

**Following are two spreadsheets summarizing all public comments received through March 14, 2008. Each spreadsheet describes the issue or concern, the number of respondents making similar comments and the department's response.**

### Draft Klamath Wildlife Area Management Plan Public Comments

| Issue or Comment   | Count | Department Response   |
|--|-------|---|
| Question regarding Objective 2.1: any way to put food crops in the permanently flooded wetlands of Miller Island?  | 1     | The wildlife area (WA) manager explained that this habitat is managed for resting waterfowl. In the future the emergent vegetation will need to be knocked back but there is only one drain pump so water management is difficult in this unit.   |
| Question was asked if there were any other flooded areas that can be managed for waterfowl.  | 1     | Per Objective 2.2, seasonally flooded wetlands can be drained and will have the forage needed for waterfowl. However, drainage relies on the Klamath River levels and currently only portable pumps can be used. The manager described the process of managing rank bulrush with draining, disking, mowing. |
| Attendee stated that something needed to be done in Long Pond area because a lot of hunters congested in a small area and downed birds get lost in the choked bulrush. | 1     | Per Objective 2.2, the manager, using the Lower Klamath National Refuge's cooperative farming process, described how this might work, in 3-4 year rotation to farm the pond bottom.   |
| Question regarding whether organic crops grown in this cooperative farming process be harvested before opening day.  | 1     | WA manager responded that the intent would be to harvest before hunting season while still having a ready crop for the farmer.  |
| Question whether the current reservation system has been a problem?  | 1     | WA manager stated that the Department might move to a number system for the reservations, similar to Fern Ridge WA and that it would not be difficult to use this process.  |
| Is it a rumor that the Department is looking a shell limits?   | 1     | WA manager stated that it is a rumor.   |
| Question asking when the draining and farming would start.   | 1     | WA manager was hoping to start in 2007 but will start in late summer 2008 in Unit B.  |
| How will hunters be notified of which units will be drained?   | 1     | Game Bird Regulations will have information, along with postings at the WA and through weekly recreation reports on the Department's website.   |
| Question regarding whether the Department allows guides on the wildlife area   | 1     | Yes, guides and their clients have to follow the same rules as the public but there are not a lot of guides who use the Miller Unit.  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Question regarding the chances of getting Ducks Unlimited to do projects on the wildlife area? | 2 | Wildlife area manager stated that there's always opportunities for DU to get NAWCA and OWEB grants to get work done. |
|--|---|--|

### Draft Ladd Marsh Wildlife Area Management Plan Public Comments

| Issue or Comment   | Count | Department Response  |
|--|-------|--|
| Attendee, representing ODOT, appreciated the opportunity to work with ODFW on mitigation project along with DSL  | 1     | WA staff acknowledge that this mitigation project was a very successful partnership and provided a large benefit to wildlife.  |
| Attendee appreciated and supported acquisitions and restoration especially for birding opportunities and asked if any acquisitions were underway. A correspondent also urged continued search for opportunities to add additional lands that may be restored to the Ladd Marsh Area. | 2     | Wildlife Area (WA) manager answered that no acquisitions were planned now. Any lands would only be acquired from willing sellers at local appraised price.   |
| Attendee asked question regarding whether the Department anticipates any problems or issues with Measure 37 development going on.  | 1     | The main wildlife area management issues which could be impacted by Measure 37 development would be big game, mosquitoes, groundwater withdrawals and additional pets running around.  |
| Attendee asked if there were any biological agents working on weeds.   | 1     | WA manager is seeing positive effects of biological agents on Canada thistle, according to 10-12 years of research plots. Actually need some thistle to keep the biological agents going. Manager also pointed out that cooperative farmers do spray their crops with insecticides to decrease beetles.  |
| Attendee commended the Department for Goal 3 of the management plan, especially managing recreation and education to be compatible with Goals 1 and 2. Is public viewing and access a concern, for example impacting nesting birds on Peach Rd.                                      | 1     | WA manager stated that increasing communication with the local birding community and college is critical, especially to decrease effects to nesting. There is research available about the impacts of wildlife viewing on nesting waterfowl.   |
| Attendee asked if there were any other opportunities or sources for more water.  | 1     | WA manager stated that the only thing would be to dig a well and the Department doesn't want to affect the aquifer. The Oregon Dept. of Water Resources is not issuing permits for additional non-domestic wells in the Grande Ronde Valley at this time. The current drought conditions are cyclical and may be long term. There are no known opportunities to purchase water rights. |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Attendee was concerned that the land around the wildlife area is prime development real estate and encouraged the Department to look at land acquisition possibilities from a proactive or prepositioned standpoint, especially foothills and migration areas.   | 1 | WA manager stated that the Department has approached some folks but nothing has transpired.  |
| Attendee commented that the Department should look for opportunities to promote sustainability and economic benefit such as the sharecropping program.   | 1 | WA manager will continue to pursue sharecropping opportunities with the local agricultural community.  |
| Attendee wanted to see reptiles and amphibians included in the management plan and particularly more control of bullfrogs; wanted to expand habitat for spotted frogs and turtles and more research opportunities.   | 1 | Reptiles and amphibians present on the wildlife area are described in the Biological Resources section of the draft plan.  |
| Attendee asked if the auto tour loop was only for vehicles or open to bikes and horses.  | 1 | WA manager stated that there was nothing to limit bikes and horses on the auto tour and he is seeing runners and others use the trail who aren't there for wildlife viewing.   |
| Attendee asked if the Department like the habitat focus rather than species numbers approach.  | 1 | WA manager stated that yes, the Department does like the habitat approach because it can control habitat but not species use.  |
| Correspondents stated that, during low water years, hunting becomes congested and unethical hunting behavior occurs (i.e. pass shooting/calling over other hunters' decoy sets, setting up between established hunters, shooting outside of posted shooting hours). Correspondents suggested that if more sewer discharge water or more pumps were installed to create open water areas, there would be more wildlife to hunt. Another correspondent also wanted to add more water to the marsh (by purchasing water rights or drilling wells) to increase habitat for all shorebirds and waterfowl. | 3 | The Department agrees that more OSP enforcement is needed to encourage better hunter behavior. The low water conditions are beyond the control of WA staff. Building additional wells is a cost prohibitive endeavor that would also put more pressure on the local aquifer. |
| Correspondents wanted to see more enforcement presence, not just on opening weekend of hunting season.   | 2 | The Department will encourage more visits by OSP at other times of the hunting season.   |

|   |          |  |
|---|----------|--|
| <p>Correspondent felt that hunting and wildlife viewing were incompatible activities and wanted the area open to wildlife viewers during hunting season on days when hunters were not present.</p>  | <p>1</p> | <p>The Department worries that additional use days for any activity during winter would increase disturbance to a level that would cause waterfowl to abandon the area. Table 6 on page 40 addresses access opportunities for wildlife viewing. Viewing opportunities have increased significantly over the past ten years.</p>  |
| <p>Correspondent appreciated and encouraged ongoing restoration and suggested accelerating restoration especially planting native grasses, forbs, shrubs and trees. Another correspondent also supported planting coniferous trees for elk use and riparian plantings along Ladd Creek.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Per Objective 1.6, Strategy 1, WA staff intend to plant native riparian species, with protective fencing, to improve riparian habitat along Ladd Creek. Objective 2.4 describes the WA's planting of coniferous species.</p>  |
| <p>Correspondent suggested building a nature trail on the Glass Hill portion of the wildlife area.</p>  | <p>1</p> | <p>Objective 3.2, Strategy 1 was re-written in the Final Draft plan to address this correspondent's suggestions.</p>   |
| <p>Correspondent appreciates the LMWA's establishment of the annual Ladd Marsh Birdathon and the Union County Christmas Bird Count. Correspondent requested that the wildlife area be closed to hunters during the Christmas Bird Count.</p>  | <p>1</p> | <p>WA staff will continue the Birdathon this year, increasing it to a two day event. The hunting season is set by District and headquarters Wildlife staff as described in the Oregon Upland Bird regulations. Closures of hunting must pass through a set administrative process, including public review, which likely would not be supported by the hunting public.</p> |
| <p>Correspondent suggested constructing a viewing platform and bathrooms for visitors.</p>  | <p>1</p> | <p>Objective 3.2, Strategy 1 was re-written in the Final Draft plan to address this correspondent's suggestions.</p>   |
| <p>Correspondent would like to look for opportunities to make the marsh more accessible for the birding public, for example in the Peach Rd. or Raceway units.</p>  | <p>1</p> | <p>Currently facilities to enhance bird watching have been focused at the auto tour route and others areas as described in Table 6. However Objective 3.2, Strategy 5 will monitor public use in order to guide future development of facilities as dictated by increasing wildlife viewing needs.</p>   |

|   |          |  |
|---|----------|--|
| <p>Correspondent wants the Department to shift focus onto big game management, especially elk, on the wildlife area by: re-design of current crops grown on the area to increase forage that elk prefer, irrigating a field or two especially on the westside, planting hay by the sharecropper, between the wet meadows and Foothill Road.</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>At present big game management and big game conflict resolution is the responsibility of the local District Wildlife biologist. Although the primary focus of the WA is to enhance and manage wetlands and uplands to benefit wetland-obligate species, Objectives 2.3 and 2.4 address management activities benefiting big game.</p> |
| <p>Correspondent urged the Department to consider an effort to remove the entire Hot Lake elk herd on the eastside of I-84 and re-locate them to some other county because of potential vehicle collisions and damage to fences and haystacks during the winter.</p>  | <p>1</p> | <p>Although the Department has conducted elk relocations in the past, disease transmission and rising costs of such efforts are limiting factors.</p>  |