2022 fee increase will result in a very large jump in fees at a latter date. **(ASD/MRD)**

Pg 71: I don't understand what this slide has to do with the surrounding slides, did I miss something?

Also, how are these numbers collected? It may not be a very accurate representation of overall non-resident customers as it does not take into account prepaid daily licenses. I understand that particular slide is just illustrating the point that most non-resident customers come from neighboring western states. However, it does make me question other assumptions that have been made regarding non-resident customers if there is a big chunk of missing data. I understand that there has been a good deal of effort to change the way daily pre-pays are handled. Not all pre-paid vendors are opposed to the idea of a new licensing system regarding daily pre-pays, but the substitutions so far put forth by the ODFW have overall been rejected by the vendors due to the increased costs and subsequent reduction by 50% of the associated vendor fee for selling these licenses. **(ASD)**

What progress has there been made with the online regulations? Will there be continued work to view regulations on a smart device based on location? What are the budget implications of this continued development or discontinuation? **(MRD)**

The graphs indicating that fishing participation remains flat, is there any correlation that the angler education programs are helping to maintain the current participation? **(I&E)**

I submitted my questions and comments yesterday and I forgot to ask in the license section if ODFW is continuing to consider annual licenses good through 12 months after purchase verses expiring midnight December 31? **(ASD)**

Question from Initial Email: Have any models been made that look at a direct correlation between angler participation vs ODFW expenditures? Even as participation goes down, expenditures go up. It seems like it should go the other way.

Question from Initial Email: In light of Covid-19 effects on the participation in fisheries this year, and likely for the next year and beyond, are there any strategic decreases in spending the ODFW can implement to provide more access to fishing for people looking to catch their own food via lower license prices going forward?

Follow-up Email: Thanks for answering my questions. For the first question, I'm not asking if expenditures impact license sales. I'm asking: If participation goes down (which would be reflected in the license sales), does ODFW spend less? Theoretically it seems that if there are less people accessing the natural resources, there should be some reduction in spending to manage human impact on those

resources. The charts indicate the opposite overall. I think this is an important question going forward since Covid-19 will definitely have some kind of impact on participation, even if the extent of that effect isn't clear yet.

### **Engineering**

It is unclear from the materials which projects were hatchery "reform" projects as opposed to hatchery "deferred maintenance" issues on the Bond Update page.

It is also unclear if ODFW spent some of these bond funds on existing Fish Division Passage and Screening Staff who were reported as providing assistance to the Bond-funded staff. We would assume that the Screening and Passage staff were presumably already funded under other funding packages.

TCA would appreciate a clearer delineation of the ODFW staff who were performing deferred maintenance work as opposed to statutorily mandated work under the Fish Passage and Fish Screening program.

What is the status of the Oregon State University Newport facility? Has this been put on hold? Will there be a relocation of ODFW Newport office to this facility? Will it be a capital expense tied into OSU's adventure or be a budget ask?

Will the Leaburg hatchery require any maintenance in the future? What is the status of this hatchery and is it going to fall under ODFW's care in the future?

### **Fish**

Support the efforts to reduce avian and pinniped predation. Believe that you should also add a section on managing predation by native and non-native fishes. Specifically, would encourage continued support for the index and tagging operations that ODFW conducts as part of the Pikeminnow program in the Columbia. This is a management success that needs the scientific and biological evaluation that ODFW provides.

The Conservation Angler (TCA) believes the prioritization of items and the language used make a difference.

The order of the Inland Fisheries programs should be changed to reflect the agency mission:

1. Better stewardship
2. Climate change policy
3. Better Communication
4. Better Infrastructure
5. Better License and Fee Structure
6. Better Fishing

If ODFW takes care of the habitat and the fish, the fishing will like take care of itself.

Under Better Stewardship, it would be helpful if ODFW's identification of high priority habitats for protection and restoration would explain the functions the particular priority habitat provides for wild fish, and include conveyance of the location and the habitat qualities that a specific habitat provides to other state and federal agencies so that the agencies with actual habitat management authority can make decisions that do not degrade the qualities and functions provided by the specific habitat. Since ODFW only retains authority over fish passage and water diversion screening, it would be more impactful if ODFW were to identify where fish passage and diversion screening limited the productivity or contentedness of high quality or high priority habitats. Hopefully ODFW will actively work with resource staff from other state and federal agencies as well as staff working on private lands to ensure development and management does not limit wild fish productivity.

Under Better Infrastructure, the descriptive sentence seems to convey that the Fish Division will build better wildlife areas and conservation projects. TCA believes that if ODFW has to invest in hatcheries to provide fish for harvest or for conservation, then it would seem that the Fish Division has already failed since the mission of the agency is to "prevent the serious depletion of any indigenous species." The existing sentence needs to be re-written to capture the likely intent involving hatcheries or fishing access areas and possibly habitat restoration projects. As written, ODFW seems to envision itself as a construction outfit.

Under Better License and Fee Structure, this part could be part of Communication, since securing new fees or license structures will pass if they galvanize license buyers. TCA believes that this element is vitally important, and we hope that ODFW will spend the necessary time and energy working with stakeholders to determine creative ways to conserve iconic wild fish, manage access and create funding for that work.

Regarding the Columbia River and Marine Program, TCA believes that there should be reference to protecting wild fish that will increasingly rely on Cold Water Refugia during their migrations. This has relevance in the Columbia River as well as in other watersheds such as the Umpqua, Rogue and smaller coastal rivers. Migrating wild fish will face warm water, low flows and focused angler pressure statewide. This issue should be noted on Slide 24 and Slide 25 in relationship to increasing migration survival in the Columbia and within the climate change scenarios statewide.

These slides and section in the white paper were good introduction to all the various aspects of fish management that occurs in the Fish Division. Although since this section contains diverse topics, it would have been better to take the major programs of the Fish Division and ask for comments on each major program's goals, aspirations and actions.

Climate Change: This is important to integrate this into all management efforts, whether habitat, hatchery, stock management, or harvest. When looking at a fish stock's harvest potential a climate change should be considered and long term stock management should be taken into account.

Habitat protection and priority mapping has been a process that ODFW has been working on for many years. Based on Cedric Cooney's presentation it has reach a very useable level. This should be a priority in the budget.

Inland Fisheries: We need to prioritize funding more data collection on all coastal fisheries, especially anadromous fisheries, as well as Columbia River stocks?

New approaches to recreation and licensing: The direction licensing has taken has been an incredible benefit in our pandemic situation. Finding new approaches to recreation paired with information and education efforts continues need to be funded.

Columbia River and Marine: I would like to hear more about how ODFW assesses fish population status in the marine environment. Ocean fisheries are huge and a great benefit to Oregon. We need to expend efforts to ensure that we keep them sustainable. Rumors among the coastal anglers about foreign industrial fishing vessels harvesting within Oregon and US waters is rampant. How do we take this type of harvest into account? How can we measure it against our own harvest and needs.

The Water Quantity and Water Quality Program is critical to protecting and restoring streamflows statewide. To that end, as we likely enter a cut budget in 2021-2023 we would urge the agency to retain all existing positions. It has taken years to gain these positions. As competition for and conflict over water escalates, the importance of these positions cannot be overstated. An across the board cut to agency programs would have a disproportionate impact on this program, so again, we would urge the Commission to retain full funding of this program if a cuts budget is required.

As to the materials presented, the draft ARB includes additional positions for the water program. WaterWatch strongly supports the further building of this program. We did notice, however, that these are the same positions that were not funded in 2020, and would appreciate an assessment of whether these pops are the top priorities, or whether other work might be more timely.

While I generally support the Fish Division priorities, it will be critical to reevaluate these priorities in the context of the COVID-19 crisis. This crisis has turned our communities upside down overnight and put unprecedented pressure on the fishing industry, which is deemed essential business - and which is clearly an essential component of the economies of coastal communities throughout Oregon. For the upcoming biennium, the only two priorities for the the Fish Division should be (1) funding only the functions and services essential for natural resource conservation and management; and (2) funding programs, services, and projects aimed at recovering and rebuilding from the COVID-19 crisis.

I support the Agency's continued efforts to Reduce avian/pinniped predation. This is critical to ensure the recovery of sensitive salmon/steelhead stocks. Similarly, I support efforts to improve hatchery performance and Increase salmon survival through mainstem dams and reservoirs of the Columbia and Snake rivers. I also support efforts aimed at addressing climate change, although I think that efforts/funding should not be increased in the short-term, given the current crisis situation.

Investments in infrastructure should be limited to essential items only for the upcoming biennium. Efforts should be made to reduce non-essential expenses as much as possible across the Agency (not just the Fish Division). New expenses should be focused entirely on projects and programs to address the COVID crisis.

I truly appreciate and support the efforts that were made to ensure that no changes are proposed to the commercial fishing fund or fee structure for the upcoming biennium, given the strain the fishing communities are facing from the COVID-19 crisis. It will be very important to re-evaluate the commercial fishing fund and related expenditures and projections once more information about the impacts of the COVID crisis is available. I look forward to participating in a subgroup of EBAC to help determine the best commercial fee/license portfolio for moving forward after the upcoming biennium.

League of Women Voters of Oregon (LWVOR) is most engaged in this division as we had hoped to be working on the 100-year water vision for Oregon. That vision will include the need for adequate water resources for aquatic creatures as well as for human consumption, for agriculture and other industrial/economic uses. ODFW positions related to this work is a priority for LWVOR.

Again, it is hard to assess given unknown COVID impacts. But again, we would urge protection of the existing water program staff against a cuts budget. If a cuts budget comes to bear, we would urge the agency to preserve programs that benefit all Oregonians, now and into the future. We look forward to future discussions as the state better understands the COVID effects on state budgets/agencies/work.

I noticed in the White Paper that the budget is asking to continue with the Columbia River Endorsement until 2022. Is this correct? What programs is the continuation plan to support in the next biennium? (Many sportsman have lost faith with the ODFW commission due to the escapade that took place in Spokane last year of a commercial weighted group of commissioners from Oregon and Washington to leverage re-introduction of gill netting in the lower Columbia. Since the reintroduction of gill netting is proposed in the mainstem Columbia, it may be a hard sell to the fishing public the continuation of the Columbia River Endorsement.)

What are the budget impacts of the hazing programs at pinch points of pinniped predation? Will there be a continuation of pinniped euthanizing per federal guidelines at pinch points and what are those budget implications? Beyond Willamette Steelhead, is it working?

What plans are there for the protection of Sturgeon from predation? Will there be additional federal asks to eliminate additional problem pinnipeds from rivers? Is WDFW coordinating with ODFW on this? What are some of the budget constraints?

What avian control programs are planned and what are those budget impacts?

Are there any impacts to fishing licenses sales due to the Coronavirus outbreak and recent non-resident closure? (Thank you for keeping the season's open even with limited access and travel restrictions.)

Does the study of Climate Change include financial impacts of both commercial and sports fisheries? Are we beginning to see these impacts with the delays in ocean harvest of crab and the decline of Chinook Salmon?

What are the future license sales projections and do we expect to see fee stabilization or additional increases in the next biennium?

I did receive a suggestion on the fishing regulations for Odell Lake opening. Instead of opening mid week on a given day, could it be on the 3rd or 4th Saturday of April consistently? Suggestion was to help the merchants and operators in the region with increased traffic and sales/reservations.

## **Wildlife**

Voluntary Access & Habitat Incentive Program: This is a continuation request with increased limitation to expend the funds awarded to ODFW by the Natural Resource Conservation Service.

OHA Comments: The Oregon Hunters Association spends thousands of dollars each year on habitat projects throughout Oregon. We are a strong supporter of anything and everything that protects our precious wildlife habitat.

However, the building of another bureaucracy to "protect habitat" is nonsense in our opinion. All monies for habitat should be flow into the field for FW biologists to determine how the monies should be spent on habitat. This decision rests with them not someone based in Salem.

In addition, and OHA will be stating this a great deal in our comments, given the pandemic environment we are now experiencing all department monies should go to supporting field biologists who maintain two of our most valuable resources: Oregon's wildlife and habitat.

Support the Division's robust wildlife health program. This may become even more important as cross-species disease issues are the focus of the public.

The continuing decline in participation in hunting and angling, and specifically in hunting, presents a tremendous challenge to management under the North American model. Support continuing creative and innovative attempts to recruit new participants, and to make it easier to access resources wherever it is possible to do so.

Page 33 Wildlife Health. First bullet states the rules for transport of cervids into the state were changed. When and what changed? Last I knew transport into Oregon of any live cervid or cervid gamets was prohibited.

Page 34 Second bullet. Suggest using a common word to replace "hibernaculum". Not a lot of the audience understands Latin.

Page 36 Greater Sage-Grouse Mitigation. First bullet. Suggest replacing "anthropogenic" with a common word.

Page 37 First bullet. What are "debit and credit projects"? Suggest using common language.

As with the Fish Division the many parts of the Wildlife Division should have been broken into different pages on this comment form.

I didn't get the sense of how the Wildlife Division was addressing the 2021-2023 budget, other than issues it is currently working on. There was no mention of Wildlife Conservation efforts and goals. Certainly the areas listed were all major concerns - the pandemic, funding, hunting season changes, wildlife health, Sage grouse mitigation and management, but there are a lot more issues in each major program area, such as mule deer population depletion, managing endangered species, wildlife damage, and most importantly Climate Change, which is likely the driver in wildlife health and other population issues. I didn't see a link to the budget and future work as clearly.

Wouldn't mind seeing additional emphasis and resources directed to the fur bearer program. We have good take data but refuting the barrage of attacks on the tool is difficult without good starting population data.

No specific comments. However, funds should be focused on essential projects and programs only for the upcoming biennium. Efforts should be made to reduce non-essential expenses as much as possible across the Agency. New expenditures should be focused entirely on projects and programs to address the COVID crisis."

With Covid-19, the issue around bat health needs to be a priority. And we need to assure adequate habitat corridors for our wildlife.

Due to the pandemic sales of ammunition and weapons increased. Will this increase the Pittman Robinson federal reimbursements and by how much?

Sage Grouse programs to increase the population to alleviate risk of listing as endangered or threatened is very important for our ranching community. Could you provide some elaboration on the enhancements of these programs and the budget planned to be allocated for these continued improvements?

Any update on the pneumonia that has stricken the Rocky Mountain Sheep? Do we know how they contacted the ailment or its source? Any programs in place to mitigate this loss? What is the budget allocation for this program?

What progress is being made in identifying the cause of mule deer population decline due to adenovirus and epizootic hemorrhagic disease? What actions are being taken and how does this influence budget regarding tag sales and additional expenses to counter these outbreaks?

Bats? Who would have ever thought that being a large issue. Are there other agencies involved with this issue and is the effort being jointly funded?

## OSP

OSP Winter Range Overtime: This request will reduce license funding for overtime work to patrol mule deer winter ranges. With the anti-poaching funding granted during 2019 session, license funds are no longer needed for these same efforts.

OHA Comments: OHA is opposed to this POP and will fight it vigorously during 2020 Legislative Session.

The State of Oregon is on the brink of losing many OSP Game officers due to lack of enough revenue flow under the pandemic. We cannot afford to keep our wildlife vulnerable and unprotected. Granted the anti-poaching granted in 2019 with General Fund dollars was a huge step in the right direction to finally help protect this valuable resource. However, we are facing a general fund crisis at this time and likely all or a goodly portion of that money will be eliminated.

Therefore, OHA strongly suggests that this POP not be brought forward. Again, we will fight this POP with the backing of our 11,000 members during the 2021 Legislative Session.

Impressed by the professionalism of the OSP fish and wildlife program and the long tradition of cooperation between OSP and ODFW.

Continuing efforts to educate the public so that enforcement is less necessary should be supported. These include identification assistance for marine fish species under conservation management (e.g. mobile id apps, posters, hand-outs, etc.), distribution of barotrauma devices, videos and on line tutorials on issues, and continued outreach efforts to under-served communities.

From the White Paper: OSP-FW has four airplanes and several boats one of which is quite large. Was ODFW the sole source of the funding for these aircraft and watercraft? IF ODFW was the sole source of funding, when these craft are used for other than ODFW mission support are the agencies benefited billed for the use?

Good information. I'm interested in how OSP Fish and Wildlife Division connects to the public by social media as well as direct contacts. Has the 5 new anti-poaching positions increased the numbers of poachers caught and prosecuted?

With revenue shortfalls, it will be important for this division to find ways to save/consolidate positions until we can return to full funding levels.

Are we continuing to provide sufficient wildlife division state troopers to cover the state as compared to other states per licensed hunters and fishers?

## Leg

Unfortunately, COVID 19 will have dramatic impact on the budget and will occupy center stage for the Legislature. Hopefully ODFW budget can sustain the onslaught.

Historically the Habitat Division was a lightning rod for controversy when it had solely "regulatory" functions, even though most of these were advisory. Support the integration of programs that include support and encouragement for voluntary landowner conservation efforts within the Division. This may lower the political temperature if controversies later erupt.

Page 48. OR Conservation and Recreation Fund. Has the Fund received any money from donors?

ODFW will seek to extend the Columbia River Endorsement Fee sunset.

TCA is strongly opposed to this effort unless the Fee is dramatically re-structured.

This section gives the clearest picture of what ODFW is planning for the '21-'23 legislative session. This helps understand some of the elements that were presented in the separate Division sections. More information on reforming the Habitat Division should be mentioned in this document, perhaps starting in the administration section.

Goals are good, would like to see early interaction on the LOP discussion. Preference would be to angle toward eliminating the sunset provision. Don't want to lose the OCRF momentum but asking for funding may not align with other priorities. Maybe suggest an effort to extend account authorization but delay GF contribution.

It will be absolutely critical to align the budget and priorities in the face of economic impacts and the potential loss of available funding due to COVID19 response.

While I generally support the creation of a new Habitat Division, I do not think it is appropriate to move forward with the establishment of this division in the upcoming biennium, given the COVID-19 crisis and the need to prioritize efforts to rebuild after the crisis.

New Legislative Concepts for 2021 should be reconsidered and focused on COVID-19 response.

We are excited about the concept of a new Habitat Division, but have grave concerns that creation of a new division will survive the expected budget shortfalls. So, while we want to see this concept move

forward, even if it turns out to be aspirational, it sets the groundwork for future discussion and possible success.

Pg 46: Regarding the May Charge up To clause. Will this be edited for all licenses that have prices listed in statute? Also, how will the reduction from \$32.50 to \$23 for ""Daily angling/shellfish"" be listed - with that exact title? Will the ""Daily angling"" heading then be removed altogether?

Pg 46: What input was collected from public regarding removing the sunset date on the CRE? When the sunset date was originally established, what was the reasoning for incurring that short term fee, and what has changed that constitutes the need for that to become permanent?

Pg 47: What is meant by premium fishing opportunity / limited entry? Are there certain species in mind for this? Where did this suggestion arise from? What fees are being considered, and how will they be used? I see that it is a placeholder. When and where will more info about that be released and made available for public comment?

Pg 48: Regarding OR Conservation and Recreation fund: Please make sure that the projects that are approved for using the funds include a sufficient amount of projects that were in place and being funded by license fees prior to the creation of this fund. According to the ODFW's website, this fund was created to be "a dedicated source of funding that reduces the financial burden on hunters and anglers and creates a mechanism for all Oregonians to support fish, wildlife, and their habitats." While I think the fishing community would wholeheartedly support this goal, I also think it would be all too easy for the advisory committee to quietly slip into a pattern of supporting new conservation projects that require additional money while failing to support the goal of reducing the financial burden on hunters and anglers who are burdened by the cost of projects already in place.

Did the comment about land owner tag sunseting January 2, 2022 include land owner preference tags? Or what does it include?

Do you think there will be adequate increase in sales to offset the proposed reduction of angler/shellfish combined license?

Do you still think it is possible to get the 1 million general matching fund due to the coronavirus outbreak and the impact to the state's budget?"

### **Budget**

My concern is that the 2019-21 budget will be impacted by revenues below expectations. What gets cut is where future focus will fall.

Continuing or enhancing general fund and lottery fund support for the Department will likely be extremely challenging in the economic environment likely next session.

page 52. Definitions. OF-Dedicated and OF-Obligated both need Wildlife fund examples added.

Definition OF. Consider explain use of term ""Fungible"".

Page 60 and 61 Your Hunting and Fishing Dollars. Why is hunting paying 28% for OSP enforcement and fishing paying only 19% for OSP enforcement? Does the Commercial Fish Fund pay for OSP enforcement?

Page 62. I would expect this slide to change because of Covid-19 impacts. Particularly as it pertains license and tag fee increases in 2022.

It is unknown at this time how COVID-19 crisis will affect the 2019-2021 biennium. Most expectations for 2019-2021 seem like they will need to be totally re-evaluated.

Pg 64: Can you please explain "Special Payments" on expenditure pie chart?

Although the 8% biennial personal services cost for 2021-23 may not change, you must plan for a significant PERS increase in 2023.

Agree that there will be an overall decline in both General Fund and lottery funds from the COVID crisis and that this will be a very important issue during the 2021 legislative session. Much of the plan and projections for 2021-2023 should be reevaluated in the context of the COVID-19 crisis.

May need to run model projections again accounting for economic impacts from Covid. Likely already have but may not be depicted here. Either way a fee increase would not likely be politically palatable, lends itself to a more focused prioritization of the POP's and CSL.

The slide of general and lottery funds availability shows and increase. How will this be impacted by the Coronavirus outbreak?

I am still working through the slideshow, but had a question about the slide on page 57: What are some of the leading expenditure categories for the inland fishery management (minus inland hatcheries) budget?

Also, does ODFW have any information about what portion/percent of total angling licenses are purchased for use in the Marine Zone as compared to other zones?

## Policy Option Packages / Proposed Habitat Division

2021-23 POPs:

Since not all policy option package concepts are presented, TCA would appreciate seeing materials for the POP concepts not highlighted before we offer support or opposition.

Jordan Cove Project Liaison work to avoid, minimize and mitigate for natural resource impacts.

TCA supports this ODFW work but it must also include stream and river crossing habitat protection.

Increase Chinook salmon forage for orca:

TCA is opposed. The impact and affects of additional hatchery chinook production in the lower Columbia and Upper Willamette has not been evaluated for its impact on ESA-listed Upper Willamette River Spring Chinook or on lower Columbia River tule chinook, nor on its likely predator attraction impacts on co-migrating ESA-listed wild steelhead, chinook, chum and coho salmon.

General Fund request supporting reintroduction planning at Wallowa Lake in collaboration with Nez Perce Tribe and others.

TCA is opposed to this POP as Wallowa Lake Dam was recently re-constructed using public funds and it was done without fish passage. Until volitional passage is provided, TCA will oppose development of a broodstock program that relies on a trap-and-haul passage plans with little if any success.

Willamette Water Reallocation and Place-based Planning and Mitigation General Fund requests.

TCA supports this funding for the habitat division. However, it would be easier to take a position if they were more explicitly presented in terms of watershed focus, and ""mitigation"" defined. TCA reserves its final decision until detailed information is available.

Shellfish/Estuary Assessment General Fund for more frequent stock assessments in major bays/estuaries to support recreational and commercial fisheries.

TCA supports frequent stock assessments for conservation and management purposes and would be inclined to support this request, however, shellfish and estuary assessments should be funded by the existing Shellfish Fund which is paid for by shellfishers - both recreational and commercial.

Klamath Reintroduction & Monitoring Bio w/position authority to utilize PCSRF funding to continue Klamath reintroduction work.

TCA supports ODFW Biologist working on Klamath salmon and steelhead re-introduction but only if the work aligns with administrative rules requiring focus on natural re-colonization of chinook, coho and summer steelhead for three life-cycles. PCSRF funds must be focused on wild fish conservation work and not hatchery work.

Western Oregon Stream Restoration Program provides technical assistance on habitat restoration projects.

TCA supports this, but as part of the proposed Habitat Division.

Deferred Maintenance/Major Construction addresses deferred maintenance needs involving ODFW office facilities.

TCA is neutral on this program. ODFW Staff deserve good offices to work in. Not every ODFW structure or facility should be classified as ""critical"" absent a prioritized evaluation of facilities and current priority activities.

I don't understand what will be gained with a new division above and beyond current habitat programs. Will each existing program ( fish habitat inside the fish division and wildlife habitat inside the wildlife division) be losing its respective singular focus? Will there be additional administrative expenses that could otherwise be used for habitat development?

Page 87. Wolf-Livestock Conflict Prevention Program. This is premature. A big NO! Three wolf management field staff just came on and they can do this work.

Page 88 -89. New Habitat Division. I'd like to learn more about how the lines of authority define for this new organization. How will this organization improve the situation? Are they a staff or a line (operational) outfit?

These slides help explain the budget POPs in better detail than the white paper provided. The white paper was an excellent introduction to ODFW in general, but the budget list at the end wasn't average user friendly. ODFW budgets (and Oregon agencies budgets) are complex and full of acronyms that the general public isn't familiar with. The more ODFW can explain its planned budget elements in plain language the better the outcome for support. I support the Habitat Division as developed, though I am still waiting for a chart of the supervisory structure of the field positions. Having ran the previous Habitat Division for 9 years, it was obvious that to fit into the agency structure, field habitat positions needed to be comparable to Fish and Wildlife Division structure. If all Habitat Division staff in the field was at a Bio. 2 level under a Fish or Wildlife Bio. 3, ODFW maintains the Habitat Division at lesser importance than the two other biological divisions. Tradition is a strong influence in establishing the strength of a division in ODFW.

Obviously the hardest part of the entire process in light of CV-19 is knowing what to expect for available GF in the next budget cycle. Assuming the worst, our general feedback on the POP's would be to focus first on the other funds authorizations. Second on job/revenue creating functions, primary example being the Good Neighbor Authority position. Third would be on the targeted infrastructure investments that are easily deployed and provide good return on the dollar for many goals, primary example being the tide gates funding. Deferred maintenance would follow. Lowest priority right now would be the build out of the habitat division. Assuming those functions are already being handled or at the very least not actively detrimental this would lend itself to low on the ranking of investments for us. It's also difficult to tell from the materials what exactly the functions and ROI would be for each position within

the new habitat division. Legislative direction notwithstanding, we suggest delaying of that effort in lieu of other priorities.

Funding should be given only to essential/critical and ongoing projects for the upcoming biennium. Ongoing efforts to address essential deferred maintenance needs should be funded. Given the COVID crisis, the establishment of a Habitat Division (ad related jobs/projects) should be deferred from the upcoming biennium.

Using page 33 of 51 of the Budget Briefing Paper, I numbered them from 1-24.

#1: Support; #2 Support (although we wish the project would go away!); #3 No opinion; #4: Support; #5: Support; #6: Support; #7: Support; #8: No opinon; #9: Concern related to state bonding capacity; #10: Again, concern related to state bonding capacity & unclear as to the projects to be requested; #11: Assumes efficiency for agency & users--not enough info to know if you need 2 positions; #12: No opinion; #13: No opinion; #14: Support, but agency needs to look at whether or not budget development can survive 6 positions--may need to reduce ask while keeping the concept of the new division alive; #15: Not clear what this POP really is; #16: Support, even if we only get one position. Place-based planning provides opportunities for collaboration and eventually finding solutions to multiple demands for water. With potential drought, this is an important function; #17: As decisions on the Willamette Basin dams move forward, it is important that ODFW have a presence and input into decisions. Cannot comment on the # of positions needed; #18: This program has been on the chopping block for years and continues to be resurrected. It is obviously a popular program. No opinion on the number of positions needed; #19: Assuming this GNA program continues and the federal gov't provides \$\$, this is an important position related to wildfire reduction while protecting fish. Board of Forestry's review of the Siskiyou area provided enlightening information on riparian buffers. This position can help with that conversation; #20: Not enough information to make a comment; #21: Should there be bonding monies invested in this issue, then a position would be warranted. But, if no money is put in this work, then these positions would not be needed in 2021; #22: Support, even if ODFW doesn't receive all 3 positions. This is an area that links clearly to climate change; #23: Support; #24: No opinion.

#### General Comments:

COVID-19 has caused substantial disruption to Oregon's economy. The state's budget will likely be highly variable this year, and as such, funding should be reserved to ensure that existing and vetted programs are able to accomplish the work they need to do. While OFBF appreciates the desire for certain new programs and more on-the ground technical support services, funding should be highly focused this year for areas of critical need.

#### Proposed Habitat Division:

More information is required to fully understand the need for this separate division, and its role within the department. As stated above, because of the state of our economy, funds must be allocated for

areas of critical need, and there should not be overlap with existing programs. It seems like the role of these new FTE's would substantially overlap with work and expertise already taking place within the department. It is unclear from the materials provided what unique role this division would serve and what the benefit would be. Additionally, if this Division does move forward, it would be highly beneficial to have FTE's that have prior proven experience working with landowners and other stakeholders across the natural resources community, who are open to adaptive management and ecological practices.

#### Water Conservation/Complex Water Issues:

More information is needed to fully understand the scope of this work and what water conservation practices the Department envisions for this funding. In general, the agricultural community is very disappointed in the final decisions that have been made for the Willamette Reallocation. With that said, OFB generally supports funding for ODFW and OWRD to implement their requirements under the Willamette Basin Reallocation as needed. However, the funding request for this line item seems quite high. More information is needed to understand details of this funding request and whether this includes needed interagency coordination with OWRD.

#### Tidegates:

OFB generally supports funding for ODFW to help maintain and repair tidegates in the state. As an active member of the tidegate steering committee, OFB understands the economic and engineering complexities of tidegates, especially in our coastal communities. The maintenance and repair of tidegates on minor waterways and in agricultural drainage ditches has proven to be highly expensive and technologically burdensome for most private landowners. Any funding that will assist landowners in making these needed repairs will be beneficial. However, we hope that funding can be used in a way that allows for engineering flexibility for landowners. Specifically, if ODFW requires fish passage for a tidegate that exists on private land, engineering requirements need to remain economically and practically feasible. Economic constraints of future maintenance and repair should be considered as part of the project evaluation.

#### Culverts Fish Passage:

More information is needed to fully understand the scope of this request. However, OFB generally supports funding to allow for the continuation and compliance of existing fish passage requirements.

#### Good Neighbor Authority Coordinator:

OFB support the funding of a Good Neighbor Authority Coordinator. GNA creates necessary defensible landscape for wildfire and is important for maintaining viable habitat and working lands.

#### Defenders of Wildlife's Wolf-Livestock Conflict Prevention Program Coordinator:

For the reasons stated earlier, OFB is opposed to expending funds for this new position. ODFW should focus on being able to maintain their current obligations for the next biennium. If any funding towards wolves should be expended, it should be funding existing programs, including the landowner compensation fund. Without more information on the true need this position would serve, ODFW should not move forward with this POP.

Sockeye Salmon reintroduction at Wallowa Lake POP. Was there a historical population and will this potentially enhance the Sockeye anadromous species in the region?

Potential policy POP for wolf livestock/conflict program. Is there any other budget source other than the general fund? Could defenders of wildlife provide some assistance? I think it may work for the benefit of both ranchers and conservationists.

### **Other**

I'd like to see the activities mentioned for each division explain how these fit with the '21-'23 budget. Line out the POPs more the way the Habitat Division was, which will allow them to be more self explanatory to the public.

Because we were not able to have the EBAC meeting in person, it would be great to set up either a virtual webinar to stakeholders can ask questions or release more information providing additional details on the budget and legislative proposals.





## 2021-23 External Budget Advisory Committee

Name	Association
Al Elkins	Oregon Hunters Association
Bob Oleson	NW Steelheaders Association
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society of Portland
Brad Pettinger	Oregon Trawl Commission
Brennan Garrelts	Lone Rock Timber Company
Carl Swartz	Oregon Bow Hunters
Cary Johnson	Salmon For All
Chandra Ferrari	Trout Unlimited
Chris Parta	Oregon Chapter of the Wildlife Society
Chris Wheaton	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Craig Ely	Access and Habitat Chair
Danielle Moser	Oregon Wild
Dave Wiley	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Don Albrecht	Former Baker County Hunter Education Coordinator
Doug Nichol	Oregon Trappers Association
George Houston	Foundation for North American Wild Sheep
Hugh Link	Oregon Dungeness Crab Commission
Jack Morby	Angling Education Association
Jake Gibbs	Starker
Jeff DeVoe	Salmon Trout Advisory Committee
Jerome Rosa	Oregon Cattlemen's Association
Jill Zarnowitz	Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commissioner
Jim Myron	Deschutes River Alliance
Joe Rohleder	Desert Spring Trout Farm
Kathleen Brennan-Hunter	The Nature Conservancy of Oregon
Ken Hand	Mule Deer Foundation
Kimberley Priestley	WaterWatch
Kristina McNitt	Oregon Forest Industries Council (OFIC)
Larry Sowa	Former Clackamas County Commissioner/State Representative
Liz Hamilton	Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association
Lonnie Johnson	Warmwater Working Group
Lori Steele	West Coast Seafood Processors Association
Marla Rae	The Rae Group
Mary Anne Cooper	Oregon Farm Bureau
Matt Markee	Markee and Associates
Nancy Fitzpatrick	Oregon Salmon and Albacore Commissions
Peggy Lynch	League of Women Voters of Oregon
Richard Angstrom	Oregon Concrete & Aggregate Producers Association
Selina Heppell	Oregon State University
Shawn Miller	Coastal Conservation Association – Oregon
Sristi Kamal	Defenders of Wildlife

Name	Association
Stan Steele	Mckenzie Guides Association, Oregon Outdoor Council
Steve Fick	Fishhawk Fisheries, Inc.
Susan Morgan	Association of Oregon Counties
Tamara Mautner	Oregon Coast Charter Association
Tim Greseth	Oregon Wildlife Foundation
Tom Byerley	Four Corners Shooting Range/NRA
Tony DeBone	Deschutes County Commissioner
Tony Meeker	Oregon Anglers
Yancy Lind	Restoration and Enhancement Board Member

John Terpening                      Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO)  
Linnea Wittekind                Chief Financial Office (CFO) DAS  
Captain Casey Thomas        Oregon State Police

**EBAC Back Up Members**

Cathy McDonald (The Nature Conservancy of Oregon)  
Dana Roberts (Coastal Conservation Assoc)  
George Okulitch (NW Sportsfishing Industry Assoc)  
Norm Ritchie (NW Steelheaders)  
Samantha Bayer (Oregon Farm Bureau)  
Sue Marshall (Audubon Society of Portland)

**Interested parties:**

Amelia Pesterfield  
Bill Kremers  
Bob Bastian  
Bob Rees  
Brett Starr  
Christy Splitt  
David Moskowitz  
David Shepherdson  
Fred Craig  
Fred VanNatta  
George Okulitch  
Kay Brown  
Kyle Williams  
Lindsay Ball  
Mark Labhart  
Michael O'Casey  
Molly McGrew  
Rod Sando  
Samantha Bayer  
Trey Carskadon