

# **Exhibit H**

**Public Correspondence Received as of  
May 31, 2023**





**CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF  
COOS, LOWER UMPQUA AND SIUSLAW INDIANS  
TRIBAL GOVERNMENT**

1245 Fulton Avenue - Coos Bay, OR 97420

Telephone: (541)888-9577 Toll Free 1-888-280-0726 Fax: (541)888-2853

November 22, 2022

ODFW Commission  
Director Curt Melcher  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302

**SENT VIA EMAIL**

**RE: Siletz Tribe Hunting and Fishing Agreement**

Dear Commission Members and Director Melcher:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians ("CTCLUSI") on the proposed agreement for hunting, fishing, and trapping by the Siletz Tribe

CTCLUSI strongly supports efforts of the State to recognize the hunting and fishing rights of Tribes and to develop co-management agreements for cooperative management of natural resources that are interest to both Tribal and State governments. It is critical that both Tribal and State agencies work on a government-to-government basis to manage fish and wildlife to ensure that there are healthy and harvestable levels of resources across the State. This agreement is a good example of how these efforts can be implemented.

Accordingly, CTCLUSI supports without reservation the proposed Siletz Tribe agreement.

We appreciate your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,


Brad Kneaper, Chair  
The Confederated Tribes of Coos,  
Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians

cc: Dustin Buehler, Governor's Office  
Sarah Weston, Governor's Office  
Roxann Borisch, ODFW

**Public Correspondence Received for  
December 16, 2022  
Commission Meeting**

*(Exhibit Cancelled)*





# COQUILLE INDIAN TRIBE

3050 Tremont Street North Bend, OR 97459  
Phone: (541) 756-0904 Fax: (541) 756-0847  
www.coquilletribe.org

November 22, 2022

Mary Wahl, Chair  
Oregon Fish & Wildlife Commission  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302

RE: Proposed Cooperative Management / Hunting, Fishing, Trapping & Gathering  
Agreement with the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

Dear Chair Wahl,

Dai s'la! I would like to provide the Coquille Tribe's comments on the proposed agreement ("MOU") between the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians ("Siletz Tribe") and ODFW regarding the Siletz Tribe's exercise of hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering rights.

The Coquille Tribe supports the Siletz MOU and its associated rulemaking. The Coquille and Siletz Tribes have a long, positive and productive track record of collaboration on multiple matters. Although we do not anticipate that this MOU will lead to any problems between us, we are confident that we can resolve future issues on a government-to-government basis.

The Siletz Tribes have been an excellent partner for the Coquille Tribe, and we fully anticipate that the proposed MOU will benefit all Oregonians, facilitate tribal self-governance and create healthier ecosystems. We urge you to approve this MOU.

Thank you for your consideration of the Coquille Indian Tribe's comments.

Masi!

Brenda Meade, Chairperson  
Coquille Indian Tribe

Cc: Confederated Tribes of Siletz  
Craig Dorsay, Siletz Tribal Attorney  
Curt Melcher, ODFW

ODFW

NOV 28 2022

Director's Office

Brian McLachlan  
Portland, Oregon  
November 26, 2022

Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission  
ODFW Director Curt Melcher  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, Oregon 97302  
*Via electronic mail to* [odfw.commission@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:odfw.commission@odfw.oregon.gov)

Dear Commissioners and Director Melcher:

I write to provide comments regarding the proposed Memorandum of Agreement between the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians (Siletz Tribe) and the State of Oregon (Siletz MOA), and the proposed Memorandum of Agreement between the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians (Cow Creek Band) and the State of Oregon (Cow Creek MOA), both concerning the exercise of hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering activities and for cooperative management of natural and wildlife resources.<sup>1</sup>

I support in principle ODFW entering into agreements with the Siletz Tribe and the Cow Creek Band to cooperate on fish and wildlife management issues and to define the exercise of each Tribe's hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering activities. I recognize and acknowledge the grave historical injustice and mistreatment occasioned upon the Tribes and the ancestors of current Tribal members through euro-American colonialism and settlement, and I respect the Tribes' dedication to preserving their cultures and identities. I am hopeful these agreements will assist the Tribes in doing so, while in addition make positive contributions to the conservation of Oregon's fish and wildlife, which will benefit all Oregonians.

I nonetheless have concerns about the proposed MOAs, including the vague and ill-defined allocation provisions, the authority of the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission to enter into these agreements, the impact these agreements could have on fishing and hunting opportunities for non-tribal Oregon citizens, and the ability of the State to exit the Siletz MOA should pending Federal legislation be enacted.

In order to protect the present and future interests of Oregon's citizens, I request the Commission take the following two actions before, and as a condition to, approving the MOAs.

---

<sup>1</sup> These two proposed MOAs are similar to the Memorandum of Agreement between the Coquille Indian Tribe and the State of Oregon (Coquille MOA) entered into earlier this year. Accordingly, I hereby incorporate by reference my June 14, 2022, comments regarding the Coquille MOA (attached).

- (1) Request and obtain written assurance from the Oregon Department of Justice/Office of the Attorney General that introduced Federal legislation, if enacted, will not affect the State's ability to unilaterally terminate without cause the proposed Siletz MOA pursuant to its terms; and,
- (2) Amend both MOAs to clarify that the annual amounts, limits, areas, and methods of Tribal harvest (a) will be consistent with the State's Wildlife Policy ORS 496.012; and (b) will reflect the parties' intention that overall fishing and hunting activities by tribal members will not increase as a result of the MOA, and that no more than small reductions in opportunities for the general public to take a few species with limited population sizes may be created to accommodate tribal activities.

The first item concerns introduced Federal legislation that would provide a process for the Siletz Tribe and State of Oregon to modify or rescind the May 2, 1980 consent decree and amend or replace the associated agreement defining the Tribe's hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering rights under Federal law. *See* Senate Bill S. 3123; House Bill H.R. 6345. In pertinent part, the bills anticipate successor agreements between the Siletz Tribe and the State and provide that such agreements "shall remain in effect until and unless replaced, amended, or otherwise modified by 1 or more successor [ ] agreements" and "may be amended from time to time by mutual consent" of the Tribe and the State. *Id.* (emphasis added).

I am concerned that under Federal Indian law canons of construction, the U.S. Constitution's federal law supremacy clause, and Congress' plenary authority over tribal affairs, this legislation, if enacted, may be interpreted to preempt the State's ability to unilaterally terminate the Siletz MOA without cause as expressly provided for in the proposed MOA.

As you will recall, earlier this year the Commission required the Coquille MOA to be amended to expressly and unambiguously provide for either party to unilaterally terminate the MOA without cause. In my view, this is an absolutely critical component of the proposed MOAs which protects the interests of the State of Oregon and its citizens, and without which the Commission should not approve the proposed agreement.<sup>2</sup>

The second item concerns the State's and Tribes' understanding and expectation regarding the amount and extent of annual tribal hunting and fishing activities and the potential impact of those activities on the general public's hunting and fishing opportunities.

Tribal hunting and fishing activities in the Northwest have been subject to disputes and divisive litigation for well over a century. In order to avoid future conflict and disagreements concerning the MOAs, it is essential that the State's and Tribes' understandings and expectations concerning tribal hunting and fishing activities are clearly and accurately expressed and memorialized.

---

<sup>2</sup> I withdrew my opposition to the Coquille MOA after it was amended to provide for unilateral termination without cause.

Unfortunately, the proposed MOAs contain ambiguous and ill-defined standards and terms governing the amounts and extent of tribal hunting and fishing activities.<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, the State, through ODFW in its Notices of Proposed Rulemaking, has affirmatively represented to Oregon's citizens that under the MOAs (a) tribal hunting and fishing activities are not anticipated to increase, (b) public impacts will be minimal, (c) businesses which provide goods and services to hunters and anglers are not expected to be impacted, and (d) no more than possibly small reductions to the general public's fishing and hunting opportunities are expected to result. *See* Notices of Proposed Rulemaking (10.18.22) for Siletz MOA and Cow Creek MOA at 2.

Because the proposed MOAs currently contain no standards or terms that actually support or otherwise provide a basis for these public representations, I request the Commission require the proposed MOAs to be amended prior to approval to expressly reflect these expectations and understandings in order that the State and Tribes are aligned and united in their understanding and interpretation of the agreements.

If the Tribes' share these expectations, they should have no objection to making the requested amendments. If they do not share these expectations and object to the amendments, then the State's and Tribes' understandings are not aligned, and the MOAs should not be approved.

Thank you for considering my comments. If you have any questions or would like to discuss my concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Brian McLachlan

---

<sup>3</sup> The standards and terms used are nearly the same as in the Coquille MOA. *Cf.* Coquille MOA § 3.b *with* Siletz MOA § 5.b.iii *and* Cow Creek MOA § 3.b. My June 14, 2022, comments discuss the deficiencies and other problems with these standards and terms.

Brian McLachlan  
Portland, Oregon  
June 14, 2022

Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission  
c/o Michelle Tate  
Director's Office  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, Oregon 97302

Dear Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

Please accept my comments below regarding the proposed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Between the Coquille Indian Tribe and the State of Oregon, through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (Exhibit C to the Commission's June 17, 2022, Meeting Agenda).

I support in principle ODFW entering into an agreement with the Coquille Tribe for cooperative fish and wildlife management and to define the exercise of the Tribe's and its members' hunting, fishing, and gathering activities. I understand the Tribe has made, and will continue to make, positive contributions that are of benefit to Oregon's fish and wildlife and to all Oregonians. I also recognize and acknowledge the grave historical injustice and mistreatment occasioned upon the Tribe and the ancestors of current Tribal members through euro-American colonialism and settlement and respect the Tribe's dedication to preserving its culture and identity.

Based on my reading of the text of the MOA, I nonetheless have significant concerns about the proposed agreement and urge the Commission to not approve the MOA as drafted at this time.

The proposed MOA is styled as a legally binding, judicially enforceable contract. It is perpetual, with no end date, and appears to require both parties' consent to be terminated. The substantive standards applicable to tribal harvest levels and limits are vague, may significantly curtail ODFW's statutorily delegated conservation and management authority and discretion, and do not factor in potential impacts to non-tribal hunters and anglers. Based on the text, I am concerned the MOA could foreseeably be judicially interpreted in a way that results in substantial negative impacts to non-tribal Oregon citizens who participate in hunting, fishing, and gathering activities, and which significantly constrains the policy choices available to the State as a political body.

Due to inadequate time to provide more complete and thorough comments, I focus here on select concerns I have with the proposed MOA, and I urge the Commission to take more time to consider and evaluate this profoundly important agreement.

**1. As a Legally Binding and Judicially Enforceable Contract, the MOA Requires Very Careful Scrutiny**

The proposed MOA is styled as a contract.<sup>1</sup> It is thus a mutual exchange of promises that legally obligates the parties to perform according to its terms and standards. And the express terms of the MOA make the parties' obligations judicially enforceable.<sup>2</sup> They also make the MOA and its attendant obligations perpetual (i.e., with no end date)<sup>3</sup> and appear to condition termination of the agreement upon the mutual consent of both parties.<sup>4</sup>

While, as a practical matter, I assume ODFW and the Tribe will work together in good faith to implement the MOA, **because of the legally binding nature of the MOA, the Commission has a duty to the citizens of this State to evaluate the MOA assuming the Tribe will demand the full extent of the contractual rights provided to it under the terms and standards of the proposed MOA.**

But for the MOA (1) appearing to require mutual consent of the parties to terminate it, (2) waiving the State's sovereign immunity, and (3) making the MOA judicially enforceable through declaratory and injunctive relief, I would not be writing this letter to you today. Absent these terms, ODFW and the Coquille Tribe would have the opportunity to cooperatively implement the MOA and attempt to work out any issues that arose in a manner that is equitable to all citizens of the State as well as to the members of the Coquille Tribe, knowing that if the terms of the MOA proved to be unworkable or inequitable, that both parties would have adequate incentives to negotiate a mutually acceptable compromise. In that case, the MOA would truly be a perpetual "voluntary" co-operative management agreement, and the State

---

<sup>1</sup> MOA at 12 ("The Parties agree that this Agreement is a contract . . .")

<sup>2</sup> Id. at 11.

<sup>3</sup> Id. at 14 ("The Parties intention upon entering this Agreement is that it is perpetual").

<sup>4</sup> Id.

would not be potentially “locked-in” to an agreement that may be interpreted in a way that is detrimental to the interests of its citizens.

But the MOA is instead drafted as a legally binding and judicially enforceable “perpetual” contract, and so I feel compelled to provide these comments and to urge the Commission to take more time to understand the ramifications of this proposed agreement.

## **2. May ODFW Unilaterally Terminate the MOA?**

The proposed MOA states: “Amendments/Termination. This Agreement can be amended or terminated in writing by mutual consent.”<sup>5</sup>

While this clause is somewhat ambiguous, it nonetheless suggests the parties may intend that termination of the MOA requires the written consent of both ODFW (on behalf of the State) and the Coquille Tribe.

**Commissioners – please ask your counsel directly the following question (and please do so in a public setting so that the public can understand the terms of the MOA): *may the Fish and Wildlife Commission unilaterally terminate the MOA at will?***

I suggest you also ask an official of the Coquille Tribe the same question to ensure that both parties have the same understanding of the termination clause.

If both ODFW and the Tribe understand the MOA to allow ODFW to unilaterally terminate it at will, then I strongly suggest the MOA be revised to clearly articulate this understanding (e.g., by revising the termination clause to read: “This Agreement may be terminated unilaterally by either party at will at any time”). If this revision is made to the MOA, my further concerns described below with other sections of the MOA are mitigated by knowing that ODFW may exit the MOA if it

---

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* Under section 13 (Effective Date) the MOA indicates the agreement will remain in effect “only so long as both the implementing rules and resolutions remain effective.” *Id.* This suggests the agreement could become ineffective should a party repeal applicable implementing rules and resolutions. It is unclear to me how this provision works in connection with the Termination clause.

proves to be unworkable, inequitable, or otherwise unduly burdensome or problematic to the State's interests.<sup>6</sup>

If, however, the parties do not understand the MOA to allow ODFW to unilaterally terminate the agreement at will, then I request the Commission to not approve it as currently drafted.

**3. If Termination Requires the Consent of Both Parties, the MOA May Impair Core Governmental Powers and Functions of Future Commissions, Administrations, and potentially Legislatures, and Thereby Undermine the Democratic Process**

In our constitutional democratic system, the power to govern is derived from the collective consent of the governed. *See* OR Const. Art. 1, sec. 1; United States Declaration of Independence. Every two, four, and six years (sometimes more often) we have elections, where the People express their collective will and elect representatives and officials to carry out the business of governing. Often, as a result, the leadership, laws, and policies of the State change. At set intervals, the membership of the Fish and Wildlife Commission changes as well. The ability of the People – here the citizens of Oregon – to change their elected officials, and for elected officials to change law and policy (and Commission membership and policy), is a core element of our democratic process and a fundamental attribute of the State's sovereignty.

Contracts which operate to legally bind or impair the discretion of future administrations, legislatures, or commissions in their exercise of governmental powers and functions (as distinguished from proprietary activities) can undermine this democratic process as well as raise separation of powers concerns.<sup>7</sup> As a general

---

<sup>6</sup> I would prefer the State's waiver of sovereign immunity and provisions allowing for judicial enforcement also be removed from the MOA. But if the State (through ODFW) has the power to unilaterally terminate the agreement at will at any time, this would allow the State to effectively avoid judicial enforcement by exercising its right to terminate the MOA if a lawsuit were to be filed. Obviously, you should ask your counsel about this.

<sup>7</sup> For example, if an agreement explicitly or implicitly binds, limits, or otherwise impairs the discretion committed to ODFW by statute (such as setting fishing and hunting bag limits and seasons), and is judicially enforceable, the exercise of that discretion, rather than residing in the agency, and ultimately in this Commission, becomes subject to court approval or disapproval, which may undermine the

principle, political bodies may not contractually bind their successors with respect to governmental or legislative powers (such as the rulemaking authority of this Commission).<sup>8,9</sup>

By statute, fish and wildlife are the “property of the State.” ORS 498.002. The State holds and manages these public resources (prior to their lawful capture) in its sovereign capacity for the benefit of all State citizens. *Monroe v. Withycombe*, 84 Or. 328, 165 P. 227 (Or. 1917). Management of fish and wildlife, including the allocation of harvest privileges through the establishment of seasons, bag limits, and

---

Legislature’s intent in delegating this power and discretion to the agency and the Commission.

<sup>8</sup> I have not had sufficient time to research Oregon law regarding this issue. As always, I suggest the Commission seek advice from its counsel about this concern. See *Board of Klamath County Comm’rs v. Select County Employees*, 148 Or.App. 48, 939 P.2d 80 (1997) (“an outgoing elected governing body of finite tenure which enter[s] into a contract involving a ‘governmental’ function [can]not bind a subsequently elected body.’...”) quoting *Graves v. Arnado*, 307 Or. 358, 364, 768 P.2d 910 (1989)); see also *Miles v. City of Baker*, 152 Or. 87, 92-93, 51 P.2d 1047 (1935) (“If the work provided for in plaintiff’s alleged contract is a governmental function, then the great weight of authority is to the effect that the outgoing council could not bind its successors in such a contract.”); *Johnson v. City of Pendleton*, 131 Or. 46, 55, 280 P. 873 (1929) (city possesses no power to enter contract binding city for all time to make annual levy for specific purpose, because “[u]pon matters which are purely governmental in their nature ... no legislative act will bind a subsequent legislature.”); see also generally, Washington State Office of the Attorney General, *Power Of County Legislative Authority To Enter Into Contract That Binds The County Legislative Authority In The Future*, AGO 2012 No. 4 – May 15, 2012, accessed 6/13/22 at <https://www.atg.wa.gov/ago-opinions/power-county-legislative-authority-enter-contract-binds-county-legislative-authority>; United States Department of Justice, *Authority of the United States to Enter Settlements Limiting the Future Exercise of Executive Branch Discretion*, Memorandum Opinion for the Associate Attorney General, June 15, 1999, accessed 6/13/22 at <https://www.justice.gov/file/19516/download>; Memorandum for All Assistant Attorneys General and All United States Attorneys, from Edwin Meese III, United States Attorney General, *Re Department Policy regarding Consent decrees and Settlement Agreements* (Mar. 13, 1986), accessed 6/13/22 at <https://www.archives.gov/files/news/samuel-alito/accession-060-89-1/Acc060-89-1-box9-memoAyer-LSWG-1986.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> *But see* Oregon Constitution, Art. 1, sec. 21 (“No [ ] law impairing the obligation of contracts shall ever be passed, . . .”); *Hughes v. State*, 838 P.2d 1018, 314 Or. 1 (Or. 1992).

associated regulations, is thus a quintessential governmental (i.e., legislative) function as an exercise of the State's police power. *See id.* The legislature has delegated and committed this authority and attendant discretion to the Fish and Wildlife Commission. *See* ORS 496.012; ORS 496.138; ORS 496.146.

While I understand and respect that the Coquille Tribe asserts fishing and hunting rights arising under federal law (e.g., treaties, aboriginal title, inherent sovereignty), I am not aware of any settled and controlling judicial determination or legal precedent concerning the Tribe's assertions. Absent this, it seems problematic for ODFW, on behalf of the State, to agree to terms that potentially perpetually contractually bind and curtail its statutorily delegated governmental authority and discretion in the management of the State's fish and wildlife. As discussed below, my concern is that the terms of the MOA could be interpreted to do precisely this.

#### **4. The MOA's Legally Binding Standards Are Ambiguous and Vague; Constrain ODFW's Management Authority and Discretion; and Do Not Adequately Protect the Interests of Oregon's Citizens**

The proposed MOA states that it "provides agreed-upon standards for the Tribe to exercise such harvest rights and to determine tribal harvest levels in cooperation with ODFW." MOA at 4-5 (emphasis added). As discussed above, the MOA makes these "standards" legally binding and judicially enforceable through waiver of the State's sovereign immunity.

While I trust the parties are entering into this agreement in good faith and with the best intentions to amicably work out any differences that may arise, fish and wildlife management in general, and especially tribal fishing and hunting rights and activities in the Northwest have a long history of controversy and litigation. Indeed, the parties here recognize that disputes are foreseeable by including a dispute resolution section in the MOA and by making the MOA judicially enforceable. Accordingly, **as Commissioners, you are duty bound to protect the interests of the State of Oregon and its citizens by very carefully evaluating the sufficiency of the terms, standards, and obligations set forth in the MOA in an effort to anticipate how these terms may be interpreted and enforced by a court of law should a dispute escalate to that level.**

The only substantive (as distinguished from procedural) tribal harvest standards I can find in the MOA are set forth in one brief sentence:

“The limits and areas of the Tribe’s ceremonial and subsistence harvest will be set annually or seasonally by mutual agreement of the Parties based on the [1] best available scientific data of [2] estimated availability, [3] escapement goals, [4] tribal needs, and [5] conservation necessity.”

MOA at 5 (emphasis and numbering added).

In my view, these “standards” are vague, ambiguous, ill-defined, impair ODFW’s statutorily delegated management authority and discretion, do not adequately protect the interests of the State or its citizens, and set up potential conflicts with ODFW’s statutory mandate.

#### **A. “Estimated Availability”**

This “standard” is inherently ambiguous. I have found nothing in the proposed MOA that defines “availability,” nor any criteria to be used to determine whether fish or game are indeed “available” for tribal harvest. Does it refer to mere presence, i.e., whether a target species is present (i.e., “available”) in a certain location? Does it require a target population’s abundance to exceed some conservation or other threshold? For instance, steelhead might be “available,” i.e., present, in a specific river, but their abundance may be lower than the State’s conservation objectives. Would these steelhead nonetheless be “available” for tribal harvest? And how is ODFW staff in administering the agreement supposed to determine “estimated availability”? Does harvest by non-tribal hunters and anglers (e.g., traditional seasons and bag limits) factor into this determination? If there is a dispute and a subsequent lawsuit, what criteria will ODFW tell the court it should employ to determine whether the “estimated availability” standard is met?

It is axiomatic that contractually binding standards should be well-defined. Ask yourself, and then ask your staff, by the terms of the MOA, what does “estimated availability” mean, how is “availability” defined, and what criteria is to be used by the parties to determine “availability”? Then ask Coquille Tribal officials the same questions. And then revise the agreement to ensure the mutual understanding of the parties is clearly articulated in the MOA.

#### **B. “Escapement Goals”**

Escapement goals are biological reference points generally employed in fisheries management that refer to the number of fish that “escape” harvest (and other sources of mortality) to complete spawning activities. Fishery management plans apply the concept of escapement goals in different ways. For instance, an

escapement goal may be based on the spawning abundance that, on average, is thought to produce the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) for a population or management unit. Alternately, an escapement goal may be set at a critical biological threshold below which there is increased risk to the viability of a population. Escapement goals may also be expressed based on recovery objectives, such as employed in ODFW's Coastal Multispecies Management Plan. Escapement goals sometimes include only natural-origin fish (i.e., "wild fish"), and other times include hatchery-origin fish spawning naturally. Hatchery operations also have escapement goals in the form of broodstock collection objectives. Moreover, some fisheries are managed without set escapement goals, such as by using exploitation rates or other metrics. For many populations, the State simply does not collect enough data to manage fisheries by escapement goals.

My point here is that this "standard," and how it will be employed in practice, is exceedingly vague and potentially subject to disagreement. What if the Tribe contends that the escapement goal for wild steelhead on a certain river ought to be set at the MSY reference point (in order for the Tribe to maximize its interest in harvest), but that conflicts with ODFW's traditional management approach and/or the Commission's policy as set forth in the Coastal Multispecies Management Plan? This of course begs the question – if there is a disagreement, who decides what approach to employ? And if this disagreement escalates into the courts, what criteria is a judge supposed to use to determine if this escapement goal standard is satisfied if the parties have not even agreed on what the escapement goal is, or by what method it will be set?

### C. "Tribal Needs"

Like the standards above, the term "Tribal Needs" is not defined in any concrete way and is thus impractically vague and ambiguous. If the Tribe tells ODFW it plans to harvest 250 elk, or 4000 Chinook salmon (or whatever, just pick a number), in a given year in order to satisfy Tribal ceremonial and subsistence "needs", how is ODFW supposed to assess whether this number is in excess of "tribal needs." Is ODFW supposed to tell tribal officials that tribal members don't need so much elk meat or salmon this year, or that the tribe doesn't need to hold certain ceremonies? Would any such suggestion not rightly be viewed as offensive by Tribe? And isn't "tribal need" inherently only determinable by the Tribe itself?

While I assume good intentions and that the Tribe will determine its harvest needs in good faith, the MOA is nonetheless a legally binding and judicially enforceable contract. Clear, well-defined contract terms are essential to set the parties

expectations, define discernible practical limits, and facilitate successful implementation.

#### D. “Conservation Necessity”

The term “conservation necessity” is a legal term of art used in the context of federal tribal treaty fishing and hunting rights. In the Northwest, it describes principles established under judicial decisions in *U.S. v. Oregon* and *U.S. v. Washington* that outline under what conditions a state may regulate treaty fishing activities. It is also incorporated into Federal policy.<sup>10</sup>

In general, where a Tribe has fishing rights guaranteed under a federal treaty, a “state may only regulate treaty fishing when reasonable and necessary for conservation, provided: reasonable regulation of non-Indian activities is insufficient to meet the conservation purpose, the regulations are the least restrictive possible, the regulations do not discriminate against Indians, and voluntary tribal measures are not adequate.”<sup>11</sup>

**Commissioners – please ask ODFW staff and your counsel if the term “conservation necessity” as used in the MOA is intended to have the same meaning as I have described in the above paragraph.**

If not, then to avoid confusion and misinterpretation, it should be removed, and another term or phrase should be used in its place.

On the other hand, if the meaning of “conservation necessity” as used in the MOA is intended by the parties to have the same meaning as used in the context described above, then I strongly urge the Commission to thoroughly discuss with counsel the ramifications of using this term (there is a considerable body of case law discussing

---

<sup>10</sup> See Final Environmental Impact Statement to Analyze Impacts of NOAA’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) joining as a signatory to the new *U.S. v. Oregon* Management Agreement for the Years 2018-2027 at 1 (*U.S. v. Or.* FEIS); see also June 1997 Secretarial Order No. 3206 entitled “American Indian Tribal Rights, Federal-Tribal Trust Responsibilities, and the Endangered Species Act”, issued jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

<sup>11</sup> *U.S. v. Or.* FEIS at 1.

the term and associated principles<sup>12</sup>), including how use of this standard may limit and curtail ODFW management and conservation authority, what burdens it may place on ODFW, and whether it may impermissibly impair the authority and discretion committed to ODFW by statute.

I am concerned that by using the term “conservation necessity” the parties may be importing a significant body of federal case law into interpretation of the MOA’s “standards.” Moreover, by using this term, ODFW may be in effect agreeing to limit and constrain the State’s sovereign authority and discretion in the management and conservation of fish and wildlife in a way analogous to the limitations and constraints imposed on the State by federal treaties with Indian Tribes in the Columbia Basin.

Does the Fish and Wildlife Commission intend to do this?

Does the Fish and Wildlife Commission have authority (delegated from the Legislature) to do this?

Moreover, this “standard” is especially concerning when used as a basis to determine the Tribe’s harvest limits and areas. It suggests that in negotiating tribal harvest limits and areas, prior to a limit being imposed on the Tribe’s fishing and hunting activities, ODFW has the burden to show that it cannot address conservation concerns by restricting non-tribal fishing and hunting activities. This appears to implicitly preference tribal fishing and hunting over non-tribal fishing and hunting when it comes to meeting conservation requirements.

If the Tribe and ODFW cannot agree on a tribal harvest limit and the issue is subsequently litigated, this “conservation necessity” standard could result in a legal burden being placed on ODFW to show (1) reasonable regulation of non-Indian activities is insufficient to meet the applicable conservation objective; (2) the agency’s proposed tribal harvest limits are the least restrictive possible, (3) the agency’s proposed tribal harvest limits do not discriminate against Tribal members, and (4) voluntary tribal measures are not adequate. If so, this would be a significant legal burden to overcome. Faced with this burden, ODFW staff may be more likely to concede to tribal demands during negotiations and in this way potentially compromise the interests of non-tribal hunters and anglers.

---

<sup>12</sup> See e.g., *Minnesota et al. v. Mille Lacs Band of Chippewa Indians et al.*, 526 U.S. 172, 205 (1999); *U.S. v. State of Washington*, 143 F.Supp.2d 1218 (W.D. Wash. 2001).

## **E. The Missing Standard – Non-Tribal Harvest and Use**

Fish and wildlife resources are finite. And, unfortunately, the abundance of many species is declining. Demand is inevitably greater than supply, and allocation is often a zero-sum game. Greater allocation of harvest opportunity to one group commonly results in less for another group. This is the reality of modern fish and wildlife management.

Conspicuously absent from the standards upon which tribal harvest limits and areas are based is any mention of non-tribal harvest or recreational use of fish or wildlife resources.

Was this omission intentional?

Given ODFW's legislative mandate to provide optimum recreational and aesthetic benefits for present and future generations of Oregon's citizens, *see* ORS 496.012, non-tribal use and harvest must be considered in determining Tribal harvest limits, areas, and seasons.

When there is a dispute involving a contract, courts look first and primarily to the express written terms of the contract to evaluate the obligations of the parties. Factors that are not included in the express terms will often be disregarded.

Here, the contractual standards governing tribal harvest limits and areas do not factor in non-tribal harvest and use needs. This appears to conflict with the agency's statutory mandate. I strongly suggest the MOA "standards" be revised to expressly include the agency's complete statutory mandate – including in particular the mandate to optimize recreational and aesthetic use for all Oregonians.

### **5. ODFW Staff's Agenda Item Summary Fails to Describe Potential Impacts to Recreational Hunting and Fishing**

ODFW staff's agenda item summary indicates the department expects the MOA to "result in a negligible reduction in revenue and a negligible change in the impact of hunting and fishing to existing fish and wildlife populations." Exhibit C, Attachment 1, at 3. While this passage describes expected impacts to ODFW's revenue and to fish and wildlife populations, a close reading reveals it does not describe the expected impacts to non-tribal recreational fishing and hunting opportunities.

ODFW is legislatively mandated to optimize recreational and aesthetic benefits for the present and future citizens of the state. ORS 496.012. As Commissioners charged with this legislative mandate, you have an obligation to ask the following question of ODFW staff, and demand that staff provide as clear, direct, and detailed an answer as possible: *what impacts to non-tribal recreational hunting and fishing opportunities are expected if the MOA is approved?*

## 6. The MOA Should be Revised to Protect State Interests Through Exclusion Section Language

The MOA states that “Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to diminish, waive, limit or otherwise affect ancestral, aboriginal, treaty, statutory, equitable or other rights of the Tribe.” MOA sec. 6.f at 12. In order to protect the interests of the State, I suggest the sentence be revised to include the following additions and revisions (in bold): “Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to diminish, waive, limit, **expand, acknowledge, recognize** or otherwise affect ancestral, aboriginal, treaty, statutory, equitable or other rights of, **or asserted by**, the Tribe.”

As I understand it, the Coquille Tribe’s asserted rights to fish and hunt have not been legally determined by a court of law. ODFW, acting on behalf of the State, should therefore include precautionary language in the MOA to ensure that nothing in the MOA may be used against the State’s interests should a legal action concerning the Tribe’s asserted rights be commenced.

## 7. Equal Privileges and Immunities


I suggest the Commission, if it has not done so already, request the Attorney General’s office for advice and counsel concerning the risk of the MOA running afoul of the Oregon Constitution’s equal privileges and immunities provision. *See Oregon Constitution Art. 1, sec. 20* (“No law shall be passed granting to any citizen or class of citizens privileges, or immunities, which, upon the same terms, shall not equally belong to all citizens.”)

While the Coquille Tribe is a sovereign political entity, my understanding is that membership in the Tribe is based on ancestry. Disparate governmental treatment of classes of people based on immutable characteristics such as ancestry, race, gender, ethnic background, alienage, nationality, and sexual orientation can be subject to rigorous judicial scrutiny, and an adequate evidentiary basis justifying disparate treatment may be required. Because American Indians and Tribes have a unique status under federal and state laws, however, whether and how the Oregon

Constitution's equal privileges and immunities provision applies here (if at all) may present a novel question (and one that is beyond the scope of my comments).

\* \* \* \*

Thank you for considering my comments.



## The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon

*Umpqua Molalla Rogue River Kalapuya Chasta*

Phone (503) 879-2301  
Fax (503) 879-5964

1-800-422-0232  
9615 Grand Ronde Road  
Grand Ronde, OR 97347

October 19, 2022

Ms. Mary Wahl, Chair  
The Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302  
[ODFW.Commission@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:ODFW.Commission@odfw.oregon.gov)

Mr. Curt Melcher, Director  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302  
[Curt.Melcher@state.or.us](mailto:Curt.Melcher@state.or.us)

*Transmitted via email*

Dear Chair Wahl and Director Melcher:


The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde has received a copy of the proposed "Memorandum of Agreement to Define Exercise of Hunting, Fishing, Trapping and Gathering of the Siletz Tribe and its Members and Setting Out Principles of Cooperative Management of Wildlife Resources" between the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians and the State of Oregon ("MOA"). Grand Ronde staff has reviewed this proposed MOA and identified areas of significant concern.

While Grand Ronde supports MOAs like the one entered into earlier this year between the Coquille Indian Tribe and Oregon for all Oregon tribes which want them, including both Grand Ronde and Siletz, the current proposed Siletz MOA would have substantial negative impacts on Grand Ronde's existing hunting and fishing rights in the Trask Wildlife Management Unit. If the proposed Siletz MOA were approved, Grand Ronde foresees significant harm to Grand Ronde citizens, disputes between Grand Ronde, Siletz and the State, and harm to the fish and wildlife resources in the Trask Unit.

Grand Ronde therefore requests government-to-government consultation at the earliest possible date with ODF&W to discuss its concerns with the proposed Siletz MOA. Further, we understand the MOA will be on the Commission's December agenda. In case Grand Ronde's concerns with the MOA are not addressed through consultation, Grand Ronde requests time at the December meeting to testify regarding the negative impacts the MOA would have on Grand Ronde and its citizens.

The Tribe looks forward to hearing from you. Please contact the Tribal Council's Chief of Staff, Stacia Hernandez (541-654-2993), to establish a time for the consultation.

Sincerely,

  
Cheryl A. Kennedy  
Tribal Council Chairwoman

cc: Tribal Council  
Tribal Attorney

*Treaties*

*Rogue River 1853 & 1854 ~ Umpqua-Cow Creek 1853 ~ Chasta 1854 ~ Umpqua & Kalapuya 1854  
Willamette Valley 1855 ~ Molalla 1855*



**CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF  
COOS, LOWER UMPQUA AND SIUSLAW INDIANS  
TRIBAL GOVERNMENT**

1245 Fulton Avenue - Coos Bay, OR 97420  
Telephone: (541)888-9577 Toll Free 1-888-280-0726 Fax: (541)888-2853

November 22, 2022

ODFW Commission  
Director Curt Melcher  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302

**SENT VIA EMAIL**

**RE: Siletz Tribe Hunting and Fishing Agreement**

Dear Commission Members and Director Melcher:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians ("CTCLUSI") on the proposed agreement for hunting, fishing, and trapping by the Siletz Tribe

CTCLUSI strongly supports efforts of the State to recognize the hunting and fishing rights of Tribes and to develop co-management agreements for cooperative management of natural resources that are interest to both Tribal and State governments. It is critical that both Tribal and State agencies work on a government-to-government basis to manage fish and wildlife to ensure that there are healthy and harvestable levels of resources across the State. This agreement is a good example of how these efforts can be implemented.

Accordingly, CTCLUSI supports without reservation the proposed Siletz Tribe agreement.

We appreciate your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

Brad Kneaper, Chair  
The Confederated Tribes of Coos,  
Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians

cc: Dustin Buehler, Governor's Office  
Sarah Weston, Governor's Office  
Roxann Borisch, ODFW

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

---

**From:** Vanessa Pence - GO \ Tribal Board Assistant <Vanessa.Pence@cowcreek-nsn.gov> on behalf of Carla Keene - GO \ Tribal Board Chairman <CKeene@cowcreek-nsn.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 2, 2022 10:20 AM  
**To:** COMMISSION ODFW \* ODFW  
**Cc:** MELCHER Curt \* ODFW; BUEHLER Dustin E \* GOV; Anthony Broadman  
**Subject:** Siletz Hunting and Fishing Agreement  
**Attachments:** 4688\_001.pdf

Please find attached the support letter from the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

Thank you,

**Vanessa Pence** | Executive Assistant to the Tribal Board of Directors  
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians  
[vpence@cowcreek-nsn.gov](mailto:vpence@cowcreek-nsn.gov)  
2371 NE Stephens St., Roseburg, OR. 97470  
[www.cowcreek-nsn.gov](http://www.cowcreek-nsn.gov)  
Office: (541) 677-5528 | Cell: (541) 673-7726

**Confidentiality Note:** This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be protected by legal privilege.

If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this e-mail or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by returning it to the sender and delete this copy from your system. Thank you for your cooperation.





## COW CREEK BAND OF UMPQUA TRIBE OF INDIANS

### GOVERNMENT OFFICES

2371 NE STEPHENS STREET, SUITE 100  
ROSEBURG, OR 97470-1399

Phone: 541-672-9405

Fax: 541-673-0432

December 2, 2022

*Sent Via Electronic Mail to [odfw.commission@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:odfw.commission@odfw.oregon.gov)*

ODFW Commission  
Attn: Mary Wahl, Chair  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302

Re: OAR 635-800-0120 and Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians Hunting and Fishing Agreement

Dear Commission Members:

I write on behalf of the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians ("Tribe"). The Tribe supports the proposed agreement for hunting, fishing, and trapping between ODFW and the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians ("Siletz Agreement") and associated OAR.

The Siletz and Cow Creek tribes have engaged in fruitful government-to-government consultation on each other's proposed agreements and we look forward to a cooperative and coordinated relationship with Siletz and ODFW in wildlife harvest and natural resources management.

Sincerely,

Chair Carla Keene  
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians

Cc:

[curt.melcher@odfw.oregon](mailto:curt.melcher@odfw.oregon)  
[dustin.e.buehler@oregon.gov](mailto:dustin.e.buehler@oregon.gov)

From: Brian McLachlan <[bamclachlan@hotmail.com](mailto:bamclachlan@hotmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, December 1, 2022 9:32 AM  
To: PALMERI Davia M \* ODFW <[Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: RE: Siletz Tribe and Cow Creek Bank MOAs

Hi Davia – sorry to bother you again so soon. I was thinking last night about the Siletz MOA's "whereas" clause re adjudication and drafted a suggestion that ODFW and the Siletz Tribe may want to consider. I hope it captures the intent of the clause in a more factually accurate manner.

**Whereas**, the Siletz Tribe's hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering rights were not resolved through a trial on the merits but instead defined through a settlement agreement and Consent Decree entered as a final judgment of the United States Court for the District of Oregon in 1980.

If desired, the Tribe may want to include an additional sentence to address its view of the settlement and consent decree (e.g., "and the Siletz Tribe now views the settlement agreement and Consent Decree as unfair and the result of undue political pressure;"). I would strongly oppose the State joining in any statement that may potentially prejudice its legal position re the settlement and consent decree.

I would have copied Erin Donald on this and my prior email, but don't have her email address.

Thanks again for considering my concerns,

Regards,  
Brian

From: Brian McLachlan  
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 11:02 PM  
To: PALMERI Davia M \* ODFW <[Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
Subject: RE: Siletz Tribe and Cow Creek Bank MOAs

Hi Davia,

Thanks for taking time today to speak with me about my concerns and questions regarding the proposed MOAs with the Siletz Tribe and Cow Creek Band.

As you requested, I have provided below a brief list of the issues we spoke about. I obviously just tried to list the issues and outline my main concerns to pique your memory. My two comment letters address some but not all of these concerns in more detail. If you need more detail or would like to discuss these further, please don't hesitate to contact me.

If I have the time, I may draft up some supplemental comments to the Commission concerning these issues.

Regards – Brian McLachlan

1. **State's right to terminate/possible preemption** should pending legislation be enacted. I requested in my comment letter that WDFW/Commission obtain assurance from OR DOJ. Also, I suggest the MOA include additional clarifying language – something like the following to sec. 15: *"In particular, the Parties intend and acknowledge that this Memorandum of Agreement is not intended to, and does not in any way, replace, amend or otherwise modify the Agreement Among the State of Oregon, the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians of Oregon to Permanently Define Tribal Hunting, Fishing, Trapping, and Gathering Rights of the Siletz Tribe and its Members' and entered into by the United States on April 22, 1980."*
2. **Basis for representations in notice of proposed rulemaking** regarding minimal or small impacts to general public's hunting and fishing opportunities and no expected increase in Tribal harvest; request that these expectations and understandings be confirmed with Tribes and memorialized in MOAs; concern that harvest allocation standards presently in proposed MOAs do not reflect these WDFW representations in notice of proposed rulemaking.
3. One issue I forgot to bring up on our call is the potential **cumulative impacts** on the public's opportunity to hunt and fish from multiple Tribal MOAs and associated harvest allocations. How will this be addressed?

4. **Concern over standards** being one sentence of **ambiguous and ill-defined terms** (e.g., availability, escapement goals, tribal need); concern re onerous “**conservation necessity**” **standard** which you said was intended have same meaning as term is used in federal law re treaty fishing and hunting rights; concern this may impair and/or burden State’s sovereign management authority over fish and wildlife and that Commission does not have statutory authority to do so; concern that **standards do not include** reference to agency legislative **mandate, including to optimize recreational fishing.**
5. Legal and practical concern re MOAs providing that **method of harvest shall be subject exclusively to tribal decision.** Method of harvest (e.g., non-mark-selective vs. mark-selective) can have significant differential impact on wild fish populations per same harvest amount; harvest method should be included in annual negotiations re hunting and fishing activities along with amount, area, season, etc.; I also have concern re whether it would be consistent with ORS 496.162 for WDFW to agree to Tribe having exclusive decision-making authority re harvest method.
6. Concern re accuracy of language in Siletz agreement indicating Siletz Tribe’s hunting and fishing **rights have not been adjudicated or determined by any court.** If Tribe asserts this, State should include response that is factually accurate referencing Consent Decree.
7. Concern re **language suggesting only certain statutes apply** to Tribes’ hunting and fishing activities.
8. Concern re **barter** being within statutory definition of commercial activity, and statutes prohibiting commercial fishing in some areas.
9. Need clarification re **which administrative rules the MOA and associated rulemaking will supersede** (e.g., seasons and bag limits for general public), and which rules will need to be followed (e.g., Coastal Multi-species management plan).
10. **Concern re a number of the recitals, i.e., “whereas” clauses,** in Cow Creek Band MOA. Suggest adding qualifier “The Cow Creek Band asserts” so that recitals are not attributable to State.
11. **Need clarification and precision in using term “rights.”** In Cow Creek Band MOA, does reference to “rights” refer to Tribe’s asserted rights under federal law (treaties, aboriginal title, inherent sovereignty) or contractual rights created under terms of MOA? In my view, the MOA’s should not be construed as providing for exercise of hunting and fishing rights under federal law (i.e., rights asserted pursuant to treaties, aboriginal title, inherent sovereignty, etc.) where such rights have not been adjudicated to final judgment.
12. We also touched on why dispute resolution exclusion section is in Cow Creek Band MOA but not Siletz Tribe MOA; and similarly why there are differences in two MOAs with regard to termination provisions and “perpetual” clause.

**From:** PALMERI Davia M \* ODFW <[Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2022 10:43 AM  
**To:** Brian McLachlan <[bamclachlan@hotmail.com](mailto:bamclachlan@hotmail.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Siletz Tribe and Cow Creek Bank MOAs

Hi Brian, Yes. I’d be happy to discuss with you today. I’m available 2-4pm today and you can call me at 971-719-1192.  
Davia

NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: [Davia.M.Palmeri@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.Palmeri@odfw.oregon.gov)

**From:** Brian McLachlan <[bamclachlan@hotmail.com](mailto:bamclachlan@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 30, 2022 8:48 AM  
**To:** PALMERI Davia M \* ODFW <[Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Siletz Tribe and Cow Creek Bank MOAs

Hi Davia –

Commissioner Labhart suggested I could give you a call to discuss some issues I’m concerned about regarding the proposed Siletz Tribe and Cow Creek Band MOAs. Is there a convenient time today or tomorrow that I could give you a call?

Regards,  
Brian McLachlan

**From:** Mark Labhart <[marklabhart@gmail.com](mailto:marklabhart@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2022 11:31 AM  
**To:** Brian McLachlan <[bamclachlan@hotmail.com](mailto:bamclachlan@hotmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Letter

Hi Brian

As you will see below, Davia is doing some checking into your thoughts with our AG. As I'm not an expert on some of these issues, we need to wait until we hear back from the AG. You are welcome to call Davia as she is well up to speed on the matters you raise. Her phone number is 971-719-1192  
Mark  
Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone  
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

---

**From:** PALMERI Davia M \* ODFW <[Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2022, 11:14 AM  
**To:** LABHART Mark <[marklabhart@gmail.com](mailto:marklabhart@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Letter

Hi Mark—

For your reference, the existing Siletz Consent Decree is in [OAR 635-041-0500](#). The federal legislation that Brian is referencing is [S. 3123 and H.R. 6345](#) (the text is identical in both chambers). I will talk with Erin before weighing in on whether Brian's concern is something I think the Commission should be considering.

Davia

NEW EMAIL ADDRESS: [Davia.M.Palmeri@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.Palmeri@odfw.oregon.gov)

**From:** Mark Labhart <[marklabhart@gmail.com](mailto:marklabhart@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 27, 2022 7:29 AM  
**To:** WOLFER Brian H \* ODFW <[Brian.H.WOLFER@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Brian.H.WOLFER@odfw.oregon.gov)>; PALMERI Davia M \* ODFW <[Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Davia.M.PALMERI@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
**Cc:** MELCHER Curt \* ODFW <[Curt.MELCHER@odfw.oregon.gov](mailto:Curt.MELCHER@odfw.oregon.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Letter

Hi Brian and Davia.

Wondering if you are right person(s) to help me here. Are Brian's points raised already addressed or is he raising issues the Commission needs to consider.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone  
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

---

**From:** Brian McLachlan <[bamclachlan@hotmail.com](mailto:bamclachlan@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 26, 2022, 7:14 PM  
**To:** [marklabhart@gmail.com](mailto:marklabhart@gmail.com) <[marklabhart@gmail.com](mailto:marklabhart@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Letter

Commissioner Labhart – I have submitted comments to the ODFW Commission regarding the proposed MOAs between the State and the Siletz Tribe, and the State and the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe regarding cooperative fish and wildlife management and tribal fishing and hunting activities. I am sending my comments to you directly in the hope that you will consider them as you did my prior comments concerning the Coquille MOA. If you have any questions or would like to discuss my concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks,

Brian McLachlan