

# **Exhibit H**

## **File 4**

**Public Correspondence Received  
March 24, 2021 to April 6, 2021**

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Steve Kelsoe <steve@kelsoeenterprises.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:24 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

This is in regard to the changes in place already for Mule Deer and planned for Elk in the Eastern part of the state. As a hunter ed instructor, a bow hunter ed instructor, and having assisted with the Master Hunter program it greatly troubles me with these changes. I am also an archery hunter with only one mule deer and two elk harvested over the past 15 years that I have hunted in Oregon. A better alternative to changing the majority of the eastern part of the state to draw would be to make use of the Bowhunter Ed program and revive the Master hunter program. Going to a draw will drive hunter numbers down along with the loss of revenue with those decreasing numbers. By utilizing the Bowhunter ed program it would reward those hunters who have taken the extra step in being a responsible and ethical hunter and would also encourage others to take that extra step in a positive direction. Education is always a better alternative than regulation and should be used whenever possible as it will be cheaper and provide a more positive result with both hunters and the general public.

Another issue that gets glossed over in regards to the elk and deer numbers because it does not fit the political agenda is the wolf impact. One area I have archery hunted regularly since 2007 is along the border of the Pine and Imnaha units. The first year I hunted there I saw numerous elk and would hear 5-6 bulls bugling in the same time period and I was less than a mile off of an open forest service road. I would consistently see elk during my hunts. I am originally from Virginia so I was still learning how to hunt elk and made many mistakes yet still would see animals. Two years ago I hunted the same area and hiked in over 4 miles off of the open roads and only heard one Bull elk and saw 10 elk with many miles of walking to see them. I am much more knowledgeable about hunting elk now and had the elk numbers been the same as there were in 2007 I would have had a better chance in being successful in my hunt. Every year I hunted there the number of elk I would see decreased and I would start hearing and seeing more wolf sign. The impact of the wolf has greatly reduced the elk population which has made my desire to buy a tag and go hunting dwindle to being virtually nonexistent. In 2019 when I was hunting I saw numerous wolf tracks and sign, I would hear them howling at night so I know they are there and I even carry a handgun to protect myself. There was an article I read a couple years ago concerning the impact of the wolves on the elk population in Yellowstone, in the article they discussed how the average age of the elk herd was getting older as the herd numbers were decreasing due to the wolves killing the calves. The average age of a cow elk was 8-10 years old and they were getting to the end of their reproductive life span with only a few younger cows surviving long enough to reproduce. I feel their numbers and their impact have been greatly understated by those who are in favor of having the wolves in the state with that attitude having a severe impact on the elk and deer herd numbers as I have personally witnessed.

In closing I will restate my feeling that a better alternative to switching to a draw system would be to utilize the Bowhunter ed and master hunter programs which in return would promote safer and more ethical hunting along with giving a positive solution to meet the desired results. And also the impact of the wolf needs to be taken into consideration as they are causing the greatest damage to the elk and deer population.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Steve Kelsoe  
Hermiston, Oregon  
541-314-0152

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Kerry Prulhiere <kerryprulhierecm@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:00 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Eastern Oregon elk draw

Hello odfw, I would like to weigh in on the potential of elk units going to a draw such as murders creek, Minam, pine creek, ect... those units should have a general season for TRADITIONAL ARCHERY only (no draw for traditional archers) in those units. Keep those units open to over the counter, exclude compound archers for a couple years, until you can take a look at the numbers again. Then reassess. I believe if those units go to a draw, then you will create the same issue of over crowding in all the units west of the cascades where the general season remains unaffected. This is a domino effect that will lead to the whole state eventually being a draw system for archery hunters. Oregon has great opportunities for elk and deer, let's keep those opportunities available, but limit capabilities of equipment. The same should be looked at for rifle hunters, how many 1000yd kill shot videos are out there? ALOT! It's not just archers who should have limited capabilities. This is an opportunity to show what archery hunting is really about! Keep it over the counter for traditional archers. The hunter harvest numbers will still decrease a lot, But the opportunity for hunting remains the same!

Sent from my iPhone

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Riley Fetter <fetter.riley@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 2:59 PM  
**To:** ODFW WildlifeInfo  
**Subject:** 2022 Archery Elk Proposal

Hello,

I just wanted to check in to see if there was an update on the 2022 Archery Elk controlled hunt proposal. I believe the last I read was the following units would change from OTC to controlled draw:

Heppner  
Ukiah  
Murderer Creek  
Northside  
Desolation  
N.Sumpster  
Catherine Creek  
Starkey  
Minam  
Imnaha  
Snake River  
Keating  
Pine Creek  
W Beulah  
N. Malheur River  
Silvies

I know you guys are in a tough spot with this subject. I don't think anyone knows of a perfect answer yet. However, is changing 16 current OTC units to controlled draw the best first response to our problem?

The units I highlighted in red are ones where elk are below MO. Would it be better to just make those 7 controlled archery units instead of all 16? That could be tried for a few years and then maybe decide if more neighboring units need to be moved to controlled draw. I assume just making the units below MO controlled draw has been discussed? If so, can you shed some light as to why it was not an option?

Thank you,

Riley

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** ryan starley <rstarley4@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 2:15 PM  
**To:** Odfw.commission@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Oregon Archery elk proposal

To the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Commission:

As a passionate conservationist, I am writing you to express my recommendations for the upcoming proposed changes to our archery elk seasons. My recommendations have been created to meet the goals that ODFW has established for the 2022 archery season.

I first wanted to say thank you for the work you are doing! These changes will affect my favorite thing to do in life, and that is archery hunt. I am IN SUPPORT of the commission preserving as much hunting opportunity as possible. With that being said, I also know that there is a need to reduce hunter harvest & hunter density in units with ongoing management challenges. To do this, I am in favor of utilizing a similar strategy that the State of Oregon used back in 1979.

In 1979, General archery seasons were created when archery was less popular, technology was limited, and success rates were lower. The 30-day season that was established in 1983, was created to draw some hunters away from the crowded rifle seasons.

Now our archery seasons are crowded. My recommendation is to utilize primitive hunting methods as a tool to draw other hunters away from the crowded seasons. This will maintain hunter opportunity, while achieving the goals of reducing over-harvest and overcrowding.

This recommendation would be just one small aspect of the overall changes. Traditional archery is currently less popular, technology is limited, and the success rate is lower than modern archery seasons. Creating Traditional archery opportunities will reduce hunter harvest rates, and lower hunter density while sustaining opportunity. The archery hunting opportunity will be available for anyone who is willing to limit their success rate by using primitive equipment. Traditional archery historically has always had less of an impact on wildlife.

By providing general traditional archery opportunities in our state, we will also be allowing for equitable utilization of our state's elk resources, and the seasons could be created in a way that is consistent and easy to understand.

Top 3 recommendations for utilizing Traditional archery to meet ODFW commission goals:

#1. Pick a region of units that is currently under management objective and has lower hunter participation to create a three year pilot program assessing the popularity and impact that primitive hunting has on wildlife. In this region, there would be a cluster of units in close proximity (Keating, Minam, Imnaha, Pine Creek, and Snake river). This region would be considered an unlimited quota general Traditional archery opportunity.

#2. Pick a single unit that is currently under management objectives and/or having crowding concerns (i.e. Desolation, Starkey, Silvies, N. Malheur, etc.) and make it an unlimited general traditional archery opportunity. This also could be a pilot program that would be revisited in three years to assess participation and effect on objectives.

#3. Create a 5-day traditional archery only, extended season to all controlled, and general archery elk seasons in Oregon. If you obtain any archery elk tag in the state, you will be given 5 extra days to hunt if you choose to use Traditional archery equipment.

Please Consider utilizing Traditional archery as a tool to meet your current objectives.

Sincerely, Ryan Starley

Sent from my iPhone

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Troy Waite <troywaite2522@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 4, 2021 10:37 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** New Archery Elk Proposal - Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

After reviewing the proposed Eastern Oregon elk archery plan, I have a few comments and suggestions.

1. Designating some of the more congested units as limited entry is a great start, however I am deeply concerned about the impact the proposed policy will have on those units you are leaving out of the draw as general archery. What kind of pressure increases will that create when those who don't draw the coveted limited-entry hunts default to the general units?

Your information says that those general units meet MOs and won't have problems with elk being pressured disproportionately onto private land, but I can tell you in the Grizzly Unit near where I live and frequently hunt, that premise couldn't be further from the truth. Public land in the unit is way over-roded with far too many hunters who quickly push the majority of the elk onto the **72%** of private land. Allowing this unit (as an example) to go into a default general archery hunt with no green dot road restrictions or limiting harvest to bulls only or other mitigations, is in my opinion, only pushing the mismanagement another direction - simply to appease the public by giving them hunting opportunities - without considering the quality of that opportunity or more importantly, the impact to the resource you're charged with managing.

**I would propose that you make the WHOLE east side limited entry archery. Set the hunt numbers for sustainability and quality hunting and if someone doesn't draw then they set it out for the season or default to a west side hunt IF a given area can sustain the added pressure.**

2. If you're going to limit archery hunting, then why would you simultaneously leave so many east side rifle hunts open to spikes only? Does the data support that eliminating a disproportionate number of spikes ultimately meets management objectives? I find it interesting that the Tioga and Saddle Mountain Units on the west side have the highest densities of elk and coincidentally have a 3 point + regulation. Perhaps there is a legitimate difference in those areas that requires such a varied harvest approach, but it raises the question of whether creating hunting opportunities is being put ahead of true objective resource management goals.

3. I would much rather see limits on hunting pressure if it would mean our elk herds are allowed time to strengthen to meet MOs. Is there a possibility of doing a rest rotation of a given unit every year, where there is no hunting pressure at all? Ultimately as the state's overall population grows, so will likely our hunter numbers. With elk numbers dwindling in many places for several reasons, it will become impossible to meet the demands of all hunters. So I'd rather see thoughtful, proactive opportunity limits placed NOW while we can hopefully still mitigate some of the low numbers rather than under-addressing them until limitations MUST be enacted because numbers have reached a critical stage.

4. Finally regarding the issue of preference points:

I'd like to see hunters be able to allocate however many points they want to a given hunt rather than this current all or nothing system. Someone who has foregone their first choice hunt opportunity for 5, 10 or 15 years, should not be penalized by point creep and degraded hunting. People who have amassed a large number of deer points for example, holding out for a Trout Cr. or Hart Mountain hunt, have not only lost recent hunting opportunity in the years they haven't drawn, but have now seen the hunt they were holding out for drop to a

pathetic shadow of what it used to be when they first started applying. So... to offset that circumstance, allow hunters to use up only the number of points needed to draw a less-popular hunt while holding on to their remaining points. While it may throw off the draw-predictability of many of the hunts, it would go a long way toward making it more fair on those who are sitting on a lot of points, unable to even apply for a hunt they may want without wasting those extra points (years).

Thank you for considering my input.

Troy Waite

Powell Butte, OR

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** James Burns <77jburns@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 3, 2021 10:19 PM  
**To:** ODFW.Wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** 2022 archery regulation proposal

I understand that there are certain things that need to be addressed as far as hunter density in certain units, and the displacement of elk on private lands. With mine and many others experiences, we have witnessed elk and deer being on private lands more frequently and residing on private lands throughout the year and that the calving and wintering grounds that were common 20+ years ago are not the same or even remotely used with the numbers in the past which is not disrupted by hunting pressures. I have hunted many years in many of the units discussed for new regulations and have noticed the changes in elk numbers and activities as well. What I and many others have experienced is the demographical change in predator pressure. I have had many up close and personal experiences with them and this is the truth for much of the elk and mule deer problems that we are experiencing, which is not being accepted or justified by ODFW. Idaho and many other states have experienced the same problems and with there new regulations, they have adjusted to try and rectify the problem. With the stats acknowledged and displayed by ODFW, the decline in opportunity, the number of hunters and the number of elk harvested is still less than they were 40 years ago or even 20 years ago, it's also half the number of hunters and half the number of elk harvested between archery vs rifle hunters. So where are the numbers and other variables that effect these numbers? Most of the rifle hunts would be better effective with different hunt dates and also not linking spike hunts during the same time as branch bull hunts. This effects the harvest and quality of these hunts. The worst hunting experiences I have had lately were rifle season hunts that there were more hunter density problems than ever during archery season. Archery might be better diversified to sell tags for different weeks during the archery season, still as a general tag but for different dates of the season. This would help the density problems and control the pressures of the season. Also start with a better predator management program and work with Forest Service and other land managers for improved habitat. Remedy of these issues would help with the numbers and problems for both deer and elk. Hunters and anglers as a whole are strong supporters of conservation of lands, waters and wildlife. We will be supportive of regulations and changes when they address all issues for improvement and not just some.

Best regards,  
James

Sent from my iPad

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Paul Wachter <gringofish@att.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 3, 2021 10:59 AM  
**To:** gringofish@att.net  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Brandon Jensen <bmfjensen@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 2, 2021 12:41 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Controlled Archery Elk

I agree with making archery season lottery draw hunts but if you're going to do it you should make all of Oregon lottery draw hunt. All this is going to do is make more trophy units and punish local north eastern Oregon hunters.

Something does need to change but I think this is not the best approach.

Thank you, Brandon Jensen

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Brandon Arn <brandonarn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 4:15 PM  
**To:** brandonarn@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

I am a lifelong hunter who values responsible game management and appreciates the difficult juggling act that ODFW is tasked with. I absolutely agree that if we don't want the hunting quality and opportunity in Oregon to suffer then we need to make some changes to the current tag allocation model. However, I would like the following considerations be included in those changes.

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Nathan Lowrie <nathan@shilohwater.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 3:36 PM  
**To:** nathan@shilohwater.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** James Pesheck <Jamespesheck@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 2:48 PM  
**To:** Jamespesheck@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Myles Daley <mylesdaley@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 2:37 PM  
**To:** mylesdaley@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Jackson Petersen <Your44@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 2:22 PM  
**To:** Your44@hotmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** April Anable <Aprilanable@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 2:16 PM  
**To:** Aprilanable@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Jenny Broadfoot <broadfoot9@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 2:12 PM  
**To:** broadfoot9@mac.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Teresa Erickson <terrydci@fireserve.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 2:05 PM  
**To:** terrydci@fireserve.net  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Andrew Rushton <Rushtona2000@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 1:53 PM  
**To:** Rushtona2000@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Pedro veliz jr Pete <Petejveliz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 1:53 PM  
**To:** Petejveliz@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Kevin McCaskill <Communityradiator@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 1:53 PM  
**To:** Communityradiator@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Todd Hill <Toddvhill@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 1:48 PM  
**To:** Toddvhill@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Contact Your Legislator Confirmation

I agree with the Oregon Outdoor Council with these requests:

Create a West and East side general archery tag for the 2022 season. Archery hunters will have to choose the side they want to hunt. Take public input to develop the boundaries.

Continue the Archery Elk Workgroup through next year to allow more work and collaboration on the ODFW and other plans that have been submitted. There are too many complex and overlapping management issues to consider that require more time and most importantly public input.

The current ODFW archery elk proposal provides zero hunting opportunity or exemptions for youth which directly contradicts the intent of their recruitment process.

The ODFW plan provides no options for units that are closed due to wildfires. Regional units, harvest quota's nor any other options have been on the table for fire danger closures.

The ODFW plan will push more hunters into the rifle draw system thus compounding the point creep issue. This will increase the years it takes to draw already limited rifle tags. It also creates the same issues for archery hunters in the future.

Archery season provides the MOST opportunity for sportsmen and women to hunt with little biological impact on the resource.

The ODFW plan claims to address bull escapement issues, but doesn't address spike harvest or the fact that elk populations are at 103% of management objectives.

There is no mention of managing predators. How does any plan that purports to scientifically manage a species pass the smell test when it doesn't address the impact of predation or other mortality on a species?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** L... Collier <levicollier@live.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 1, 2021 11:48 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** 2022 archery elk proposal

Dear ODFW Staff,

As an avid outdoorsman and a believer of the importance of conservation of the wildlife and the land they roam, I've read your proposal and would have to say I can agree that there are some changes that need to be made in the management efforts in the NE region, but not just focused on the general archery elk hunts.

I think we all can agree that there are several other factors that weigh in on the issue at hand that never seem to be brought forth for discussion. We all know where that discussion could lead us but that's for another time.

I can acknowledge and agree that the number of general archery elk hunters has increased significantly over the years and that the overcrowding(over hunting) in certain game management units plays a factor and has made an impact, but what I can't see is the benefit of more regulation and less opportunities. From a hunters point of view after reading through this proposal it would appear that this is more or less to draw more revenue and establish more regulation, not actually a strong management proposal at all. I understand the idea to create a healthier herd and a higher bull to cow ratio, but statistics throughout the state of Oregon does not support your claim that hunter numbers is a key factor to this issue. If it is I'd like to see those statistics and your methods of generating said statistics.

There are a lot of other options that could be considered on managing hunting pressure in given areas. Implementing another draw tag in your plan is not at all a means of game management. Possibly a unit/weapon choice be designated when a is planning their fall hunting, with quota limited sells in given units, once these quotas are met then tags are no longer for sale in given unit, that's how you limit hunting pressures. Which is what you're really trying to do.

On the issue of bull to cow ratios, whoever thought up the general spike elk rifle tag allocation should reconsider their evaluation of this idea. To me it's just another draw of revenue to the department and in no way has a thing to do with management. I understand the idea of taking some young bulls out of herds to eliminate premature breeding or late season breeding, possibly, but to take out majority of your younger bulls in general season and not having the numbers to replace more mature bulls taken in other seasons, doesn't really add up.

Bottom line!!! Stop regulating and actually manage, not just one or two species, but all species, big game to the predators.

In my opinion the ODFW has let myself and others down for decades. You've adopted all liberal ideology and turned your back on the true idea of conservation efforts and the very people that put food on your tables.

As a child growing up in the NE region, game numbers were exponential and abundant, had a lot of fond memories growing up in a hunting family, the kind of memories that I'll never have a chance to create with my own children, that being said if this proposal is the best "management" plan you can bring forth and the proposal in fact becomes the new norm in hunting this great state, I assure you my days of helping fund/hunting here are near an end and I'd rather fund an establishment with far better management practices and game rich resources and hunt out of state.

Thanks and I hope ODFW can do right by the right people for a change Sent from my iPhone

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Josh Friberg <josh@joshfriberg.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 31, 2021 5:09 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery Elk Hunting Changes--Public Comment

Hello-

Thank you for taking the time to consider public comment and input on changes to the archery elk hunting.

**I am support the BHA (Backcountry Hunters and Anglers) Micro-zones proposal alternative.** (see here: [https://www.backcountryhunters.org/or\\_bha\\_proposes\\_micro](https://www.backcountryhunters.org/or_bha_proposes_micro))

My family are now 5th generation Oregon deer and elk hunters. However, I and my kids had drifted away from hunting for 15 years or so. We came back to hunting because of the appeal of the archery elk hunting opportunity. Additionally, I have been able to recruit 5 new hunters this last year because of the opportunity for archery elk. Specifically, we like the length of season, the flexibility of geography (particularly with west side fires last year), and the ease of getting a tag.

BHA's proposal best meets the objectives of ODFW, while preserving flexibility and opportunities for new hunters.

Thank you,

Josh Friberg  
Speaker | Trainer | Coach  
[www.theabundantagent.com](http://www.theabundantagent.com)

Call/ Text: 503-330-4818



**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** scott turo <s2ro@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 31, 2021 10:11 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Comments on Archery Season Proposal  
**Attachments:** Archery Elk Proposal Commnets.docx

ODFW Staff and Commissioners

Please accept my comments to the changes proposed for the Archery hunting season.

Thank you

**Scott Turo**

Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission,

**RE: Comments on current eastern Oregon Archery Elk Hunting Proposal.**

I would like to thank the Fish and Wildlife Commission for recognizing the seriousness of the proposed changes to the General Early Archery Season, and for allowing more discussion and input before a decision is made. During the first round, it appeared that the public comments submitted were simply overlooked and not considered. The proposed changes to the archery season will impact the archery hunting heritage we pass along to future generations and further discussion should occur.

**I am not in favor of the current Early General Season Archery Elk Hunting Proposal for eastern Oregon. It is large loss in opportunity to archery hunters. Especially families that hunt before the first week of school begins in early September. Due to the boundaries chosen in the current proposal, a majority of the accessible elk in eastern Oregon will be within a controlled unit and off limits to most families. I see this a huge loss to the archery hunting heritage in Oregon.**

I hunt the first week of the season with my son before school starts in September. Once school and sports start hunting time gets a bit tougher to find. We hunt the Heppner Unit, and use our bikes to get away from some of the people and experience a 'backcountry' camping hunt. He enjoys it, and has many stories to tell each year when he returns home. Even with this experience and connection I do not see him being recruited into the sport as he gets older. Cost, tag availability, and access to a quality experience will be the major factors. On a positive note, he enjoys bird hunting and the youth hunting opportunities created in Madras have been great. The staff and volunteers involved with this effort should be commended.

At 12 he got his first youth elk tag for the Heppner Unit. We knocked on a few doors to find some access and had success finding a few willing landowners, but we had to get in line behind other youth, family members, and paying clients before we could hunt. Add in a week of rest (no hunting), before the paid gun hunters arrived for deer season, and there was not much of a chance left for us even with permission. We heard the pheasants cackling in the distance, so we asked about trying our luck, and the answer was that the bird hunting was already leased out.

The door knocking led us to new places and new tactics but in the end, we realized there is very little access to the elk once they leave public land. At 4 points, my son may get the Heppner Youth tag one more time as a youth, not a very attention-grabbing recruitment tool. The new damage tag looked promising, but once we found the all-private land is leased out, we realized the damage tag was not for us, but rather a money grab for landowners. We do not believe in paying to hunt publicly owned wildlife so this leaves the general archery tag as the only true annual hunting opportunity for us.

The issue here in Oregon is not overcrowding, but rather lack of access on private lands to the publicly owned wildlife. I would like to know why Oregon has struggled to keep up the with surrounding states that have large, well-managed public access programs and cheaper license costs? Oregon's public access on private land programs are a mere fraction of what neighboring

states offer both residents and non-residents. The access I have found on private timberlands offered by the state is poorly marked and usually requires an online mapping tool to feel legal or local knowledge to find legal access.

Public funding like Oregon Lottery dollars are being used to purchase properties that will have no public access. Land Trusts and other groups regularly use Oregon Lottery funds to purchase properties with no plan of public access because the funds do not require it. The Deschutes Land Trust recently purchased about 4,500 acres in Jefferson County using over a million dollars in public funding and have no plans for public access. Citizens of the state should not have to be member of an elite group like this or have to sign up for a butterfly tour to gain access to lands purchased with public funding. This is absurd and shows a lack of understanding of the issues with access to the publicly owned natural resources in this State. Oregon is moving quickly towards a 'Pay to Play' state which will ruin the hunting heritage we leave for future generations.

I recently noticed the R3 Coordinator position announced with the Department and thought maybe I should apply. Recruiting new members and reactivating lost members into the sport is a cool feeling. Once I saw the new archery season proposal, I realized the challenges facing this position are far worse than the smartphone and video games. The biggest challenges appear to be coming from directly inside the Department, by a constant reduction in opportunity, increasing license costs, and lack of access to the resource. Finding solutions to these issues is the problem that needs attention, but I never see it on the Commission's agenda. Failing to address these issues is unacceptable. What about the hunters or family hunting groups that do not use the lottery system due to cost and complexities? Did the team consider those constituents? The hunters who have already reached their budget limits for fishing and hunting licenses. Another sign "Pay to Play" has taken over our state. Sending the message that if you don't pay you don't have a voice and your concerns and opinions really do not matter.

The logic behind not meeting unit level management population objectives for elk as the driver of the proposed changes is simply flawed. Unlimited over-the-counter antlerless elk damage tags are issued in the same units now proposed for controlled archery. These elk are pushed off public land and then hunted heavily on pay to play private lands with high success rates. These elk are part of the breeding herd in the same unit not meeting management objectives. Limiting archery hunters is not the tool to address this management objective problem.

If you must continue with the Archery proposal, I would like to provide a few suggestions for consideration.

- First, I suggest you move to a choose your weapon system like Washington. If overcrowding is such an issue, then make each hunter or group choose their weapon before picking a tag to hunt. If you hunt rifle or bow there should be both OTC and Controlled hunts to choose from. There is too much overcrowding to allow rifle hunters to pick up an OTC archery tag and head out to their favorite eastern Oregon unit during archery. This would be the simplest and fairest way to address the overcrowding concerns.

- Second, the units proposed for additional controlled hunts are the ones with all the elk and available public access. I am opposed to making them controlled unless you dice them up further, allowing some to go for zero points in the lottery. I think these elements of the proposal by The Oregon Outdoor Council should be considered by the Commission for approval. This option is more family friendly. I have 13 elk points and like many have been holding out for that once in a lifetime hunt. I feel, If I put in for a point saver, I am staying out of the controlled hunt mess and should be allowed some good elk units to hunt in. The family units. If I take my chances for a random draw of a controlled unit and do not get chosen then I should be allowed to only hunt the general units. Yes, this creates more rules to follow and figure out, but that is what the current proposal is doing anyway.
- Third, as an archery hunter who would rather use traditional equipment, I think the Commission should create and approve a traditional only deer and elk license that that would allow statewide hunting (except the current controlled hunt units) from September 1<sup>st</sup> through December 31<sup>st</sup>. All traditional archers would have to pass and accuracy test each season and pay an additional fee of \$100 to generate revenue. All bucks would be 4 points or better during October, November and December, with a hair tag for elk costing extra. This will decrease overcrowding, increase opportunity and interest in the sport. An easy win in my book with the number traditional archers in Oregon. I am usually not in favor for pay to play options, but with the way things are moving in Oregon I figure this idea may have a chance.

I hear many Oregon resident hunters say that they don't even bother with applying in the Oregon Big Game lottery anymore because there are better odds of getting an out of state tag in many instances. Further proof that the exodus has already begun and will continue if public input continues to be ignored.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Scott Turo  
Madras, Oregon

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Jeff and Mona Johnston <jeffmona4853@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 30, 2021 8:47 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** archery elk season change

Dear ODFW: Thank you for the work you are doing. I am a passionate hunter. I have always appreciated the freedom to pursue game with as few restrictions as necessary. I have also considered it a privilege to fish and hunt game. I have also always thought that the ultimate concern should be for the health of the wildlife, not my hunting pleasure. Therefore, I should only take life from a healthy prosperous population. You have shared the need to restrict harvest to preserve the health of our herds. It will cost me, but I do support your proposal. Thank you, Jeff Johnston  
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Nathan Harper <natewou@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 30, 2021 8:39 AM  
**To:** Odfw.commission@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Oregon Archery Elk Proposal

To the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Commission:

As a passionate conservationist, I am writing you to express my recommendations for the upcoming proposed changes to our archery elk seasons. My recommendations have been created to meet the goals that ODFW has established for the 2022 archery season.

I first wanted to say thank you for the work you are doing! These changes will affect my favorite thing to do in life, and that is archery hunt. I am IN SUPPORT of the commission preserving as much hunting opportunity as possible. With that being said, I also know that there is a need to reduce hunter harvest & hunter density in units with ongoing management challenges. To do this, I am in favor of utilizing a similar strategy that the State of Oregon used back in 1979.

In 1979, General archery seasons were created when archery was less popular, technology was limited, and success rates were lower. The 30-day season that was established in 1983, was created to draw some hunters away from the crowded rifle seasons.

Now our archery seasons are crowded. My recommendation is to utilize primitive hunting methods as a tool to draw other hunters away from the crowded seasons. This will maintain hunter opportunity, while achieving the goals of reducing over-harvest and overcrowding.

This recommendation would be just one small aspect of the overall changes. Traditional archery is currently less popular, technology is limited, and the success rate is lower than modern archery seasons. Creating Traditional archery opportunities will reduce hunter harvest rates, and lower hunter density while sustaining opportunity. The archery hunting opportunity will be available for anyone who is willing to limit their success rate by using primitive equipment. Traditional archery historically has always had less of an impact on wildlife.

By providing general traditional archery opportunities in our state, we will also be allowing for equitable utilization of our state's elk resources, and the seasons could be created in a way that is consistent and easy to understand.

Top 3 recommendations for utilizing Traditional archery to meet ODFW commission goals:

#1. Pick a region of units that is currently under management objective and has lower hunter participation to create a three year pilot program assessing the popularity and impact that primitive hunting has on wildlife. In this region, there would be a cluster of units in close proximity (Keating, Minam, Imnaha, Pine Creek, and Snake river). This region would be considered an unlimited quota general Traditional archery opportunity.

#2. Pick a single unit that is currently under management objectives and/or having crowding concerns (i.e. Desolation, Starkey, Silvies, N. Malheur, etc.) and make it an unlimited general traditional archery opportunity. This also could be a pilot program that would be revisited in three years to assess participation and effect on objectives.

#3. Create a 5-day traditional archery only, extended season to all controlled, and general archery elk seasons in Oregon. If you obtain any archery elk tag in the state, you will be given 5 extra days to hunt if you choose to use Traditional archery equipment.

Please Consider utilizing Traditional archery as a tool to meet your current objectives.

Sincerely,

Nate Harper

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** smiley culver <smileyculver@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 30, 2021 7:19 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Comment on Archery change proposal!

Good Morning:

I would like to add my opinion to your new archery proposal!

First we have a wolf problem that you people are ignoring! The elk are being herded up before archery season by the wolves on private ground near the valley fringes so no one can hunt them except the wolves. This goes on until about the third week of archery season when the bulls start getting their cows and then some bulls will bring cows up to the National Forest but it is very hit and miss. This pattern has wrecked archery season as we are used to scattered animals and hunting is better. These wolves need to go and unfortunately people like me want to get rid of them and some are starting to cross the line to get rid of them and this is sad some of these over achievers will get felonies when the actual wolf problem is mismanagement by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife!

Now another problem while I am on predators is the other two (bears and cats). I did not hunt last year but the year before my hunting party saw 9 predators and 9 bull elk during the 30 day season. None of us even got a shot at any of the nine bulls. What this tells me is when you have as many predators in an area as there are now (Starkey Unit) your elk numbers are going to drop. We saw seven bears and two cougar. Again because ODFW took away hound hunting of these two species the numbers have ballooned. Again I blame ODFW for mismanagement.

Now to the issue of making some units in archery season a draw I think that is absolutely stupidity! The problem with bowhunter numbers has been caused by ODFW being greedy and allowing rifle hunters that draw to bowhunt when their draw is unsuccessful for rifle. If hunters must choose the bowhunting numbers will fall. Of course so will your revenue. I personally have never drawn a tag from ODFW. I started bowhunting back in the 80's so have not needed to draw but before that I was never successful. This is something that really makes people out here on the east side of Oregon mad is we can't get a tag. Senator Lynn Findley is one of them. Your draw system is so rigged that I am not sure who would want to use it. For example my brother's father in law I witnessed drew a Muderer's Creek elk rifle tag for over 20 years straight. Paul Smith drove the ODFW fish truck out of LaGrande. This type of favoritism only gives ODFW draws a really bad name. Now me I like archery because I can hunt for a month and go where I want and just have a nice vacation. One day I might hunt clear down on Snake River and then back to Starkey and North Sumpter. Now your ODFW board wants to do away with all of that and stick to one unit. I spend most of my time in Starkey but the cooperative road closures have ran everyone out. I will address that next paragraph. I have never heard of a too many problem in archery season except for like Strawberry Mountain unit where private landowners are being infringed upon. That is the only unit I could see needs added to the old draw units. And this problem is because everyone wants big horns and word has gotten out so everyone wants to hunt there. Well add it but leave the rest out. Just like Starkey Unit three years ago when you expanded the Clear Creek travel management area all the hunters left and now populate along the 43 road. This is another problem ODFW created as the hunters are going to places they have access to and so here is a big population and the road closure does not get hunted except by young people and then their game spoils. I really think if ODFW makes people choose rifle or archery the archery numbers will be manageable without your stupid draw.

Now I think we need discuss cooperative road closures. I have no idea how you people make these stupid decisions but Rifle and Archery are done in complete different climates. My Uncle Bryce Powell worked most of his life for ODFW. He managed the Murderers Creek Ranch and the pheasant farm at Adair Village. His hunting partner Lindsey Ball headed your ODFW for a while. To my knowledge those two would have not wanted cooperative road closures in Archery

season. If you kill a bull elk one mile from the entrance to the road closure it will spoil in the 80 and 90 degree heat we get during archery season. So I guess you may as well know that when I can not get game out then there is not purpose to hunt. And ODFW wants to give tickets for spoiled game yet their road closures are the cause of it! Idaho right next to us here has road closures too but at each gate is a sign you can enter from 10am to 6 pm to retrieve game. That could work in Oregon too but the way our road closures are by design is to curb success. But in the end there goes tag sales because if you can't be successful you need not go. Now my issue is I am now 66 years old. I still get around good but the way the road closures are designed means you have to be young. I think this is called discrimination against the elderly. I have really thought a lot about this because I have waited years to have the time to hunt and then ODFW wrecks it because I have no access and where I do I have no chance of getting the game out without spoilage. Your board needs some hunters on it.

Three years ago when the Clear Creek road closure expanded and went to archery season a guy I have know for 15 or more years stuck a bull north of second crossing of wolf creek and the bull headed for the North Fork of Wolf Creek. He called me on the phone in a complete panic so I grabbed my pack and my bow and went to his camp. He then took me up and showed me where he had shot the bull. It was terrible tracking but right at dark after the guy that shot the bull had given up I found the bull. I had phone service and called two of my hunting partners. We had four quarters hanging in trees at 2 am. And yes it was in the new closure. I knew of a road that loggers put in back in 1972 that the Forest Service has quit using. I got a GPS reading on ONX hunt and texted it to myself. Then the next day I took my 4wheeler with my cargo trailer in and we walked the bull downhill to the 4 wheeler. Walked right to the bull with the GPS. Technology is amazing. But with fly blow to meat not bagged and what not I figure 1/3 of the elk had spoiled due to the hot weather. It still makes me mad that had I not fudged on rules to get that elk out all of it would have been lost. And that is why I did not hunt last year. If ODFW will not let you go get your meat in a responsible manner then there is no need to go.

Now the last issue is the Indian Creek Closure. I have hunted that area since before it was a closure. I have evolved along with it but as soon as it became a year round closure and I lost access I have never killed game since. The way this closure sets geographically if you do not have access by a road you will not kill anything unless you hunt near bear butte and then you must be young and be able to cover ground to get ahead of the elk as they leave food to go bed. ODFW has made this unit a waste. The Forest Service still uses the road and there is no reason why hunters can't use them for access. But again ODFW does not want success and that is why unless something changes you won't get much of my money now that a pioneer is \$6. You really need hunters on your board so you can turn this around before you go broke.

I enclose a photo of the salvage elk.



Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Sincerely,

Reed Culver  
541-805-9126

## **BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** BRANDON GALLAGHER <brandongallagher@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 29, 2021 3:42 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

Dear ODFW,

Changing Eastern Oregon Archery from a general season to a controlled season is a horrible idea. The current flawed controlled hunting structure for rifle hunting is what has led us to this. Many of us current bow hunters migrated from rifle hunting because of the current system. We were tired of not getting to hunt but every 5 or 6 years in our desired unit and switching archery to this type of season would create the same problem. This would also create overcrowding in Western Oregon for both archery season and general rifle season. The remaining Eastern Oregon units would also get more pressure, and eventually you would decide to make them controlled, further compounding the issue. Controlled hunts should be used for a few select units, managed for trophy animals.

According to the statistics on the ODFW website, in 2019 there were 2081 archery hunters in the Northeast zone of the state, which a total of 384 elk were harvested with a success rate of 18%. If you remove the three trophy units (Mt. Emily, Wenaha, Sled Springs) the success rate was only 16%. This is compared to 21741 rifle hunters in the same zone where 5322 elk were harvested with a success rate of 24%. The success rate for rifle hunters is much higher and remains at 24% when you remove the same three units from their statistics. In no way do these statistics support reducing the number of archery hunters.

This also equates to government theft. Currently Oregon requires us to purchase a hunting license to apply for tags. If we only get to actually hunt every 5 or 6 years, the state will still receive its money without providing any kind of product or service. This could be considered a donation if it were voluntary but is just stealing from the public if it is required.

I know that complaining without providing solutions is a waste of everyone's time, so I have a few possible solutions, that I believe, when applied would lead to a better hunting experience, and better wildlife management.

1. Hunters would choose either an Eastern Oregon Archery tag or a Western Oregon Archery tag. Hunters would still apply for the few current controlled hunts if they choose, but after tag results were released, they would have the option to purchase a general tag for the side of the state they wish to hunt. This would help reduce overcrowding on both sides of the state.
2. Fix the archery season to Sep 1<sup>st</sup> - Sep 30<sup>th</sup> every year. The last couple years have had the archery season end sooner, and has contributed greatly to the overcrowding of hunters.
3. Longer Seasons for rifle hunting. Many of the complaints from rifle hunters are about lower success and being overcrowded when they finally draw a tag.
4. Fix the current preference point system. Point creep has become a real issue. Hunts that used to take a couple years to draw now can take 7 or 8. Have a reasonable set number of preference points required for each unit. For Example, 4 points for a unit like Ochoco or Hepner, and 18 for a trophy unit like Wenaha. Only have random draw available if the hunters with preference points were under the set tag limit for that unit.
5. Change Eastern Oregon Archery Elk hunts Brow Tine Bull/Cow only.

6. Change Eastern Oregon Rifle hunts Brow Tine Bull only.
7. Remove rifle spike elk hunts out of the controlled rifle season time periods. Move the spike hunts to after the regular controlled rifle elk seasons.
8. Fix Predator management. Allow the use of dogs when hunting Cougars. Stop trying to introduce Wolves into the state, and institute a hunting season for the wolves that are currently here.

Sincerely,

Brandon Gallagher

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Jeff Drullinger <steadfast1965@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 29, 2021 3:31 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

To whom it may concern,

To say that I'm extremely disappointed in this proposal is an understatement. I oppose this proposal. From my understanding the head(a state employee) of the group of various non state employees (I know Wayne Endicott, owner of the Bow Rack is one) meeting on various hunting issues has not listened to the majority of the group nor are the decisions being made done on factual harvest information. I'm not sure if this has any impact on your decisions but if so that is wrong. I get the feeling that, just like the political climate such as Governor Brown making up law apart from the legislature, the government will do what they want no matter what facts or citizen concern is. With that in view I'll still put in my two cents.

I've been bow hunting since the early 80's and have had to compete with rifle hunters the whole time. Hunter success numbers don't in anyway reflect the math to make these changes. We have been having our hunts limited by current forest fire fighting practices and National Forests being shut down during the season as well as private forests being closed to access during the season. I had been putting in for Weneha bow elk since that became a draw unit and ended up losing several points (I believe it was 6) when I inadvertently forgot to put in in the time frame (back when that was in place). Now I've built up 20 points just in time for you to mess with the whole thing plus make it so that I wouldn't even be able to hunt the west side if I did draw. This isn't fair to those of us who have finally built up a lot of points. I have also liked the ability to go to other units when fire has shut down others. What incentive would I have to bow hunt other than I enjoy that weapon? My only option, if you choose this route, is to hunt other states if I can afford it.

If you want to control the number of bow hunters, why not make it so that when a hunter puts in for a controlled hunt and it is a bow or a rifle hunt then they have to hunt a general season for that weapon if they don't draw. I know many who put in for rifle and when they don't draw they bow hunt. If you're going to take opportunities away from the bow hunter then add hunts.

Just for your information, there are many like myself who don't have the ability to go online (no computer or lack of band width) to attend the upcoming meeting.

I'm sure you can tell from my email I'm very disappointed and have lost faith in our system. I'm a retired public employee myself and understand that you're having to make changes but I'd like to see, if a change is in order, then it be made on facts not under pressure and the interest of those affected the most in some way is taken into account and with your changes make some other changes to make up for the shift.

Sincerely,  
Jeff Drullinger

Sent from my iPhone

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** James Longsdorf <longsdorf24@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 29, 2021 1:23 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** managemant proposals

Thanks for your time. I think the proposals for the units are OK, but I'm not fully aware of the East side herd demographics. I do think the middle of the State and the Western Units should remain the same simply due to animal health and herd numbers. I also think cow tags should remain on the West side in areas with high elk numbers. As far as healthy herds go, the Cities of Gerhart and Warrenton have an elk problem and I think there should be a way to get a couple archery hunters in to try to curb/maintain the numbers. maybe a raffle for those that can access private property. That or maybe draw a few Ft. Stevens tags.  
Thank You

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Deanna Longsdorf <dlongsdorf@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 29, 2021 12:36 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** draft proposal feedback

As per your proposal I agree that the NW zones should remain a general archery season simply because of animal numbers remaining pretty much constant. As far as a general season archery tag, I think there should be sound reasoning as to "why" we would have 2 separate zones unless the season dates differ.

Thanks,  
James Longsdorf

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Robin West <robinnoteast@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 29, 2021 9:30 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

I support ODFW making changes to elk hunting in NE Oregon to address areas where post hunt bull/cow ratios are repeatedly low; however, I do not support the proposed action of restricting much of the prime archery elk hunting units to drawing permit only. Such action would reduce hunter opportunity, interest in participating, hunter recruitment, non-resident participation, and likely overall revenue generated to the Department. More importantly, reduced bull harvest can be achieved without taking away permits for rifle hunters, and while still providing guaranteed, but different, opportunity each year to bowhunters in traditionally sought after areas. ODFW decisions should be data driven and maximize opportunity for hunter participation while working to meet management objectives. To that end, ODFW should look to the timing of reported archery harvest, considering success per effort (days hunted). If the data shows bull harvest is higher on average in the first few days and last few days of the archery season, adjustments could focus on this (bulls seem more vulnerable early, before being "pushed" and later, when the weather is generally cooler and rut activity tends to peak). Options that could be considered using such information might be a limited controlled hunt during the second two weeks of the season and an over-the-counter hunt for the first two weeks. Another option could be an all legal archery equipment general season for the first three weeks and traditional bows only for the last week - reducing effective range and harvest when bulls may be most vulnerable. There are many variations that could achieve overall reduced bull harvest and still allow all bowhunters an opportunity to go afield every year to their favored areas. These should be fully explored before further limiting hunter opportunity.

I have hunted elk in Oregon (both with rifle and archery equipment) on and off for 50 years. I remember when the State had fewer elk but more opportunities. We could hunt with rifle and bow in the same year, there were early and late archery seasons, and most units had over-the-counter tags. Bull/cow ratios became a problem in many areas, and spike bulls dominated the rifle bull harvest. Archery technology increased and harvest was possible at over 50 yards vs. under 30 - success rates increased. Split rifle seasons were imposed to reduce crowding and controlled permits became the norm for rifle hunting in the northeast - first requiring only a preference point or two to draw, then gradually increasing to where better areas may only be predictably hunted a handful of times during a hunter's life. Restrictions are part of the necessity of proper game management. Cumulatively however, they have spelled a slow and seemingly irreversible decline in hunter recruitment. Indirect effects are no less impactful. An example of this might be funding issues associated with the current proposal. As written, non-resident archery hunters should be predicted to decline significantly as they would be expected to switch interest to places like Idaho or Colorado that offer over-the-counter tags. If ODFW tried to recoup this revenue loss through resident license increases, such action could also further depress hunter participation (which lessens further revenue generation, along with public support for some management activities).

Please do what needs to be done to protect the resource while inflicting the least pain to hunter opportunity. Limiting participation is sometimes necessary, but should generally be the last choice.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Robin L. West

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Jeffrey Kruggel <jeff\_kruggel2006@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 28, 2021 6:00 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Controlled Elk Archery 2022

Let's be honest here do you really think making archery a controlled hunt will fix our elk numbers? Why would the state want to take opportunity away from people who are giving an elk a chance. We have to get within 60 yards to make a kill and a rifle hunter can kill up to 1200 yards. Overcrowding of units seems to be the norm no matter where you hunt and whatever weapon your using. Remember rifle elk hunters take 2/3 of the elk harvested in the state. Why should archers be punished when rifle hunters are the ones killing the majority of the elk? Please reconsider this proposal, please don't let jealous rifle hunters take our season from us.

Thanks,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

**From:** Rick Miller <rickinhalfway@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 28, 2021 4:11 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us

Many hunter choose archery, so they can have a nice experience while hunting elk, hearing bulls, and maybe even harvesting one. This is one of the few hunts when a group can hunt together without worries about a draw. But I live in Halfway and began archery elk hunting in 1983 and have not rifle hunted elk since then, so I know that something has to be done to control or limit the hunting pressure.

Have you even given any thought to splitting the archery season. Start a first season a week earlier than the current season and have this season be a 16 day season with three weekends for bulls 4 point and larger or a cow as the legal animal to harvest. Then after a 5 day period, start a second 16 day season on Saturday for bulls 4 point and smaller or a cow. I use 4 point bulls as the minimum and maximize point size because a 4 point bull is very easy to distinguish. This season could run a week longer than the current season, which in my area would make it overlap the Eastern Oregon Buck season. But this would not be too much of a conflict as the elk and deer habits do not always overlap too much. Also I doubt if poaching a elk with a rifle with this overlapping season would be an big issue, because having buck hunters in the forest would work as a deterrent and having this season be a smaller bull or a cow, would also make may hunters wonder if poaching a non trophy elk would be worth the cost associated with poaching.

Also having the second season for smaller bulls would have a positive effect on the herd bulls, since I know from my experience as a hunter and as a observer of what happens in the mountains around my home, that the majority of mature bulls in archery season are harvested later in the current archery season. So many of the herd bulls would survive into rifle season, making have a rifle tag more appealing.

Another thing I am sure you are aware of, is the number of mature bulls that are being wounded that late in the rut, when they are less concerned with their surroundings. This has be a worsening issue here in this area. So if the mature bulls are hunter early, when they are not as careless, this would also have a positive effect on their survival numbers.

I wrote a day ago about reversing the current bull seasons here in Eastern Oregon, making a spike only as the 1st season and any bull as the 2nd season. Then have both season be over the counter purchases. My intent was to explain by having an over the counter purchase for both rifle seasons, all hunters would have the opportunity to hunt and camp with their friend every year. This a large number of spikes are currently shoot in the 1st any bull season, there are few to find in the 2nd spike only, which has discouraged many hunters, so they have either quit hunter or switched to archery. So this would stop those archery hunter that are not really into archery, they only hunt archery when they are unable to draw a rifle tag, these also lowering to some degree the number of archery hunters.

I know a lot of hunters that just enjoy an camp out with friends but since the draw hunts was

started years ago, they have lost that opportunity, unless they pick up a bow and fling some.  
Thanks Rick Miller

Sent from my iPad

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Diane Bauldree <dianebauldree@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 8:32 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

I am not in favor of your new archery elk proposal. Please keep things the same way they have been.

Thank you,  
Jim Bauldree

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Aaron Bailey <aaronbailey81@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 8:10 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

Why are rifle(any legal weapon)seasons getting more tags as you are making things more "far" and less density for hunters?

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Shane Lorimer <slorimer3@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 4:00 PM  
**To:** ODFW.Wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** comments on archery elk plan for eastern oregon

Two of the biggest problems I have with the current proposal are this:

- 1) The hunt I like best in Oregon involves being deep in the backcountry and hunting back and forth over GMU lines depending on what the elk are doing.
- 2) I strongly dislike the proposal to separate the general season by East and West along the cascade crest. I live in Portland. If my preferred hunt is going to be controlled, then at least let me choose where to go as I explore around the state. And if that can't be the case, at least maintain some continuity so I can hunt on both sides of the PCT on a single backcountry hunt.

Please consider the alternative proposal put forth by Backcountry Hunters & Anglers [https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/backcountryhunters/pages/9561/attachments/original/1616617261/OR\\_BHA\\_Micro\\_Zone\\_Alternative\\_V2.pdf?1616617261](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/backcountryhunters/pages/9561/attachments/original/1616617261/OR_BHA_Micro_Zone_Alternative_V2.pdf?1616617261)

Thank you,  
Shane

--

Shane Lorimer, MPH  
[slorimer3@gmail.com](mailto:slorimer3@gmail.com)  
(913)980-8438

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Taylor Boudreau <boudreau.taylor@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 3:27 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Re: Archery elk proposal

I wanted to follow up and voice support for the Oregon chapter of Backcountry Hunters and Anglers proposal of micro zones, and a cascade zone separation. ([https://www.backcountryhunters.org/or\\_bha\\_proposes\\_micro](https://www.backcountryhunters.org/or_bha_proposes_micro))

Thank you!

Taylor Boudreau  
Portland, OR

On Thu, Mar 11, 2021 at 10:59 AM Taylor Boudreau <[boudreau.taylor@gmail.com](mailto:boudreau.taylor@gmail.com)> wrote:

I'm reaching out regarding the 2022 Archery elk proposal to add a comment. I'd like to see changes to the proposal to have a single general archery elk tag for all general units in the state. Since archery elk seasons now most directly overlaps with fire seasons, opportunity to hunt can often be severely limited depending on wildfire conditions, and consequently picking one side of the state can have significant consequences to opportunity to hunt.

A single general archery elk tag, even with the reduced number of units, still distributes hunters who choose to purchase the tag, but ensures that a specific area of the state having a bad wildfire year doesn't prevent someone who's already purchased a general tag from having an opportunity to hunt elk during their season.

Additionally I would like for the controlled archery hunts in the north east units to be good for more than one unit, especially in the units in and around the wallowas. The unit boundaries are often in the middle of the wilderness, and a single unit tag, could easily mean a fire could make the entire unit inaccessible. Combining multiple units, such as Imnaha/Pine Creek, Minam/Catherine Creek, Desolation/Sumpter, would make these tags more attractive and better hunts while making them more resilient to access issues.

Thank you for your consideration!

Taylor Boudreau

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Thurman Falk <falkthurman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 10:27 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

Hi,

Thank you for the careful consideration you are giving to managing Oregon's elk populations. I also appreciate the collection of hunter feedback.

It would be my preference to keep the east Oregon bow season accessible to all units but limit the number of hunters that can hunt through a draw. One of my favorite things about the eastern Oregon archery season is the ability to hunt multiple habitats. I enjoy hunting in dense lodgepole pine forest, open and sparse sagebrush flats, and the aspen and willow covered cliffs of the Wallowas. Each hunt provides a unique experience, in the dense forest I have to channel my inner ninja, while on the sagebrush flats I will see several hundred elk but all of their eyes also usually pick me out, while in the Wallowas I pretend to be a mountain goat climbing steep ridges. It is quite fun experiencing these things every season.

I am a young working professional, and usually take one week off to hunt during the season and then will hunt every weekend. I appreciate the long season with access to many units because it works well with having a career. I am able to put in a substantial effort and try multiple areas.

My personal preference would be to keep access to most of the east Oregon units but change it from a general season to a draw to limit the number of hunters. Thank you for listening to my feedback.

Thanks,  
Thurman Falk

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Joe Etchamendy <joe\_etchamendy@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 7:36 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk 2022

My biggest complaint is (and I am sure you are getting a lot of those) is that you are kind of screwing the eastern oregon hunters over. I will not be able to hunt every year archery. I have been archery hunting in Oregon since 1993. Not sure what I will be able to do as I feel this will fall on deaf ears. Idaho or Wyoming will get a ton of oregon hunters. I will probly be buying beef after I burn my points. Thankyou oregon. The west side gets over the counter opportunity and the east side gets hosed! Yea I can go hunt some units but those units are garbage and will be a sacrificial units. They are gonna be low oppportunities on elk and you know it. I will have to travel just for the opportunity to camp for a week. I can do that without buying a tag. Do something about the bears and cougars. Allow wolf culling as well. The deer are just about gone and you are worried about the elk. Numbers are good there but predators will take there toll when all the deer are gone. Wolves will start eating all the elk next.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Joe Lewis <jjlewis006@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 6:25 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

If you were doing your job there would be plenty of elk to hunt. Quit squandering our natural resources.

Sent from my iPhone

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Michael Rankin <blacktailhunter063@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 25, 2021 6:18 AM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk pro

I am in favor of the controlled hunts proposed. The unit I have hunted the most over the last 9 years is one of the units with the low bull to cow numbers. Over the 2014 to 2019 period the bull to cow ratios has gone down nearly 50 percent. Over that same time period the number of archery hunters has gone up nearly 50 percent. The success rate in the unit has gone down nearly 50 percent over that same 2014 to 2019 time period.

I am waiting for the 2020 statistics to be released. There was definitely more people in 2020 than 2019. I know the area well, hunt a lot of days each season, and hunt very hard, and we get our chance at a bull each year. I'm not complaining about the number of hunters. I am just looking at all the data on the ODFW website, and am very concerned about the fast rise in hunter numbers, and corresponding drop in success rates and bull to cow ratios.

Please cut tag numbers across all weapon types in these units that are hurting.

A nearly 50 percent drop in bulls in some of these units over just a 3-5 year period seems like an emergency. I am really hoping tag numbers are not set based off the number of archers that hunted the unit in 2019 or 2020. That number of hunters appears to be very unsustainable.

I am an archery hunter that hunts NE Oregon every year.

Thank You

Sent from my iPhone

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Grant Rolles <granrolles4@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2021 5:07 PM  
**To:** ODFW.Wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Elk archery comments

Hey there,

As a archery hunter I'm happy to hear the objective of ODFW is to bring bull numbers up and to help not crowd units.

I support Oregon BHA proposal and hope that you guys take a look at it

Thank you  
Grant Rolles

Sent from my iPhone

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Travis Schneider <Travis.J.Schneider@state.or.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2021 4:23 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal

Why must we control archery elk HUNTERS. The first step in controlling our elk populations is predator control. It's sad to see the way this state is going with their hunting and fishing. We must control the predators first. It's just getting harder and harder to hunt in this state and archery is the only good thing going. If we make archery elk controlled after time it will be just like anything else the points keep will be horrible. Its inevitable that there will be points creep. It happens all over the western states. Do not control resident archery elk. If you control anything control out of state first. Not many states have a controlled archery season for residents. This is going to make it even harder to recruit youth into the sport of hunting. If we do not have our youth getting involved we will lose hunting all together. We as hunters are already small enough, we need recruitment. This proposal is going to make it harder and harder to go hunting with our family's every year, thus recruitment will go down for youth. Your general hunts make it sound good in all but are in areas that do not have much of an elk population and or access. Oregon elk numbers are doing ok so do not control your resident hunters. Thank you for your time and this must not happen to continue the tradition of hunting That we all love.

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Spencer Burdick <spencerburdick@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2021 4:13 PM  
**To:** Odfw.commission@state.or.us  
**Subject:** OTC General Season

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Forwarded to Wildlife

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Spencer Burdick** <spencerburdick@gmail.com>  
**Date:** Wed, Mar 24, 2021 at 9:16 AM  
**Subject:** OTC General Season  
**To:** [odfwcommission@state.or.us](mailto:odfwcommission@state.or.us) <[odfwcommission@state.or.us](mailto:odfwcommission@state.or.us)>

To whom it may concern,

Hello I am Spencer Burdick a resident of Washington state. I started hunting Oregon last year for the first time on general season tag opportunity! This was an amazing trip and we seen an over abundance of game compared to my home state of Washington of I would think around 2-1 on both the east and west side of the state. The model you guys are seeming to go with has an alarming resemblance to the model that has seemed to severely harm Washington's elk populations. Regardless of the elk population concerns taking hunt opportunities away from the public is not a way to go about handling the last of a dieing breed. Our hunting heritage is in severe danger at this time and looking into the future and feeding into death by a thousand cuts as "management tools" is ridiculous. I ask you please reconsider the new rule changes for 2022 as I as well as many others I know enjoy Oregon's great hunting opportunity! Thank you for your time. I would like to add a forward my good buddy Matt sent me as a proposal as well. Please reconsider!

As a passionate conservationist, I am writing you to express my recommendations for the upcoming proposed changes to our archery elk seasons. My recommendations have been created to meet the goals that ODFW has established for the 2022 archery season.

I first wanted to say thank you for the work you are doing! These changes will affect my favorite thing to do in life, and that is archery hunt. I am IN SUPPORT of the commission preserving as much hunting opportunity as possible. With that being said, I also know that there is a need to reduce hunter harvest & hunter density in units with ongoing management challenges. To do this, I am in favor of utilizing a similar strategy that the State of Oregon used back in 1979.

In 1979, General archery seasons were created when archery was less popular, technology was limited, and success rates were lower. The 30-day season that was

established in 1983, was created to draw some hunters away from the crowded rifle seasons.

Now our archery seasons are crowded. My recommendation is to utilize primitive hunting methods as a tool to draw other hunters away from the crowded seasons. This will maintain hunter opportunity, while achieving the goals of reducing over-harvest and overcrowding.

This recommendation would be just one small aspect of the overall changes. Traditional archery is currently less popular, technology is limited, and the success rate is lower than modern archery seasons. Creating Traditional archery opportunities will reduce hunter harvest rates, and lower hunter density while sustaining opportunity. The archery hunting opportunity will be available for anyone who is willing to limit their success rate by using primitive equipment. Traditional archery historically has always had less of an impact on wildlife.

By providing general traditional archery opportunities in our state, we will also be allowing for equitable utilization of our state's elk resources, and the seasons could be created in a way that is consistent and easy to understand.

Top 3 recommendations for utilizing Traditional archery to meet ODFW commission goals:

#1. Pick a region of units that is currently under management objective and has lower hunter participation to create a three year pilot program assessing the popularity and impact that primitive hunting has on wildlife. In this region, there would be a cluster of units in close proximity (Keating, Minam, Imnaha, Pine Creek, and Snake river). This region would be considered an unlimited quota general Traditional archery opportunity.

#2. Pick a single unit that is currently under management objectives and/or having crowding concerns (i.e. Desolation, Starkey, Silvies, N. Malheur, etc.) and make it an unlimited general traditional archery opportunity. This also could be a pilot program that would be revisited in three years to assess participation and effect on objectives.

#3. Create a 5-day traditional archery only, extended season to all controlled, and general archery elk seasons in Oregon. If you obtain any archery elk tag in the state, you will be given 5 extra days to hunt if you choose to use Traditional archery

Spencer Burdick

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Dale Webb <ikesays@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2021 3:00 PM  
**To:** odfw.wildlifeinfo@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Archery elk proposal.

First off, I would like to suggest this is not just an archery elk proposal, this proposal if run to its conclusion will be a proposal that will affect all hunters and the elk themselves. In light of the major shift in hunters from rifle to archery, which was manipulated by ODF&W controlled hunts formats (rifle), it is not a surprise to see in the stats that in many units now support more bull elk hunting opportunities to archers than rifle hunters. The premise though of shifting hunters into a lesser successful endeavor was based on a false premise, that archery success would remain at a 6-8% success rate (I attended those meetings). It is easily seen today that archery success rates have far exceeded expectation and contribute to breeding issues due to too much mature bull loss.

Anyone that is wanting to continue down the current path of over allocated bull elk harvest is ignoring basic science and is only concerning themselves with self-interest. Let's be clear, anyone with a basic understanding of elk population dynamics in concert with ODF&W herd composition counts can quickly observe that the bull component of Oregon's Rocky Mt. elk populations is being over exploited. Bull ratios in the mid-single digits to low teens are a key indicator of this. Simple computer modeling of the herd composition quickly points out that bull harvest is exceeding recruitment in many units. The current trajectory is not sustainable, banking on diminishing success rates is a poor tool with which to manage our herds.

I have said for a long time, you cannot manage what you do not control. This is a very simple concept, one that ODF&W has embraced for Mule deer for many years. The leap to managing Rocky Mt. elk archery harvest is a minor step, yeah there are a lot of people with self-interest that are screaming, but we owe it to the resource to manage our elk properly. We should also not be sugar coating what this proposal is really about, it is about lowering the harvest to regain bull ratio M.O.'s in many units that have chronically under performed. There is also probably some momentum to restore hunter opportunity between the different hunter groups as has been found in the hunter survey preferences.

What often gets lost in these contentious debates is what is the right thing to do for our herds. Many writing to you with their self-interest will want to ignore the fact that our Rocky Mt. elk herds are becoming less productive in regards to bull recruitment. In fact, in a cursory look at six units in the heart of this proposal it is easily seen that calf production is now half of what it was in the early 90's. Simply put, the bull recruitment has fallen in half, yet harvest pressure has basically remained the same as archers have become more and more effective. It has to

be pointed out; archery seasons affect the number of bulls remaining for the upcoming breeding season. ODF&W stats show that a large proportion of the few mature bulls are being harvested before they can contribute to the breeding population. What was a good idea back in the 90's is now biologically bankrupt today.

The proposal before you will help correct a lot of the current issues that face our Rocky Mt. elk herds. While the herds in many of our units are above population M.O., they are underperforming in bull recruitment and the research out of the Starkey Experimental Forest on elk indicates low numbers of mature bulls in the populations can be part of the reason why calf production underperforms. We need productive herds to provide the hunter opportunity, herds at population M.O. with poor calf production does not fill that need.

You will hear many self-interest complaints the rifle hunters harvest more elk; these complaints ignore the fact that a majority of these elk harvested are antlerless elk harvested in damage hunts. The need to push elk back off of private grounds during the winter should not be construed to be the same as a hunter's opportunity to pursue bull elk. With that said, in the units that are overpopulation M.O. archery antlerless take could be enhanced to allow a better distribution of these animals.

The issues before us today are not going away, kicking the can down the street is not a sign of true leadership. To address the issues before us we must gain control over harvest, at the minimum we must regain bull M.O.'s and I would suggest a review of said objectives in light of the Starkey research. The key to providing the maximum hunter opportunity lies in herd productivity. You will never satisfy all the hunter groups; the demands today are simply too great.

Dale Webb  
Vernonia Oregon

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Nolan Cook <cooknolan13@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2021 12:10 PM  
**To:** odfw.commission@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Oregon Archery Elk Proposal

To the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Commission:

As a passionate conservationist, I am writing you to express my recommendations for the upcoming proposed changes to our archery elk seasons. My recommendations have been created to meet the goals that ODFW has established for the 2022 archery season.

I first wanted to say thank you for the work you are doing! These changes will affect my favorite thing to do in life, and that is archery hunt. I support most of the current commission proposal with a few additional ideas.

I am always in support of preserving as much archery hunting opportunity as possible. With that being said, I also know that there is a need to reduce hunter harvest & hunter density in units with ongoing management challenges. To do this, I am in favor of utilizing a similar strategy that the State of Oregon used back in 1979.

In 1979, General archery seasons were created when archery was less popular, technology was limited, and success rates were lower. The 30-day season that was established in 1983, was created to draw some hunters away from the crowded rifle seasons.

Now our general archery seasons are crowded in many units. My recommendation is to utilize primitive hunting methods as a tool to draw other hunters away from the crowded seasons. This will maintain hunter opportunity, while achieving the goals of reducing over-harvest and overcrowding. This recommendation would be just one small aspect of the overall changes.

Another change that I support is controlling non resident tag numbers for all archery seasons. There will most likely be an increase in nonresident hunters coming to Oregon as over the counter opportunities continue to decline throughout the west. If we don't control non resident tag allotments, we will be susceptible to more overcrowding issues in the future.

One last change I would like to add to the current proposal is making hunters choose their weapon. If you apply for a controlled rifle tag you must hunt a general rifle season if you don't draw or vice versa. Choosing guys to pick their weapon will help with many of the problems we are seeing with overcrowding.

Traditional archery is currently less popular, technology is limited, and the success rates is lower than modern archery seasons. Creating Traditional archery opportunities will reduce hunter harvest rates, and lower hunter density while sustaining opportunity. The archery hunting opportunity will be available for anyone who is willing to limit their success rate by using primitive equipment. Traditional archery historically has always had less of an impact on wildlife. This will also be allowing for equitable utilization of our state's elk resources, and the seasons could be created in a way that is consistent and easy to understand.

Top 3 recommendations for utilizing Traditional archery to meet ODFW commission goals:

#1. Pick a region of units that is currently under management objective and has lower hunter participation to create a three year pilot program assessing the popularity and impact that primitive hunting has on wildlife. In this region, there would be a cluster of units in close proximity (Keating, Minam, Imnaha, Pine Creek, and Snake river). This region would be considered an unlimited quota general Traditional archery opportunity.

#2. Pick a single unit that is currently under management objectives and/or having crowding concerns (i.e. Desolation, Starkey, Silvies, N. Malheur, etc.) and make it an unlimited general traditional archery opportunity. This also could be a pilot program that would be revisited in three years to assess participation and effect on objectives.

#3. Create a 5-day traditional archery only, extended season to all controlled, and general archery elk seasons in Oregon. If you obtain any archery elk tag in the state, you will be given 5 extra days to hunt if you choose to use Traditional archery equipment.

Please Consider utilizing Traditional archery, and my other recommendations as a tool to meet your current objectives.

Sincerely,

Nolan Cook

**BORISCH Roxann B \* ODFW**

---

**From:** Brandon todd <brandonktodd@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 24, 2021 10:52 AM  
**To:** Odfw.commission@state.or.us  
**Subject:** Oregon Archery Elk Proposal

Good Morning,

As a passionate conservationist of our wild resources, I am writing you to express my recommendations for the upcoming proposed changes to our archery elk seasons. My recommendations help to meet the goals that ODFW has established for the 2022 archery season.

I first wanted to say thank you for the work you are doing! These changes will affect my favorite thing to do in life, and that is archery hunt. I am IN SUPPORT of the commission preserving as much hunting opportunity as possible. With that being said, I also know that there is a need to reduce hunter harvest & hunter density in units with ongoing management challenges. To do this, I am in favor of utilizing a similar strategy that the State of Oregon used back in 1979.

In 1979, General archery seasons were created when archery was less popular, technology was limited, and success rates were lower. The 30-day seasons that were established in 1983, were created to draw some hunters away from the crowded rifle seasons.

Now our archery seasons are crowded. My recommendation is to utilize primitive hunting methods as a tool to draw other hunters away from the crowded seasons. This will maintain hunter opportunity, while achieving the goals of reducing over-harvest and overcrowding.

This recommendation would be just one small aspect of the overall changes. Traditional archery is currently less popular, technology is limited, and the success rate is lower than modern archery seasons. Creating Traditional archery opportunities will reduce hunter harvest rates, and lower hunter density while sustaining opportunity. The archery hunting opportunity will be available for anyone who is willing to limit their success rate by using primitive equipment. Traditional archery historically has always had less of an impact on wildlife.

By providing general traditional archery opportunities in our state, we will also be allowing for equitable utilization of our state's elk resources, and the seasons could be created in a way that is consistent and easy to understand.

Top 3 recommendations for utilizing Traditional archery to meet ODFW commission goals:

#1. Pick a region of units that is currently under management objective and has lower hunter participation to create a three year pilot program assessing the popularity and impact that primitive hunting has on wildlife. In this region, there would be a cluster of units in close proximity (Keating, Minam, Imnaha, Pine Creek, and Snake river). This region would be considered an unlimited quota general Traditional archery opportunity.

#2. Pick a single unit that is currently under management objectives and/or having crowding concerns (i.e. Desolation, Starkey, Silvies, N. Malheur, etc.) and make it an unlimited general traditional archery opportunity. This also could be a pilot program that would be revisited in three years to assess participation and effect on objectives.

#3. Create a 5-day traditional archery only, extended season to all controlled, and general archery elk seasons in Oregon. If you obtain any archery elk tag in the state, you will be given 5 extra days to hunt if you choose to use Traditional archery equipment.

Please Consider utilizing Traditional archery as a tool to meet your current objectives.

Sincerely and Respectfully,

Brandon Todd