Public Correspondence

Public correspondence received as of May 20, 2010
Citizen Comment concerning the ODFW Management Plan Draft for Sauvie Island:

This comment comes from Barbara Scot, a citizen and resident of Sauvie Island (15500 NW Ferry Rd.) who qualifies as a "wildlife viewer" under the categories and definitions within the ODFW draft and I will address my concerns from that standpoint. I have been using the SIWA for hiking and birding for over thirty years. I am asking that this draft, which indicates that it will define the use of SIWA for the next decade, include anticipated development of additional time, area and developed trails for the non-hunting wildlife viewer.

First, I want to express my admiration for Mark Nebeker whose understaffed and under-funded agency has dealt with the competing demands of the public with tolerance and mostly good humor. I can speak from experience that those who would criticize (and I have quite liberally in the past) would do well to familiarize themselves with the complexity of issues of funding and sometimes contradictory uses of state wildlife areas that his agency is expected to address. There is much in this draft to commend, particularly the attention and progress made in native habitat restoration; however, for the non-hunting wildlife viewer there is cause for alarm as it is obvious that viewing and hiking areas are to be reduced in length of access (a May 15th opening date to accommodate cackling geese, almost a month later than this year's opening of Oak Island, is cited in rather vague reference—p.36) While the draft acknowledges that "an increase in participation of and demand for wildlife-oriented recreational uses has occurred since the 1980s" that has resulted in "shifts in demands and management emphasis over the past 62 years" (draft, p.7) little in this draft reflects that is the case on Sauvie Island. Less attention is paid in this draft to the non-hunting public than in the plan put in place fifteen years ago. With almost dreary repetition the new draft refers to the original 1947 intent of "providing a public hunting area" as the past and present priority of the management staff. ("Providing public hunting programs continue to be the main management priority of SIWA staff"—p.3)

One needs only to Google with "decline in hunting as an outdoor sport" to verify that nationally hunting is no longer the primary thrust of visitors to wildlife areas as it was in the days of the "Game Commission" in 1947. Federal areas such as Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge recognize the change in attitude toward wildlife that has accompanied the environmental movement and have adjusted their activities and recreational possibilities accordingly. I am asking that the SIWA management do the same as it addresses the next decade of use. With the exception of the one superb viewing platform near Willow Bar, the repeated litany of places or paths available to the non-hunting public on SIWA that supposedly provides 100,000 viewing days is quite deceptive. Birding and general hiking activities are restricted to the periphery of the entire refuge from Oct. 1st to currently April 16th—a date that seems destined to be moved to May 16th. The quarter-mile long Rentenaar Rd. is the only penetration for birders during the winter wildfowl season into the refuge and it provides limited viewing in a heavily hunted area. The few hundred yards at Coon Point are far from water. The Warrior Rock "trail" is practically non-existent and the signage is confusing as to the legitimacy of its use. The only established trail is on Oak Island and the area between the trail and Steelman Lake has been developed for cackling geese grazing so it is likely become even less accessible to the casual hiker and birder. Even in non-hunting season when "a much larger portion of SIWA is open or available for use" herds of cattle graze in most areas accompanied by several bulls whose benign nature was belied in an east county death last summer.

One can sympathize with the burden put on Fish and Wildlife because of the non-wildlife oriented recreation that results from beach use. One can also sympathize with the natural tendency of the management to favor the hunters and give them preferential treatment when both historically and presently that is the source of the funding for the wildlife area. But times and attitudes are changing and will change more in the next ten years, the projected life of this plan. All non-hunting individuals and groups that want equal treatment in the next decade regarding use of the wildlife area need to be prepared to offer alternative and supplemental funding for state and federal wildlife areas and especially for Sauvie Island. I acknowledge this responsibility and will work with others to offer creative solutions to a continually under-funded agency but in return, I ask that the current plan include the anticipated development of additional time, area and trails for the non-hunting wildlife viewer.

Barbara J. Scot
15500 NW Ferry Rd.
Portland, Or 97231  bjscot@teleport.com
From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2009 11:20 AM
To: Mark Nebeker; Nancy Breuner; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Follow-up comments to ODFW Sauvie Island Plan Review

From: cindy reid [mailto:cinbah@spiritone.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2009 11:41 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Follow-up comments to ODFW Sauvie Island Plan Review

Following are my comments and follow-up from the ODFW Sauvie Island Plan Review meeting in August, 2009:

1) **Community involvement** - the Sauvie Island Community, while asked to comment on the plan, were not involved in creating the plan. Farmers present at the meeting I attended felt they had not been consulted - and viewed the plan as a top-down (administrative) written plan - rather than a carefully developed plan inclusive of community input that would insure community buy-in and involvement. It might be wise to defer adopting the plan until the community at large has been sufficiently included and heard.

2) **Revenue Sources** - The current plan continues to view hunters as a main source of revenue, and hunting as a priority activity for wildlife area management. I would **URGE** ODFW to aggressively explore non-hunting revenue resources - as there are hundreds of thousands of visitors to the island each year. With a coordinated regional public education effort, I am quite sure that winter users would gladly pay a fee similar to a hunting tag, to view wildlife in the areas they are excluded from during hunting season. Hunting days could be traded off for wildlife viewing days or other activities that are non-invasive to wildlife and nesting areas.

3) **Habitat restoration** - It was difficult to see how ODFW would actually provide funding, staffing and expertise to improve habitat areas. Long time island residents at the meeting mentioned the degradation of land areas over time to invasives and mono-cultures. There is a lot of regional expertise about watersheds, woodland management, grassland restoration, riparian habitat - and it seems that there needs to be **multiple agency involvement**, along with community involvement to truly improve these stands of land that comprise the ODFW wildlife areas on the island. Again, I believe there is tremendous public interest in the well-being of this island as a natural area - and I saw nothing in the plan to coordinate and make use of this interest or potential volunteer effort.

4) **Aesthetic management** - I strongly suggest, that the plan include directives for aesthetic management. When any areas are going to be "improved" or "managed" by clearing invasives and planting natives, or food, there needs to be an aesthetic consultant (landscape architect) involved for placement. Many restoration projects, while technically having the right "ingredients" plant-wise, end up getting planted and looking terrible because there is no one present with an eye for how and where nature grows things. As a result the areas look shabby, as if humans went in and simply planted stuff without regard for beauty.

5) **Enforcement/human numbers management** - The plan needs to include more specific directives for oversight and enforcement of public use areas. ODFW needs an active enforcement arm not only for "use" compliance - but to manage litter and all that comes with too many humans. The plan does not really address **how it is going to manage the proliferation of the human species on the island**. There are a million more people coming to the Portland Metro area, say the forecasts - and every year this island is harshly impacted. Plastic, metallic balloons, and all kinds of garbage show up in the waterways, and all over the roadways - and probably inside birds and other wildlife. ODFW does not have any real means of addressing these issues at present - or in the plan.

6) **Regional planning** - I would also urge that this plan include specific goals of cooperating with and
leading regional planning for the island - to advocate for and insure wildlife protection OVER human popular recreational "use" - which holds sway everywhere. If this is truly a "refuge" then ODFW needs to be working hard to build in protections from overuse by the human population. I don't see specific directives to address this type of regional planning in conjunction with other public bodies.

7) Education - I would like to see more emphasis on regional public education about the island, the objectives of wildlife & habitat management - the consequences of careless human activity - and what people can do to help - not simply to school children - but to island users as a whole (and this would tie-in to #2 above - non-hunting revenues).

I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Cindy Reid
Sauvie Island Resident (for 25 years)
(503) 621-3071
cinbah@spiritone.com
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2009 12:46 PM
To: Mark Nebeker; Nancy Breuner; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Sauvie's Island Wetlands

---

From: Beatrice Hedlund [mailto:beabosche@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 30, 2009 10:19 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie's Island Wetlands

To the Fish and Wildlife Commission-

I am writing in support of wetland and oak woodland restoration on Sauvie's Island.

I also support habitat improvements and numeric targets increasing nos. of for native turtles, frogs and songbirds, sandhill cranes, as well as geese.

Finally, I would like to request that the area receive an adequate level of funding and staffing to manage humans and wildlife AND to restore native habitats.

Thank you,

Beatrice Hedlund

9/8/2009
It has come to my attention that the proposed management plan for Sauvie Island eliminates many hunting opportunities that have existed in the past. Rabbit and racoon hunting with dogs are two of these opportunities. There appears to be no reasonable justification for these changes other than a capricious and arbitrary decision by the director, possibly based on personal animosity toward one particular individual cited for and acquitted of illegally hunting rabbits on the wildlife area, when such hunting was, in fact, not prohibited in any way. We have lost many opportunities for hunting with dogs over the last 20 years, and this is yet one more.

The area was established and purchased using taxes generated by hunting and fishing equipment sales. It continues to be maintained primarily with general hunting and fishing license fees and user fees. Is it fair to then limit usage to waterfowl hunting and archery deer hunting? I don’t think it is. I have obtained training permits my coonhounds on Sauvie Island for several years now. If the ban on furbearer hunting with dogs is upheld in the wildlife area plan, then I plan to go elsewhere for all my hunting. I will cease to support the wildlife area concept, as it becomes more and more a situation where hunting and fishing revenues are used to support other uses. Sauvie Island already has a utilization rate of 86% non-fish and game related activities (beach goers 600,000 visits, all others 100,000) financed primarily by hunters and fishermen. This is not acceptable.

John Price
10750 SE 242nd Ave
Damascus, OR 97089
Home 503-558-0737
Office 503-464-7904
Cell 503-805-8538
jprice@floop.com
Hello:

I am commenting on the draft Sauvie Island Wildlife Area management plan.

I am happy you are proposing some habitat restoration projects and I would like you to make sure that these projects will restore habitat for all native birds, animals, and plants...not just geese!

Sincerely,

Peter McGovern
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2009 11:06 AM
To: Mark Nebeker, Nancy Breuner, Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: I strongly support conservation and restoration efforts at Sauvie Island.

From: Linda Magnuson [mailto:l magnuson1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2009 3:06 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: I strongly support conservation and restoration efforts at Sauvie Island.
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2009 11:06 AM
To: Mark Nebeker; Nancy Breuner; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Support for ODFW for including goals for habitat restoration at Sauvie’s Island

From: Marlene Huntsinger [mailto:huntson@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2009 12:46 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Support for ODFW for including goals for habitat restoration at Sauvie’s Island

Please accept my voice of support for you habitat restoration plans at Sauvie’s Island.

I also support wetland and oak woodland restoration and habitat improvements, including numeric targets for increasing nos. of for native turtles, frogs and songbirds, and sandhill cranes.

I would like to request that the area receive an adequate level of funding and staffing to manage humans and wildlife AND to restore native habitats.

Thank you

Marlene Huntsinger
Michelle Tate

From: mark j greenfield [markgreenfield@involved.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2009 10:06 AM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan

Dear ODFW Commissioners and Staff:

I have reviewed the draft management plan and attending one of the public hearings on the plan, and I offer the following comments.

First, I am generally pleased with the direction of the plan. In particular, I support the restoration, enhancement, expansion and management of wetlands and grasslands to benefit birds, fish and wildlife. Similarly, I support the maintenance and improvement of oak woodlands and oak savannah. A recent "Nature" program on PBS said that the oak tree is the single most important species of tree in providing food for native species, including the insects that birds feed on. It is very important that the refuge manage oak trees as a critically important species. I would love to see the oak habitat on the island expanded. Indeed, I'd love to see it reach a point where maybe it would re-attract acorn woodpeckers to the island. On our 13 acre property on Sauvie Island, we have planted close to a dozen of the native Garry oaks to help restore native vegetation to the island. We appreciate that the plan will do its part for the refuge.

Second, I very strongly support the new Goal 4 to control public uses to minimize adverse impacts on fish and wildlife habitat and related recreation. As an island resident, I am witness to many of the hundreds of thousands of people who come here not for wildlife purposes but to use the beaches. Most of these folks are respectful of the island, but many are not. With proposed higher parking permit fees, the refuge should be able to pay for full time sheriff's patrol, which is especially needed in the warm summer months. We also hope higher fees would be used for better patrol and enforcement of the parking permit program. Even though it is a relatively small percentage of folks who do not buy the permits, the money they would owe would easily pay for the cost of enforcement, plus more. We were told that the price of a daily pass would rise to $7 and the price of an annual pass would rise to $25 or $30. Again, as an island resident, I am more than happy to pay the higher annual parking pass price to see stronger law enforcement on the island. Given the concerns raised before the Columbia County Board of Commissioners earlier this summer, when they threatened to wipe out funding for the island sheriff's patrol, I believe many other island residents share this concern.

Regarding traffic, I am concerned that the number of car trips to the island to use the beaches will only get worse over time. I am not sure what should be done about it, but it is something that should be monitored. Maybe a bus shuttle system will be needed during summer weekends where people leave their cars on the mainland.

Third, while the draft plan speaks to improved habitat for geese in particular, I would like to see improved habitat for sandhill cranes. These glorious species visit here every winter and they are fantastic both to view and to hear. Many people who come to visit us ask us to take them to places where they can see cranes. Given that Sauvie Island is a designated "Important Bird Area", and also that the island now has several sites included as part of the Willamette Valley Birding Trail (which is currently in web form but will be in a printed brochure by about year's end), and given that Travel Oregon is helping to push birding as a reason for people out of state and, indeed, all over the world, to come to
Oregon to visit, the refuge should be thinking not only about what is good for game species, but also for nongame species, and trying to improve habitat for those nongame species. On that point, I should add that the closure of most of the refuge to birders during the winter months (when birding is best) is something I do not fully agree with. Just as some snow mobile trails are closed to snow mobilers for brief times during the winter so that cross country skiers can use them without fear of harm or irritation from the noise and smell, so to, I'd like to see the refuge open to birders for many several full weekends each winter. I do not think that is too steep a price for hunters to pay, and I truly believe birders would be happy to pay their share for their occasional winter use of the refuge. If this became refuge policy and word got out that the refuge was open on, say, the last weekend in December, January and February, I think you'd see birders flocking to the refuge on those weekends, because Sauvie Island is so ideal for birding.

On that point, let me add that the proposed closure of the refuge from April 15 to April 30 is unfortunate because this is during the peak of the bird migration period and the birding on places like Oak Island is outstanding.

Fourth, I support efforts to restore Sturgeon Lake to improved conditions. Other lands as well appear to be silting up, which is not good.

Sauvie Island is a treasure in Portland's back yard. Located on the Pacific flyway, it is of critical importance for wildlife (especially birds) and fish. I very strongly support efforts to restore and improve the refuge. As Portland urbanizes and native landscapes disappear from the area, it becomes all the more important to preserve this area. Mark Nebecer and the ODFW staff on the island have done a very good job of determining priorities. I support their policies on hunting (what is and is not hunted on the island), except to the extent that I think native nongame wildlife deserve more attention in terms of habitat restoration, and with respect to my interest in having some weekends for birders to visit the refuge during winter months. Their attention to and interest in habitat restoration, including oak and wetland habitat, is laudatory. I'd like to see this in other refuges as well.

Mark J. Greenfield
14745 NW Gillihan Road
Portland, Oregon 97231
Tel. (503) 227-2979/Fax (503) 292-1636
markgreenfield@involved.com
Michelle Tate

From: Anne W. Squier [wompsett@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2009 9:10 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island Plan

I live close to Sauvie Island and regularly bicycle to it, view wildlife, visit the beaches, hike, pick berries, and buy organic vegetables. I purchase a parking permit early each January. On occasion I have rowed/paddled in the Gilbert River and elsewhere.

In general I strongly support the proposed Sauvie Island Wildlife Management Plan and support funding and staffing sufficient to implement it. In particular I applaud the attention to vital oak woodland and hardwood habitats so important to songbirds and other species.

The cyclical return of Sandhill Crane and Swan populations is a special treat, and reason enough for attention to habitat for all of the varied waterfowl that grace SIWA.

I particularly support Strategy 1 on page 54-55 including maintaining closure of hunting for furbearers, predators, etc.

Likewise, I strongly support Strategy 7 (road closures/management) on page 55.

As the metropolitan population of Portland continues to swell, the value of the habitat provided by the SIWA will rise exponentially. I am willing to work with ODFW and partner agencies to find some additional funding sources for the non-game wildlife needs expressed in this plan.

Thank you for your consideration of these brief comments.
Sincerely, Anne W. Squier
13402 NW Marina Way
Portland 97231

8/31/2009
Greetings,

From what I have heard a meeting on Tuesday, August 26th, on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area management plan had mostly comments about loosening restrictions on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area in regards to shooting animals and being allowed to drain wetlands. From an email I received about this meeting...

"One farmer bitterly complained about the proliferation of sandhill cranes that are eating his corn."

It sounds to me like the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management planning is working quite successfully. Unfortunately most people don't understand that while they may own the land the wildlife belongs to the state of Oregon. If the state of Oregon feels there is an over-abundance of sandhill cranes and they have become a nuisance requiring eradication on Sauvie Island I feel that we will have gone back decades to a time where only how much money can be earned per acre mattered.

Ecosystems are very complicated and it is easy to not understand how an animal's role in the ecosystem is important to the health of the ecosystem. I can't speak on the sandhill crane but I do know that in the mid-west in attempting to eliminate the prairie dogs numerous species that were dependent on the prairie dogs such as mole snakes dropped in large numbers because of man's arrogant ignorance. The same can be said of the eradication of wolves and now the resistance to their re-introduction.

Also from the email I received about the meeting...

"A couple of farmers said (and others nodded in agreement) that more of the native wetlands should be plowed under to plant pasture and corn fields to feed geese to keep them off private farmland. They disagreed with the refuge manager that native wetlands providing more food for geese than pastures and cornfields."

Many people consider wetlands a waste of the use of the land because they don't understand the wetlands function. The wetlands on Sauvie Island are a home to much more than geese and other migrating waterfowl. When I housesitted for a friend on Sauvie Island I was amazed in the spring to the noise frogs and toads have made during mating season.

Besides providing a home to these amphibians wetlands can also act as a "sponge" in times when we receive massive amounts of rain in a very short period of time. Without wetlands many of these complaining farmers might find out their crops are rotting as they are under water in such a scenario.

With most countries and people agreeing that global warming has thrown the balance of nature out of kilter I would hope that the state of Oregon would be trying to re-balance whatever it could, and restoring Sauvie Island is an excellent place to start as it appears you are being quite successful there.

Please keep up the good work you are doing, while I appreciate it, there are future generations that are counting on it.

Andy Reid
3333 SE 39th Avenue, # 26
Portland, OR 97202
As an island resident, board member of the WMSWCD AND member of the Audubon Society's Sauvie Island Important Bird Area committee, Sauvie Island landowner and frequent visitor to the wildlife area, I commend you on this plan.

I am supportive of the hunting uses of the area and the need to encourage geese from feed on the refuge rather than nearby farm lands, but I am also very interested in the restoration of oak, wetland and riparian habitats and of removal of invasive plant and animal species. These activities are essential to carrying out the department's wildlife strategies and are compatible with providing for the needs of geese.

Sauvie Island is recognized by many, many people as a treasure. When people ask where I live, and I tell them, they gush...oh....I love Sauvie Island. For all the love this island gets, not much of it is reflected on the ground. The place is a mess....infested with non-native weeds and animals. We need to take care of it. Several state strategy species like painted and pond turtle, white-breasted nuthatches and other birds, as well as Salmon, are imperiled because of Sauvie Island's degraded conditions.

I know that budgets are tight, so I hope ODFW will help area residents put their money where their mouths are in loving the island. I realize that restoring habitats is expensive, but grants can be applied for, volunteers can be enlisted and conservation non-profits and other agencies can assist.

Perhaps most importantly, the department needs to take care of Sturgeon Lake. Other agencies and organizations are standing by to help, but the Department really must step up efforts and find funds to take care of this degraded treasure. In the time I have lived here, the lake has shrunk and gotten shallower. It's dying. It needs your help. Please, please, do something.
June 18, 2009

Mr. Mark A. Nebeker, Director
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, Sauvie Island Division
18330 NW Sauvie Island Road
Portland, Oregon 97231

Dear Mark,

This letter is in regards to the upcoming meetings to review public use activities on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Areas. Your efforts to update management plans are greatly appreciated. I would like to take this opportunity to address a concern relating to Goal #4: To control other public uses to minimize impacts on fish and wildlife, their habitats, and fish and wildlife related recreation and to maintain the security of the wildlife area and reduce disturbance to neighboring private lands.

Our concern is regarding our property at Sturgeon Lake Farms, LLC. As you may recall, we had correspondence regarding our concern for the safety and well being of both the hunters on our property, and the hunters using the Johnson Unit hunting slot (blind) #1. I have attached copies of our correspondence for your reference dated January 15, 2003, May 19, 2003, and November 21, 2003.

Our initial concern in January of 2003 was the close proximity of our private property line with Johnson #1. It created a number of conflicts, most importantly the safety of the hunters. While my request was to close Johnson #1 was not supported by the department, we appreciate your efforts in resolving the issue by posting a marker 60 yards north of the property line that instructs the hunters to conduct their activities north of the marker.

Unfortunately, we believe there is still a safety issue. As you are aware, there is water fluctuation in this area during the waterfowl season. At times the water is too deep to walk into Johnson #1, so hunters have been using the slot leading to the area and shooting from behind our blinds. This is again unsafe for all of the hunters.

Our recommendation is to move the marker 100 yards from the property line and restrict the hunters from using Johnson #1 when the water level prohibits them from getting to the blind. In no instance should they be hunting closer than 100 yards for the safety of everyone involved. There should be clear signage designating the blind and indicating the restriction of its use during high water periods. Setting the marker at 100 yards would still provide adequate hunting opportunities in the Johnson Unit.

It is important to maintain a safe environment so we can continue to provide hunting opportunities and achieve the goals that were set when the wildlife area was originally established.

We appreciate your time and consideration of this matter. I plan to attend one of the upcoming public input meetings. I would be happy to meet or talk with you at your convenience. I can be reached at 503.781.4370.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Walter E. Remmers
cc: The Sturgeon Lake Duck Club Members: Tim Boyle, John Chaney, Phillip Dawson, Greg Houser, TJ McDonald, Phillip Muir, Richard Parker, Brian Radditz, Nick Stanley, Ted Troutman

735 SW 158th Avenue Beaverton, Oregon 97006 T 503.641.7342 F 503.641.7661
January 15, 2003

Mark Nebeker, Director
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
Sauvie Island Division
18330 NW Sauvie Island Road
Portland, OR 97231

Re: Safety issue at Johnson Unit Blind #1 and Sturgeon Lake Farm LLC

Dear Mark:

I appreciate your taking the time to discuss our concerns for the safety of the hunters on the Game Management area as well as the hunters on Sturgeon Lake Farm LLC private property.

As we discussed, the close proximity of Blind #1 to the private property line has created a number of conflicts and safety issues. Some of the problems I have personally witnessed are: 1. Public hunters continually shoot across the private property line (their decoys are virtually on the property line); 2. The close proximity of private property blinds and public hunter’s blinds has caused some instances of both parties accidentally shooting at each other.

As we discussed, the private property has gone through some ownership changes in the last couple of years, which has increased the hunting pressure and the opportunity for conflict and safety issues. What was once the B & O Duck Club, owned by the Bishop & Osbourne families, has now been sold to Sturgeon Lake Farms LLC, consisting of 13 members.

I would be happy to meet with you or your staff to discuss this matter and hopefully resolve this dangerous situation. I can be reached at my office at (503) 641-7342, x201 or on my mobile at (503) 781-4370.

Sincerely,

Walter E. Remmers
Senior Vice President

WEM:al
Cc: Mr. Brad Bishop
    Mr. John R. Chaney
    Mr. Greg Houser
    Mr. Phillip R. Muir

Mr. Brian Radditz
Mr. Ted A. Troutman
Mr. Tim Boyle
Mr. Phillip Dawson

Mr. T. J. McDonald
Mr. Richard Parker
Mr. Nick Stanley
Mr. Michael Warf
May 19, 2003

Mark Nebeker, Director
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
Sauvie Island Division
18330 NW Sauvie Island Road
Portland, OR 97231

RE: Safety issue at Johnson Unit Blind #1 and Sturgeon Lake Farm LLC

Dear Mark:

In January 2003, we had spoken by phone and I followed up with a letter (see attached) regarding the safety concerns at Johnson Unit Blind #1 and Sturgeon Lake Farm LLC.

We appreciate your closing Blind #1 for the remainder of the 2002/2003 season. Please contact me to let me know if this closure is permanent. I would be happy to meet with you or your staff to resolve this potentially dangerous situation. I can be reached at my office at (503) 641-7342 or on my cell phone at (503) 781-4370.

Sincerely,

Walter E. Remmers
Senior Vice President

WEM:al
Enc.: Letter dated 1/15/03

CC: Mr. Brad Bishop  Mr. Brian Radditz  Mr. T.J. McDonald
    Mr. John R. Chaney  Mr. Ted A. Troutman  Mr. Richard Parker
    Mr. Greg Houser  Mr. Tim Boyle  Mr. Nick Stanley
    Mr. Phillip R. Muir  Mr. Phillip Dawson  Mr. Michael Warn
November 21, 2003

Mr. Walter Remmers
15500 SW Jay St.
Beaverton, OR 97006

Dear Walter:

This letter is a follow up to our telephone conversation on November 21, 2003 concerning the Johnson Unit hunting slot (blind) #1. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) staff from Sauvie Island Wildlife Area, North Willamette Watershed District, and the Director's Office met at the site today and jointly developed a strategy that we believe constructively resolves the issues involving waterfowl hunters at Johnson #1 and Sturgeon Lake Farm LLC. To improve the situation at this site, Sauvie Island Wildlife Area staff will post a marker approximately 60 yards north of the Sturgeon Lake Farm LLC/ODFW property line and will instruct hunters on ODFW public lands to conduct their activities to the north of this marker. This change should significantly reduce any conflicts between the two groups of hunters without causing a substantial loss of hunting opportunity for either group.

The Department does not support the closure of the Johnson Unit slot #1 as a means to resolve potential conflicts. This area has been used for decades with few problems, and elimination of this hunting area would substantially reduce public hunting opportunities in the Johnson Unit. The greatest loss of hunting opportunity would occur early in the waterfowl season when the Johnson #1 and #2 areas are the only slots (blinds) within the Johnson Unit that have water available for waterfowl hunting. As you are well aware, the presence of this open water is critical to waterfowl hunting early in the season.

As I mentioned, we are concerned about this issue and believe that the proposed solution will reduce potential conflicts at this site without reducing hunting opportunities on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Nebeker
Manager
Doug Honeycutt

To: ODFW

Subject: SAUVIE ISLAND WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN

I would like to submit a letter of concern about the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan, I may not be able to attend the public meetings due to work issue's, so this will be my only source of input. I realize that this plan involves many groups, however the one group I would like to address and focus on is the hunting concerns. First I would like to say that most of my time hunting on the refuge over the past 30 plus years has been on the east side units, with an occasional hunt on the west side.

-----The first and foremost problem I see that has progressed over the past several years and needs to be addressed ASAP is the problem with high shooters (crippling birds and not retrieving them). Possible solutions would be shell limits or making several units that back to back each other for shooters and then make other areas for hunters. The later still does not fix the problem of unsportsmanlike hunting, but at least if I go to a hunting unit I do not witness bad shooting behavior. The main problem you have here is that many shooters think they are hunters? Any change in this area to address the problem will be welcome one or we are on the fast track to Summer lake mentality 1 box of shells per harvested bird.

-----Second, is more opportunity to harvest geese in other units other than oak island. (I realize the Dusky ID problem on the public) a solution might be reduced limits or longer wait period if a dusky is harvested by an individual to hunt geese on the refuge.

-----Third is the reservations that are issued should have the blind numbers issued when reserving a blind so you know which blind you have access to in advance. The problem is when you have a reservation you have to spend the night to get the blind you want, depending on water levels and some blinds are consistently better than others.

-----Forth, would be to change the eastside standbly non-reservation line to the system you have on the westside. Once again it would avoid spending the night (or two) and give everyone an equal hunting opportunity to open spots that were not filled by reservation hunters. In conclusion, I would like to say that I mentioned Four things that should be changed, but their are a lot of things that the ODFW staff is doing right. With the amount of hunter volume they deal with they do an extremely good job and are organized, I have enjoyed hunting on the refuge for many years and hope to see it improve. Thanks for listening and your considerations of my proposed changes.

Doug Honeycutt

AUG 06 2009

RECEIVED
AUG 06 2009
WILDLIFE DIVISION

7/30/2009
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2009 9:53 AM
To: Nancy Breuner; Mark Nebeker; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Sauvie Island Draft Management Plan

From: Cheryl Coon [mailto:ccoon4444@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 26, 2009 10:59 AM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island Draft Management Plan

Please include the following comments to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission with regard to the draft management plan.

We strongly support the Plan adequately addressing:

- Support for wetland and oak woodland restoration

- Support for habitat improvements and numeric targets increasing numbers of native turtles, frogs and songbirds, and sandhill cranes, as well as geese

- Requests that the area receive an adequate level of funding and staffing to manage humans and wildlife AND to restore native habitats.

Sincerely,
Cheryl and Jim Coon
MEMORANDUM
Sept. 21, 2009

TO: Roy Elicker, Director
    OR Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
    3406 Cherry Ave.
    Salem, OR 97303-4924

FROM: Theodore P. Kistner, M.S., D.V.M.

SUBJECT: Proposal for Sauvie Island 10 year Management Plan to Ban All Hunting Except Deer and Waterfowl

I am unalterably opposed to the above rule. It is discriminatory at least and totally against the role of the Department in management of wildlife and provision of hunting opportunity in and on a Department Wildlife Management Area. It would appear the current manager is expressing his own bias for proposal of such a rule. I wonder if Pittman-Robertson Funds can be used to support an area if such a rule limiting hunting were to be established, and such funding challenged. Also, if this rule were enacted, what would be the ruling on the annual fee Pheasant hunt on the area?

I strongly urge you and the Wildlife Commissioners to have this proposed rule deleted from the proposed management plan.

Cc: Marla Rae, Chair, OR Wildlife Commission; Commissioners-Dan Edge, Vice-Chair; Skip Klarquist; Jon England; Carter Kerns; Bobby Levy; Zane Smith.
June 30, 2009

Draft Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan

The overall plan is very comprehensive, well organized, and professional.

General comments:

- **Page 35, Table 4. Boat Ramp (3)**
  
  I’m not familiar with “Farrell.” Should “Round” (Lake) be also entered?

- **Page 38**
  
  7th line from top. I’m assuming the two boat launches are Round and Steelman.

- **Page 42**
  
  7th line from top. Sentence . . . However, do not (e.g. brood rearing habitat).
  
  Probably not needed. Delete. (Called that into Karen.)

- **Page 47**
  
  10th line “plus” from the top. Duplication of sentences. (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 lines).

- **Page 56**
  
  Expect discussion of Strategy 14. (Possible loss of Sheriff Larry Weaver’s position.)

- **Page 61**
  
  How are you expected to accomplish your goals and objectives with your current staff? Something has to give!!!!
WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

There is no plan on how we will supply enough feed for waterfowl in the winter.

Example: For ducks, if you have an average population of 60,000 (we know there are more than 60,000 birds) you will need the following amount of feed:

\[
\frac{60,000 \text{ ducks}}{180 \text{ days}} \times \frac{\frac{1}{4} \text{ lb}}{\text{day}} = \frac{\frac{60,000}{4} \text{ lbs}}{180} = \frac{15,000}{4} \text{ lbs} = 3,750,000 \text{ lbs}
\]

With an average of 2 ton per acre of feed you need 675 acres of feed.

For geese, if you have a population of 100,000 (again we know that there are more birds than that) you will need the following amount of feed:

\[
\frac{100,000 \text{ geese}}{180 \text{ days}} \times \frac{1 \text{ lb}}{\text{day}} = \frac{100,000}{180} \text{ lbs} = 555,556 \text{ lbs}
\]

If green forage would produce 500 lbs per acre it would take 36,000 acres of feed. Currently we know that there are about 350,000 geese in the flyway.

Don Anderson
22005 NW Gillihan
Portland, Or 97231-1500
503-621-3327
What Do You Think About Wildlife Area Management?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

As I read this plan, it really doesn’t say much. There is no mention of how much feed will be grown/provided for wintering waterfowl, such as geese or ducks. This plan talks about the Oregon Conservation Strategy OCS, which we know nothing about, nor is spelled out in this document. Having a plan that was derived from an ecosystem-based management philosophy and having recommendations from OCS leaves out the effects to the farming community and expertise from them on what needs to be grown for feed on the Sauvie Island Management Area.

This draft plan was produced solely by staff with no outside participation. This plan was not available until June, which is right in the middle of farming season. This time frame makes it almost impossible for the kind of lengthy discussions needed by all parties as the 1993 plan had.

Columbia County Farm Bureau opposes this draft plan in its current form for all of the above reasons.

Marie Gadotti Vice President
Columbia County Farm Bureau
33717 Johnsons Landing Rd.
Scappoose, Or 97056
503-543-6573
WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

If rabbit hunting is allowed, how do you plan to control general non-hunting public conflict vs rabbit hunters? The best rabbit hunting is around parking lots.

Well managed species specific hunting has allowed high hunter density hunting with very little hunter-hunter conflict with rabbit hunting and their very different hunting methods. How do you plan to control hunter-hunter conflict between these groups?

All hunting on area is very species specific with very little disturbance to other hunter groups. Why does rabbit hunting, which does not follow this format deserve to be hunted out here?

With typical rabbit hunting methods, how do you control rabbit hunting vs harassing wildlife?
WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

West Side:

The small parking lot and ramp for small boats & canoes that is just South of westside checking station should be open to the public between April 15th and October 1st.

The gate on the westside should have it's hours changed from 10 pm to 7 am. Closing the gate at 10 pm is black but opening it at 4 am is too early. It's difficult to fine someone to open the gate at 4 AM.

Oak Island - much more of the area should be grazed for better goose usage.

Sturgeon Lake - needs to be dredged and make mounds thru out the lake for nesting. If something isn't done soon there will be no lake for winter food except for a short period during the winter.
The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

Increase in daily and yearly fees need to be addressed
WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

- Due to such high public use - it is appreciated that ODFW has well marked signs of habitat closures for Geese & other wildlife

- I would like to see more clothing mandatory signs in areas (beaches) not associated with the clothing optional beaches - to help manage inappropriate public actions & displays.

- Parking Permit Increases is welcomed to help budget allocated to maintain facilities used by public

- The Priority Should be for the Land Management (Ecosystems) because it is the backbone of all other concerns (hunts & viewing). The emphasis on the Habitat & Ecosystems is greatly appreciated!

- I support creating more funds through Wildlife viewing permits like etc. I would gladly pay fees to enjoy more than just hunting to help in Habitat Restoration and Conservation

ODFW gave a great presentation - well organized & professional
Sept. 22, 2009

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

My comment has been submitted online.

I am asking that the draft which indicates that it will define the use of St. Wildlife Area for the next decade be modified to allow development of Time-1 Trails for the non-hunting wildlife recreators. Particularly for Oak Island and the trail to Warrior Rock.

Barbara Scot
14500 SW Ferry Rd.
Portland, OR 97223
WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

Remove language in the plan that discriminates against hunting, except deer. Case 54-55 of the short form.

I think I would like to see you and the Department of Fish & Wildlife to create an ad for the infield that will include rabbit, squirrel, corn, some other hunting and maybe conflict with waterfowl hunting and other recreational uses.

Terry C. Roy
6055 NE 124th St
Madrion View
Columbia City, IN
97330
541-443-7341
WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WILDLIFE AREA MANAGEMENT?

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is seeking your comments regarding management of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. You can add your comments to the record by completing this form and turning it in tonight, faxing it to ODFW at 503-947-6009, or by sending an e-mail to ODFW.comments@state.or.us. All comments will be kept on file at ODFW headquarters in Salem.

I'm concerned about enhancing goose habitat on the island, given its proximity to PDX. Erichtches are a threat to the traveling public. Supporting increasing populations may be unwise. I plead to contact PDX personnel with this concern.

Arden Ray
September 2009

RE: Proposed ODFW Sauvie Island Wildlife Management Area 10 Year Plan

For the record, I wish to submit the following comments:

Landscape issues:

1. Controlling Invasive plant species. This is the single most important biological issue. During the past 20 years we've watched the blackberries take over and transform many acres of the WMA. Cottonwood forests and lakesides you used to be able to walk through are now impassable. Wildlife trees like the berry yielding Mountain Ash intentionally planted along Reeder Road are being overwhelmed and buried by blackberries. Same for the old homestead orchards. Much more aggressive action is needed including planning for the immediate extermination of Knotweed when it's spotted.

2. Replant the old farmstead orchards to benefit wildlife and people. These legacy fruit and nut trees are at the end of their life spans and are being lost without any replacements.

3. Make better use of volunteers to achieve all that needs to be done on the area's 11,000 acres. A volunteer coordinator position is warranted given the huge amount of hands-on effort that is needed.

4. Kudos! Construction of the East Side Viewing Area platform, as well as the viewing blind on Rentenauer Road are very positive accomplishments.

Even more so is the new riparian vegetation management regime in Hunt Unit. What was once dry, sun-baked mud through the summer is now very productive and rich in wildlife. We've seen a dramatic increase in both wildlife numbers and numbers of species.

Social issues

1. Managing the escalating number of visitors. For management planning purposes, the 1-million annual visitor day threshold is really not very helpful. It's not the 'annual total' that is the issue but rather the "maximum capacity" of the beach parking areas and sanitation facilities on any single day. ODFW needs to determine what is the maximum daily capacity is, and then develop options for managing daily visitors within that
capacity. This planning has been put off and it's time for ODFW to face the issue squarely.

2. Either compensating the Sauvie Island Volunteer Fire Department for the all too frequent call-outs, or getting a better handle on the beach usage and the activities that are causing our Fire Department to be called almost every day there are large crowds.

3. Reducing interference at the Gilbert River Marine Facility. This boating facility, which I understand was constructed using Marine Board boat registration monies, is becoming more and more difficult for boats to use. Increasing numbers of anglers use the dock for fishing, and refuse to move - even when asked - or allow boats to dock. All too often anglers are refusing to reel in and we’re winding up their fishing line in our prop - which can cause expensive damage to a motor’s lower unit. Better signage that boats have priority use and enforcement of Columbia County’s ordinance regarding this is needed.

4. The need for law enforcement presence commensurate with the volume of daily visitors. WaterFront Park would never have a 10,000 person event and have only a single officer on duty all day. As the responsible management agency ODFW must provide adequate law enforcement.

5. It's vital that increased gang presence be recognized and dealt with aggressively. Suddenly, in the last couple years gang graffiti has spread along the beach areas, Gilbert Ramp, etc. These guys are trying to stake out their turf. Gang graffiti has to immediately be removed, painted over or otherwise obliterated. This isn't happening and needs to be made a priority. These criminals cannot be allowed to gain a toehold.

6. An explicit policy that offroad vehicles/atv's are banned.

Adequate funding

If the Sauvie Island WMA is going to be funded by user fees, then ODFW needs to set the groundwork now so that in the next legislative session there can be a proposal for enough increase in the WMA parking fees to provide the required level of funding.

I encourage ODFW to reach out to it's neighbors and user-group partners so there can be broad-based support for what will be, percentage wise, a significant increase.

Sincerely,

Gary Kish
From: Bill Cleghorn [mailto:bilc_sdio@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 02, 2008 12:17 PM
To: Mark Nebeker
Cc: Bradley Bales; Roy Elcker
Subject: Transforming a substandard S.I. Hunting Unit into a desireable one-A Proposal-

Mark,

This is an idea I've had for a number of years now, probably dating back to the first time I ever saw/hunted the Holman Point Unit on the Westside of Sauvie Is. WMA.

I first brought this up with Ray Johnson, so that would have to have been sometime in the mid-1980s. From him I only got the response that, "That would take action by the State Legislature to change the Refuge Boundaries", and he was anything but receptive to it, even when it was pointed out all the NEGATIVE factors involved in hunting Holman Point in the conditions it's hunted most of the season.

History- I first attempted to hunt on Holman Point sometime in the early 1980s and was appalled at 2 factors that I observed on my first trip out there.

First, the unit was set up in such a many that TYPICALLY there's no access to any water to place decoys to attract ducks into "lethal" shooting range for the Steel Shot we were required to use. The second and most disturbing thing I witnessed was the fact that shooters who were hunting out there took shots at high flying ducks (perhaps the lowest ones that flew over them) more out of frustration and desperation and Crippled numerous ducks "sailing" them as cripples into the Gilbert River back behind the trees from where the hunters were located.

In following years I've since witnessed this, seeing cripples gliding out onto Sturgeon Lake while I was hunting on Malarky Unit on the
Eastside, across the Gilbert.

When confronting Ray Johnson as to why this was allowed to continue as a "crippling unit", he simply stated that, "It was originally set up that way as a "Pass Shooting" area for shooters who wanted that type of opportunity".

This might have been the case in the days of Lead shot that may have permitted successful bagging of birds at longer ranges than what's common these days, but to my mind something that shouldn't (and isn't, in literature) encouraged by our resources agencies.

The undeniable fact about Holman Point is that most of its hunting sites are typically (at all times except "flood conditions") OUT OF and not near the water.

Since my original query and proposal for "improvement" of Holman Point Unit, some 20+ years ago, I've occasionally brought this up with various employees of the Wildlife Management Unit and generally received favorable comments as to "It's a good idea IF you can convince anyone in authority to do something about it".

So here's my idea...

-PROPOSAL-

I propose that the Oregon Dept. of Fish & Wildlife adopts as a project to "rehabilitate" the Holman Point Unit by seeking to change the Refuge Boundary, moving it out into the water in a line that runs parallel to the shoreline and approximately 60 yards from the "grassy bank" that is typically the waterline during mid-season on.

I realize that like other units similarly set up, early in the season there might not be any water at the hunting sites.

By extending the Refuge Boundary past the current location, back
in the trees where it currently exists and out into the water some distance, hunters can use the tree line to conceal themselves and can place decoys out in the water to hopefully attract Ducks within reasonable shooting distance.

Two points have been made that may pose potential difficulties in doing this.

One is getting approval from the Legislature to move the existing boundary. I believe that if the Department made the recommendation, especially citing the reduction in non-recoverable Waterfowl losses do to improved hunting practices there shouldn’t be much debate over the favorability of such a change. (It has been pointed out to me that perhaps the current location of the Refuge Boundary signs might not even be "correct"? And perhaps maybe NO approval is required)

The other item that has been pointed out as a "problem" with changing the Refuge Boundary is loss of refuge area.

IF this is the case, then additional Refuge Boundary area can be "picked up" by moving the boundary in other areas.

I would suggest that additional Refuge area could easily be acquired by shifting the boundary marker signs out on the Aaron Unit where they run across the field directly over the Dike. If the area loss was calculated for Holman Point, a similar area could be gained by shifting the Refuge boundary signs to the right, looking west from the dike, into Aaron Unit without any appreciable loss of "hunting area" (no loss to the areas that are typically hunted in Aaron Unit). IF the amount of water area loss to the Refuge were an additional concern (if that might be the case), additional water Refuge area could be acquired by shifting angles of the "in water" Refuge boundary between Malarky and Aaron units (thus acquiring more "refuge" in non-hunted open water areas, again a "no impact" change
As I see it (and hopefully you will too) this shift in Refuge/Hunting Boundary to the Holman Point Unit would transform it from a generally poor performing hunting unit that encourages High Shooting and high crippling losses, to that of a much more desireable hunting opportunity that would in addition take some of the pressure off of the other, more desireable hunting units on the Westside (i.e. Mud Lake, low number blind sites). This simple action would in effect create a unit similar to Johnson Unit on the Eastside.

In addition, it’s been pointed out to me that additionally convening a work party of volunteers to "clean out" some of the brush and tree limbs on the Holman Point #2 site would also enhance that site's location as a "good" opportunity.

I hope you will look at and consider this proposal.

I think this is something that could be done, mostly administratively, with a minor amount of physical effort that could greatly improve the hunting opportunities on the Westside of the Sauvie Is. WMA, and at the same time reduce waterfowl crippling losses. That's surely a "win-win" situation.

Respectfully submitted,
Bill Cleghorn
ODFW June 2009 Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Plan / comments

I preface these comments by saying that I agree with other Sauvie Island Conservancy members who have complimented the plan on rating a "high priority" for restoration of Sturgeon Lake, oak woodlands and savannahs, and wetlands. Most other people have gone through the plan and commented on individual items. Because I've been involved with ODFW and the SI Wildlife Area on a broader scale for the better part of two decades, my comments reflect more of an overview than specifics in the plan.

In the early '90s, I was one of 60 people selected by ODFW to attend their Second Century Conference, with the aim of "increased emphasis on the sustainability, restoration and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat."

I was one of a few dozen people who spent a year and half helping to rewrite this plan's predecessor. Some key points were to "shift to overall habitat considerations," "accommodate wildlife-oriented recreation by providing additional year-round opportunity for wildlife viewing," and "explore additional funding or support resources."

In the intervening years, ODFW put together the Oregon Conservation Strategy.

Yet here we are, 16 years later, and I'm looking at a plan that is mired in the 1947 mentality of hunting, hunting, hunting. Page after page points out that this is an agency whose main purpose is "managing habitat and programs for public hunting." Where's an increased emphasis on sustainability? Where's guidance from your Conservation Strategy? Where are overall habitat considerations?
Where's the year-round wildlife viewing?—in fact, the viewing is getting decreased. And where are plans or even visions for additional funding?

My main thought after reading through this plan is: ODFW needs to get its head out of the goose poop.

In the 16 years since the last plan, other agencies have revamped their agendas to support all wildlife. The number of hunters has decreased while the number of wildlife watchers and people who care about wildlife have increased. Metro managed to create a vision and work through the reality of garnering over $300 million for greenspaces, wildlife and habitat. State Parks got an infusion of $123 million dollars since 1999 from lottery funds. And here's ODFW, still catering to hunters, merely talking about raising the parking permit to $7 while admitting that won't do anything to help wildlife. I'm thinking about millions of dollars of money coming from wildlife watchers and thinking, "It's ODFW's turn."

My recommendations to ODFW are these:
- You need to change from the top down.
- If 8,000 people are hunters and 80,000 people are wildlife watchers your staff should reflect a 90% focus on non-game species.
- ODFW needs to work with other agencies to research and solve the proliferation of geese by biological means rather than hunting. I googled the words "birth control for geese" and found 375 links, including companies and products for "human population management technology for wildlife." Wildlife agencies' goose habitat programs are the reason we are so overrun with geese; they should be working hard to undo the problem they created.
- Your seven-person Commission should be a representation of people in the state as it relates to wildlife: one hunter, one avid anti-hunter, and the rest non-hunting supporters of wildlife.
- Metro and State Parks got money from wildlife-watchers because they have an image of "warm and fuzzy." ODFW has the image of "the killing-critters folks." You need to be "re-branded" from a hunting and fishing agency to the shining star for Oregon's fish and wildlife, the savior of, or at least doing the very best to save, all species and habitats. Live up to your name, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. In the Sunday September 27, 2009 Oregonian's O! section, there's a story about "ad man Jelly Helm," taking a sabbatical from his brilliant work at Weiden and Kennedy to re-brand the Oregon Humanities Council. I read that and thought, "ODFW needs someone like him."
ODFW needs to hire the visionary staff to come up with creative ways to draw money out of all the people who care about wildlife. Don’t say it can’t be done. Metro and State Parks figured out a way.

You need a strong, engaging message about your plight and what you need money for.

You need to educate people about wildlife needs and what you're doing/will do for wildlife and habitat (and what that means to people).

Like the old Clinton campaign slogan of "It's the economy, stupid," every staff person should have a poster in their office, "It's the non-hunters whom there are more of who care about wildlife, stupid" as a constant reminder of where your greatest numbers of potential supporters lies.

ODFW needs to create a volunteer position and tap the enormous volunteer resources out there willing to help. In the first greenspaces campaign that won, there was one Saturday afternoon where we had 400 volunteers out going door to door. If the wildlife area has over a million visitors and your agency's visionary person found a way to get volunteers to ask for just $1 from everyone, that would exceed the entire $750,000 budget you have right now.

All this is possible.

So, I say to ODFW, quit focusing on hunting and start focusing on all wildlife. Get some vision, and visionary staff. Let that vision lead to creativity in a wealth of funding from people who care about wildlife. That's where you need to go in the next ten years. This plan not only isn't going to get you there, it's not even especially headed in the right direction.

Sincerely,

Donna Matrazzo
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Ave NE
Salem OR 97303

Regarding: Draft Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft SIWA Management Plan. We think it’s a very good plan, and will contribute to the continued good management of the reserve; hence, our comments are relatively minor. However, as neighbors of the reserve, we’d like to share our thoughts.

We think that a budget priority should be education, including signage. We’ve run into a lot of boaters from St Helens, Washington state, and other parts of Oregon state who aren’t aware that they’re on a reserve, or that the rules regarding restricted access to some areas during hunting season, campfires, or camping might be different than on the Washington side of the river or Sand Island. Most of these people certainly aren’t maliciously breaking the law; they are simply unaware. For example, I think there were about a hundred people (mostly families) camping on the northeastern beach over the Fourth of July weekend simply because it gave a good view of the fireworks on Sand Island. I know that the northern section of the reserve is much harder for reserve staff and security to reach than areas closer to road access, but that signage near the beach up there would likely cut back on activities that are prohibited on the reserve.

On a related note, the estimates of the number of people visiting the reserve only include those who access it by road. We think there’s a significant population who reach the reserve (throughout the year) by boat. I have no idea how you would count them, but it might be worth a note in the Public Use section.

A wildlife reserve should be managed for wildlife (game and non-game). I understand that some neighboring farmers on the island are unhappy about birds getting in their crops. It’s unfortunate, but I don’t think that the wildlife reserve’s role should be to cut back on wildlife so that it doesn’t disturb the neighbors. Wetland habitat isn’t everywhere, and it’s important that it is preserved. This wildlife reserve is incredibly important for migratory birds. As neighbors, we appreciate that neighbors are being taken heavily into account in this planning process. However, we know that you are aware that there are a significant number of people who hike and bird-watch in the reserve. We’ve talked to quite a few people...
(mostly Portland residents) who hike out to Warrior Rock once or twice every few years. These people likely didn’t attend the DNR meetings nor see the draft. I’m certain that their comments would also ask for the protection of wildlife habitat.

As owners of the property at Warrior Rock, we know that our property is a bit too small to really show up on any of the maps in the report, as is the case with some larger private parcels. In the interest of avoiding confusion for the many people who visit the northern unit and Warrior Rock (hikers, boaters, and Sauvie Island residents), would it be appropriate to indicate the existence of private parcels in the area? Perhaps an appendix that includes approximate locations of properties and their use (e.g. “private hunting club”) might be useful to readers of the plan.

Invasive plant control is important for habitat, and uncontrolled invasive plants are likely to spread to neighboring property. Appendix B should include a list of known invasive plants.

We appreciate that the reserve is off-limits during nighttime hours. Security is difficult then, and we hope that reopening it is a low priority.

And finally, the addition of headers in appendices would help readability.

Thank you. We really appreciate the work that went into this.

Sincerely,

Christi Denton and Gene Kunze
503 298 4813
mail@chaikana.org
TO: ODFW                                           October 9, 2009
FROM: Brian Lightcap 13342 NW Newberry Rd., Burlington, OR.

RE: Re-evaluation of the Sauvie Is. Mgmt Plan

As one member of the West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District, a professional ecologist, and forest and farm land manager in the West Hills, I have a unique responsibility to comment. As many of you all know I support the restoration of Sturgeon Lake, but having just returned from a Science Panel Salmon Recovery Workshop, convened by Phil Trask. I have an altered perspective. This perspective is poorly articulated in the Sauvie Is Mgmt Plan. These workshop attendees included most federal and State agency reps from Oregon and Washington. Some of these agencies and organizations annually review grant applications for ecological restorations. Some their focus was on segment 7 of the estuary below Bonneville Dam. That segment is from Ridgefield to the Willamette River confluence with the Columbia.

This group observed that restoration strategies are usually uncoordinated and frequently in competition with one another, especially in reach 7 (F). This group desperately is attempting to avert all this grant application chaos. The situation wastes a lot of grant evaluation time on the part of OWEB, BPA, and LCREP and many others. Though I know the immediate issue is managing resources on the island and keeping landowners relatively happy, I still now strongly believe this local action is rather myopic. It tends to pit bicyclers with farmers, urban recreationists and fisherman, hunters and salmon. It does not suggest a strategy to light a light at the end of the tunnel. At one time, as I noted at one of the meetings on the island, there used to be Coordinated Resource Management Plan CRMP) led by NRCS and ODFW (Frank Newton). CRMP is not just an idle acronym. It’s foundations lie with the Department of Agriculture. It’s real and has many federal and state partners. If attention to the past CRMP had been attended to, the work to update the ODFW management plan would have been FAR easier. I would like to see the following included in the Management plan.

- A clear statement at the beginning of the plan that Sauvie Is is within of Segment 7, of the 8 segments between the mouth and Bonneville Dam.
- That be science driven recovery and management strategies for waterfowl and fishery resources will be publicly explained and prioritized, in order to make best use of restoration funds;
- To accomplish this effort, partners, both in Oregon and Washington will be sought for significant contributors for efficient cost (time) effective solutions for recovery options in Segment F.
- That significant restoration actions will occur in the context of resource lands (private and public) that are (might) competing for restoration funding on or near the ODFW refuge;
- That the Sturgeon Lake restoration effort proceed in the context of all the other salmon recovery options provided by the Science Workshop Team. This work may be started by a sub-group of this team, tasked to that end for presentation to the full team.
- That ODFW make a serious effort to re-institute the CRMP group.
- That ODFW publicly recognize and endorse, actions of groups, such the Science Wshp Team to be more effective with coordination restoration proposal in segment 7 of the LCRE.
As a longtime user (almost thirty years) of the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area, I have read the proposed Sauvie Island Management Plan with great interest and a sense of obligation to participate. Hence, I want to contribute my views with the hope strengthen the plan so it will become a solid management tool for the next ten years. Overall, the plan is very comprehensive and addresses what are likely to be the critical issues. As Portland’s population grows, usage of the SIWA will grow and pressure will arise to open the area to many different activities that may endanger habitat for birds, fish, and other animals that currently thrive there. Placing habitat management as two of the major goals is wise, for that provides overarching protection. So I fully support the main goals and objectives of the plan.

That said, I feel that the plan has a major weakness: Setting as one of the management foci the need to manage habitat for wintering geese. Here are my reasons for disagreement:

As was clearly stated in the plan’s introduction, “The wildlife area was established in 1947 with primary objectives of protecting and improving waterfowl habitat and providing a public hunting area.” This premise was reiterated later, “Public hunting is one of the primary reasons for the purchase and creation of SIWA and waterfowl hunting will remain a high priority public use on SIWA.” Clearly, the management plan recognizes that waterfowl hunting on the SIWA has always been and always should be a top priority. Waterfowl hunters essentially paid for purchasing the land through the Pittman-Robertson Act and continue to support operations through purchase of licenses and parking permits. They pay for and expect waterfowl hunting opportunities.

The goose populations on Sauvie Island have increased dramatically in recent years, and private land owners are justifiably concerned about predation on their agricultural crops. Waterfowl hunters, on the other hand, essentially have no opportunity to hunt for geese on the SIWA because of the minuscule annual Dusky goose quota on the SIWA.

The management plan, as currently drafted, states, “One of the primary purposes of the wildlife area will be to manage pastures to provide habitat for geese and minimize their dispersal to, and grazing impacts on, neighboring private agricultural areas.” No comparable statement is made in the management plan alluding to a primary SIWA purpose is to manage for duck habitat. Goose habitat management will require resources, both staff and materials. By default, then, management to enhance goose habitat will decrease duck habitat. Yet SIWA Waterfowl hunters can only hunt for ducks, and not geese. Hence, those hunters’ dollars will be subsidizing local farmers and diminishing the waterfowl hunting opportunity on the SIWA. Thus, when the Management Plan states that a primary SIWA purpose is to manage for geese, it is a direct contradiction to its own claim that waterfowl hunting is a high priority.

My specific recommendation is as follows:

1. Reduce the list of management foci from four to three by elimination of the focus that states “Providing habitat for wintering Canada geese.”
2. Eliminate the explanation of the phrase "Providing habitat for wintering Canada geese" to avoid explicitly stating that a "primary purpose of the wildlife will be to manage habitat for geese..." on pages 5-6.

Thank you for considering my recommendation.
Respectfully submitted,
Graig Spolek
503-282-0266
Suavie Island Management Plan
ODFW
3406 Cherry St,
Salem, Oregon 97303-4924

Dear Sir,

Your draft of the Ten Year Management Plan for Suavie Island has language I would like removed from the plan. On pages 54 and 55, under objectives 3.1: strategy 1. The restrictive language stating "maintain the closure for hunting of furbearers, predators, unprotected and protected wildlife" should be removed.

This language is discriminating to the hunting community at large and should not be included in the plan.

Please honor my request and remove the language in question from the plan. I await confirmation of my request and am available for comments concerning the matter.

Sincerely,

Jerika Wallace

RECEIVED
OCT 19 2009
WILDLIFE DIVISION
Suavie Island Management Plan
ODFW
3406 Cherry St,
Salem, Oregon 967303-4924

Dear Sir,

Your draft of the Ten Year Management Plan for Suavie Island has language I would like to see removed from the plan. Under objectives 3.1: strategy 1, on pages 54 and 55. The restrictive language proclaiming “maintain the closure for hunting of furbearers, predators, unprotected and protected wildlife” must to be removed.

This passage is discriminating to all hunters and should be removed from the plan.

Please acknowledge my request and remove the language in question from the plan. I await confirmation of my request and am available for comments concerning this issue.

I am also concerned about the use of the area. I noticed that the blackberries near the parking lot for the beach, in the northern most unit had been sprayed with herbicides. This presents a potential danger to the cattle that were grazing on the berries and to any humans who eat the berries or the meat from the cattle.

Sincerely,

John Carr

[Signature]
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 2:18 PM
To: Mark Nebeker; Nancy Breuner; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Hound Hunting on SIWA

---

From: Kathy Corbett [mailto:corbe12@attglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 12:09 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Hound Hunting on SIWA

Please allow Beagles and Coonhounds to hunt on SIWA. We see no valid reason to exclude hounds from this land.

Kathy Corbett
20665 SW Johnson Street
Aloha, Oregon 97006
From: Libby Wentz [mailto:libbypw@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 11:45 AM
To: ODWF comments
Subject: re Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan

10/28/09

Dear Sirs,

Hound hunting, both beagle and coonhound, should be re-instated on Sauvie Island Wildlife Area (SIWA) because SIWA was bought with Pittman-Robertson Act money and is maintained with hunt license dollars.

Rabbit hunting was upheld as legal by a judge in court a few years ago. That SIWA managers added another administrated rule to prohibit beagles illustrates the bias against hounds by the current management.

Coochunting was allowed in SIWA many years ago but became infeasible when the parking permit program was instituted. The only reason the area was no longer used by coonhunters was because the parking was only from 4 AM -10 PM.

I wrote a letter to ODFW in June of 2007 and was given reasons why off leash training would not be allowed. None of them were satisfactory. I am no longer seeking to change the off leash program. I want coonhunting and rabbit hunting to be allowed on SIWA.

One of the reasons for not allowing night hunting was ‘livability’ for the island residents. The livability issues they have are with the tremendous deluge of beach users in the summer. This livability excuse was mis-appropriately used out of context to keep coonhunting off the island.

Another issue brought up in the response letter I got was security. The most effect way to keep riff-raff out of the SIWA is to have honest people using it. The riff-raff is looking for a quiet, out of the way place. They do not want to drink, do drugs and have sex where it is possible and likely law abiding people will be.

Therefore, parking permits for coon hunting at night should be issued to Oregon residents with proper and current hunt licenses. The permits should be offered out to general coonhunting public and not given to management pets. The likely areas would be any in which other hunting is allowed and might be on alternating days from the duck hunters. The area at the north end of Reeder Road would be a likely area, too.

Sincerely,
Windows 7: Simplify your PC. Learn more.
Allow hunting on SIWA please!
Please allow: BEAGLE AND COONHOUND HUNTING ON SIWA.

THIS LAND WAS BOUGHT BY HUNTER AND IS MAINTAINED BY HUNT LICENSES SO WHY EXCLUDE HOUNDS??

Thank you,

Barbara Baker

Merchant e-Solutions
Helpdesk Representative
Mon - Fri 6:00 - 2:30 PST
Ph: 888-288-2692
Fx: 509-232-5625
person responsible for delivering this message to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have reason to believe that you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this message to an intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

This e-mail has been scanned by MCI Managed Email Content Service, using Skeptic(tm) technology powered by MessageLabs.
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 2:19 PM
To: Mark Nebeker; Nancy Breuner; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Hounds on SIWA

From: Karri O'Brien [mailto:mkobrien@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 12:51 PM
To: odfw.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Hounds on SIWA

I'm sending in my request to allow hounds including beagles on the SIWA. This area is maintained by my wildlife dollars and yet I'm excluded from my choice of hunting.

Mic O'Brien
President of the Lower Columbia Sportsman's Alliance

Windows 7: It works the way you want. Learn more.
-----Original Message-----
From: Eric [mailto:ericecologyaa@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 1:04 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Hound Hunting

We have hounds and support hound hunting in Oregon. There are plenty of management 
opportunities. It's frustrating when there is news of government officials conducting culls 
or removing nuisance animals. Instead of paying taxes to remove animals revenues could 
be generated for permits, fees and license and citizens would have greater opportunities to 
partake within the livelihood of a houndsman.
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 2:19 PM
To: Mark Nebeker, Nancy Breuner, Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: hunting on SIWA

From: Scott Ward [mailto:sward@ci.healdsburg.ca.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 1:10 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: hunting on SIWA

Hello,

Why in the world are you preventing the use of hounds and beagle on SIWA? It makes no sense! Hunter dollars paid for it, let them hunt!

Scott Ward

(707) 431-3337
Hello,

My Name is Buddy Woodberry, I'm the Northern Oregon Director for the Oregon United Sporting Dog assoc. I'm emailing you today to encourage you to allow Sauvie's Island wildlife Area open to Scent hounds and training of Fur Bearing animals, and Rabbits.

Sauvie's Island is a Great resource for Women and children Hunters who can Train and hunt safely in a more controlled environment. I see no reason to allow One User group access over another User group.

If there is any reason's or concerns with allowing Dogs who Pursuit Fur bearer's please let me know so we as a User group can address this situation. If it's regarding safety, or Firearms, Perhaps allowing Pursuit or training instead of Harvest would be something that we could agree on.

Buddy Woodberry
October 30, 2009

Mr. Mark Nebeker  
Sauvie Island Wildlife Area  
18330 NW Sauvie Island Rd  
Portland, OR 97231-1312

Dear Mr. Nebeker,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with Portland Audubon staff and board members on September 30th regarding the draft Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan. The Sauvie Island Wildlife Area is of critical importance to Portland Audubon's 11,000 members in the Portland Metropolitan Region. Portland Audubon has a longstanding relationship with the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area. In 2003 the Wildlife Area was designated as one of 103 internationally recognized Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in Oregon. Important Bird Areas are sites that have been identified as being of critical importance for avian breeding, wintering and migratory needs. Portland Audubon manages the IBA program in Oregon.

We view our collaborations with the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area as an important and productive part of our program and are eager to find new opportunities to work with ODFW to protect and restore the wildlife area and to utilize the wildlife area in an ecologically responsible manner to increase public enjoyment, understanding and stewardship of the important natural resource values that are found on the island.

Our current activities on the Sauvie Island include:

1. Leading dozens of natural history trips and classes to the island each year;  
2. Partnering with ODFW, Metro and HawkWatch International to present Raptor Road Trip each February, an event which draws between 400-800 people to the island to learn about its wintering raptor populations;  
3. Public releases of rehabilitated birds of prey, events which have drawn as many as 800 people;  
4. Wildlife research including point counts at Oak Island (in support of ODFW plans to restore habitat) and at Wapato Wetlands and raptor surveys;

Audubon Society of Portland  
5151 NW Cornell Road  
Portland, OR 97210  
(503) 292-6855  
www.audubonportland.org
5. Restoration Projects including helping support shorebird habitat restoration at Racetrack Lake and Coon Point and a kestrel nest box installation and monitoring program;
6. Rehabilitation of wildlife including using the refuge for flight training and hacking of injured and orphaned native birds.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft management plan. We strongly support the ecosystem-based management philosophy on which the new plan is based and are pleased to see that the Oregon Conservation Strategy (OCS) is explicitly referenced as a guiding document. We fully endorse the plans stated prioritization that public uses must be compatible with the protection, enhancement and management of wetland and upland habitats to benefit fish and wildlife species and all of our ensuing comments should be read in that light. However, there are several places that we believe the document could be improved.

1. **Public Process**: We were originally informed that ODFW would develop a public stakeholder group to help develop the Management Plan. We were quite surprised when the plan rolled out in draft form without such a process having been initiated. Our understanding is that ODFW was concerned about a repeat of the acrimony associated with development of management plans in the past. We believe that this concern would have been best addressed through professional facilitation of the plan development process rather than forgoing the stakeholder process altogether. We believe that the Management Plan would have benefited from the type of dialogue that is generated in a stakeholder process, but which does not typically occur in the three minute sound bites presented at public hearings. We also believe that a stakeholder process would have allowed ODFW the opportunity to solicit outside input and expertise in areas of particular interest or deficiency. Finally we believe that a stakeholder process not only helps to build ODFW's relationship with the community but also helps build relationships between diverse stakeholders. The decision to abandon the stakeholder process was in our opinion ill advised and inappropriate for a public agency.

2. **Public Access for birders and other wildlife watchers**: It is absolutely critical that ODFW reach out to non-traditional constituencies and provide more equitable access to the island for the birthing and wildlife watching communities. In the past, Audubon has been a strong and vocal supporter of ODFW management decisions that have reduced access to benefit natural resource protection and restoration efforts. We continue to support prioritization of these objectives even where access is reduced. However, where opportunities do remain, ODFW needs to do a better job of considering the birding and wildlife watching communities. The Draft Plan as written is insufficient to rectify this existing deficiency.
   a. The document in several places refers to "hunting, fishing and other wildlife oriented recreational and educational opportunities" (see pages 3 and 38).

Audubon Society of Portland
5151 NW Cornell Road
Portland, OR 97210
(503) 292-6855
www.audubonportland.org
This type of language perpetuates the perception that birding and wildlife watching are relegated to secondary considerations. It is important that ODFW identify these activities by name: We would recommend "Hunting, fishing, birding, wildlife watching and environmental education opportunities."

b. The plan should describe specific strategies for increasing opportunities for birders and wildlife watchers including increased winter opportunities. Strategies could include the following:
   i. Winter closure days when birders and wildlife watchers will be allowed into restricted areas rather than hunters;
   ii. Special winter birding permits (fee based) that will allow conditional access to specific restricted areas (could be coupled with provisions to prevent conflicts with hunting activities);
   iii. Permits to allow groups such as Audubon to lead trips to winter closure areas at specific times;
   iv. Increased monitoring programs that would allow trained volunteers to enter restricted areas to support research priorities.

c. There is an error on page 37. The text describes an average of 8500 hunter visits per year but Table 5 describes 15,000 hunter days.

d. Raptor Road Trip, IBA and Working Group as well as formal field trips offered by Audubon and other organizations should be added to the list of activities on pages 39 and strategies on page 57;

e. The educational/interpretive section on page 40 should provide greater detail regarding existing activities;

3. Management for Canada and Cackling Goose Habitat: We are deeply concerned that the Management Area is being converted into a Canada and Cackling (i.e., ssp. minima and leucopareia—AOU now considers the Cackling Geese and Canada Geese to be separate species) goose farm. We understand the pressures placed on the Management Area by Native American subsistence rights in Alaska as well as by depredation concerns of local farmers. However, Sauvie Island is critical for a wide variety of species, and biological diversity should not be sacrificed to support a monoculture of Canada geese. It is of great concern to see the amount of land being proposed to address this narrow concern. The overall effectiveness of such a strategy, including the incremental benefits of converting additional areas to goose forage, are poorly described. We question whether this strategy is sustainable given that refuge goose populations have increased from 6,000 in 1947 to more than 100,000 today (with migration peaks at sometimes reaching 300,000) and we are still nearly 70,000 geese below flyway targets. The heavy prioritization placed on managing Canada and Cackling geese is inconsistent the vision articulated in the plan: "...Sound management measures to support a diverse array of fish, wildlife and plant species." We encourage ODFW to do the following:

Audubon Society of Portland
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a. We strongly question whether management for wintering Canada and Cackling geese should be singled out as one of four primary management foci;
b. Clearly distinguish in the Management Plan between grasslands that are managed for goose forage and grassland that are managed specifically for other species or for broader ecological biodiversity. On page 20 grasslands and pastures should be separated into their own sections;
c. Continue to work with the farm community to develop hazing strategies and incentives to deal with Canada/Cackling Geese on private lands;
d. Better evaluate the incremental value of conversion of refuge habitat for goose forage—how effective is this strategy for reducing depredation on private lands;
e. Work with the Pacific Flyway Council to evaluate whether continued growth of goose populations is sustainable in terms of refuge management objectives in the Willamette Valley and beyond;
f. Consider reducing the area allowed for hunting and dog training in order to provide reduce disturbance areas for geese, thus reducing the overall landbase necessary to set aside for goose habitat.

4. **Funding:** Audubon strongly supports the development of mechanism that would allow birders and other wildlife watchers to contribute more substantively to support the refuge. We would support both voluntary and mandatory funding mechanisms. At the statewide level we have supported a tax on birdseed to fund the ODFW Wildlife Conservation Strategy. We have also supported establishing and increasing fees for access to ODFW managed wildlife areas for non-consumptive users. We encourage the management area to look for refuge specific strategies to take better advantage of funding opportunities presented by the vast popularity of the refuge with the wildlife watching community. Strategies to consider include:
   a. Non game stamps;
   b. Wildlife Watching Access Fees;
   c. Special Access Birding Permits (for example to access specific areas during winter closures);
   d. Increasing collaborative grant writing to fund specific wildlife diversity projects;

5. **More explicit recognition of the importance of nearby habitat areas in protecting the integrity of the Sauvie Island Management Area:** The Sauvie Island Management Area is part of a larger network of remnant natural areas that comprise what is left of the Lower Columbia River Floodplain. In many respects the system is failing, a fact exemplified by the federal listing of salmon and steelhead species and reports detailing dramatic declines in native bird populations. Significant management changes or landscape conversion at proximal natural areas has direct implications for the integrity of the Sauvie Island Management Area. For example

---
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potential loss of hundreds of acres of habitat at West Hayden Island to marine industrial development or increased public access at Government Island facilitated by expansion of public docking facilities could drive Canada Goose populations westward to Sauvie Island exacerbating an already difficult situation. It could also increase the importance of prioritizing certain species such as Streaked Horned Lark and western painted turtles as local alternatives for migratory stopover habitat, foraging and breeding are reduced. We recommend that the management plan devote a section to more fully describing the system of natural areas in which the Sauvie Island Management Area is embedded and strategies for developing a more holistic integrated approach to managing this system.

6. **Intertwine Alliance**: In 2007, Portland Audubon, Trust for Public Land, Urban Greenspaces Institute and Metro began work on a new alliance devoted to building "The world's best system of parks, trails and natural areas." The geographic focus of the Alliance is the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Region with a specific priority placed on ensuring that the efforts of the Alliance directly complement and connect to biodiversity and active transportation (bike and pedestrian) efforts on the greater landscape. A second focus of the alliance is increasing funding to fund the parks, trails and natural areas system with notable success already occurring with passage of the 2006 Greenspace Bond Measure ($237.4 million) and the 2008 THPRD Bond Measure ($100 million). Too often Sauvie Island is viewed as outside and separate from the urban ecosystem when in fact Sauvie Island is directly impacted by natural resource decisions made by proximal jurisdictions and serves as a primary destination of choice for urban residents. We encourage the Sauvie Island Management Area to become actively involved in the Intertwine Alliance as a vehicle for integrating the objectives of the management area into funding, biodiversity, recreational and environmental education strategies at the regional level.

7. **Species specific prioritization and strategies**: The plan should more clearly describe how it will help meet the objectives of the Oregon Conservation Strategy. This should include detailed descriptions of how the habitat objectives in the plan will benefit specific species of conservation concern and how these management strategies will contribute to overall regional objectives.

   a. 50 acres of native grasslands and 193 acres of oak woodlands and oak savannah is woefully insufficient given that more than 2,100 acres of habitat will be managed for Canada and Cackling Geese. The disparities are overwhelming and completely contrary to the Plan's stated objective of managing for diverse populations of native fish and wildlife.

   i. We would in particular like to see conversion of some existing goose pasture to serve as habitat for grassland species including Western Meadowlark, Streaked Horned Lark, Savannah Sparrow and Short-eared Owl.

---
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b. The plan notes that over 274 avian species (including 70 breeders), 37 mammals and 13 herps are found on the refuge. The plan should clearly delineate which non-game species are priorities, how the plan will benefit these species and how this will contribute to regional objectives. For species of conservation concern that are not assisted by the plan, there should be a clear explanation of why these species are not being targeted.

c. The Plan should include a shorebird strategy to ensure that existing and historic shorebird habitats are maintained and restored. Loss of shorebird habitat and viewing opportunities is a major concern for Audubon. The information provided on page 42 (consideration of shorebird habitat in yearly work plans) is a start in the right direction, but it does not go far enough--there should be a specific list of priority sites that will be managed for shorebirds.

d. The Plan fails to state any management objectives for the shoreline beach habitat found on the island. The plan seems to simply accept that the beach will serve has habitat for nudists and other recreational users. The Plan should incorporate specific management objectives for wildlife that utilize beach habitats including shorebirds and gulls.

e. The Biological Resources Section of the Plan fails to consider passerines, gulls, herons, egrets, grebes or raptores. These omissions should be corrected.

f. The monitoring section describes existing monitoring program. It should also include a prioritized list of new monitoring programs that should be initiated on the refuge (should resources become available) to track specific species of conservation concern.

g. The plan fails to mention invertebrate species such as butterflies, moths, dragonflies, mussels etc. These should be considered.

8. Other Issues:

a. Page 39: The Plan should describe in greater detail what steps will be allowed to control for West Nile Virus. As written the plan suggests that ODFW is deferring to vector control agencies. We recommend that ODFW take a more active role in this process given the implications for native wildlife populations.

b. Strategy 1 on page 59 ("manage public use compatible with the biological needs...") is actually an objective. The Plan should provide specific strategies as to how this will be accomplished.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. Please feel free to contact me if you need any further clarification or information. We look forward to continuing to work with the Management Area in the future.

Sincerely,

Audubon Society of Portland
5151 NW Cornell Road
Portland, OR 97210
(503) 292-6855
www.audubonportland.org
Bob Sallinger  
Conservation Director  
Audubon Society of Portland
To Whom it may concern:

Because hunting is such a large arena, and our hunting license and tag purchases pay for much of the wildlife areas maintained by ODFW, I feel it is very wrong that the hound hunting for rabbit and coon is so restricted when it comes to the use of State Wildlife Areas. EE Wilson is the only W.A. that openly allows rabbit hunting - like duck hunters who can utilize just about all State Wildlife Areas - I want to see rabbit and coon hunting with hounds brought to the SIWA. Our hunting dollars help pay for the operations of that land and when I pay for something I expect TO BE ABLE TO USE WHAT I HAVE PAID FOR! The Manager of SIWA is operating and maintaining SIWA in a very self-serving manner - THIS IS COMPLETELY WRONG.

Missy Fix
From: diver99@juno.com
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2009 8:58 AM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: allowing beagles and coonhounds to hunt on siwa

YES, YOU SHOULD ALLOW BEAGLE AND COONHOUND HUNTING ON SIWA

GENNY HERBRAND
253-307-8854
10304 8TH AVE S
TACOMA WA 98444

Top Bathroom Remodelers
Get up to 4 free bathroom remodel estimates today. No obligation!
http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL2131/c?cp=JwDAUmkk174LEq2Kx3BLwAAJz159at7jShg4I-wy2FvGla5AAQAAAAFAAAAAN5WBz8AAMlAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABYGAAAAAR=
I thought I would drop a note asking why is it that on the Sauvies Island that you now have excluded beagle hunting/rabbit and hunting with coonhounds??

One would think that an island that was bought by hunters and funded by hunting dollars aka licenses and permits. You would think all hunters should be able to use the island for "all" hunting pleasure.

Yet you do not take into consideration that with the rabbit hunting, it would help keep the rabbit population down to help with the vegetation for the other animals that inhabit the area. Also with the raccoon hunting it would help keep in check the raccoons from eating the eggs and birds in the area, and also help with the diseases that both the rabbits and raccoons are known for.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely a concerned hunter and outdoorsman

Calvin Foster
Michelle Tate

From: David M. Sill [DMSill@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 7:17 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Congratulations & Snow goose hunting on entire SI wildlife area

Of all the Wildlife Areas I have visited or done business with in my professional wildlife biologist career Sauvies Island is among the best managed.

I would like to strongly suggest that in line with several plan goals the entire area open to duck hunting also be opened to Snow Goose hunting. Please consider the following:

1) The Snow Goose population is healthy and growing on the Island. All private lands are open to Snow Goose hunting.

2) Snow Geese are easily identified. Most of today's hunters are much more sophisticated and not likely to mistake dark geese, crane, swan or anything else for Snow Geese.

3) Dark geese would not be much further disturbed because duck hunting is going on with plenty of gun fire anyhow. Further, Snow Geese generally don't seem to mix much with dark geese so dark geese flocks would not be much more disturbed.

If in doubt at least try it for a season or two as an experiment and see how it goes.
PLEASE ALLOW BEAGLE AND COONHOUND HUNTING ON SIWA. THIS LAND WAS BOUGHT BY HUNTER AND IS MAINTAINED BY HUNT LICENSES SO WHY EXCLUDE HOUNDS??
ALLOW BEAGLE AND COONHOUND HUNTING ON SIWA. THIS LAND WAS BOUGHT BY HUNTER AND IS MAINTAINED BY HUNT LICENSES

WHY EXCLUDE HOUNDS??

pete richardson north troy VT
ALLOW BEAGLE AND COONHOUND HUNTING ON SIWA. THIS LAND WAS BOUGHT BY HUNTERS AND IS MAINTAINED BY HUNT LICENSES SO WHY EXCLUDE HOUNDS??

Barb

haystackranch@yahoo.com
As a birder and frequent visitor to Sauvie Island, I have a few comments about the Draft Management Plan:

1. I am concerned that Sauvie Island is being managed almost solely, and to the detriment of other species, for ever increasing numbers of Cackling and Canada Geese. Much of the grassland habitat that used to host Western Meadowlark, Horned Lark, and Short-eared Owl, to name a few, has been converted over to goose pasture. It's good that the Cackling Goose population has rebounded, but, enough is enough!

2. I would like to see more access for birding during the 7 months of the year that large portions of the refuge are closed. In particular, the Area is now closed for two of the best birding months of the year: October and April. I request that you allow birders some entrance, e.g., every other day, during the 4 non-hunting months (Oct 1 to Oct 15, Jan 15 to Apr 30) when the refuge is "closed".

3. I applaud the efforts to restore shorebird habitat, e.g., at Racetrack Pond, and would like see a similar effort at the sound end of Sturgeon Lake (Coon Point).

4. I would like to see a trail/boardwalk that extended up the east side of Sturgeon Lake from the dike out to Coon Point to provide better viewing of shorebirds.

5. Sturgeon Lake is silting up and it's just a matter of time before it becomes a vast meadow, probably of reed canary grass. I would like to see the hydrology restored, e.g., by opening up Dairy Creek to allow the lake to "flush".

Thank you for your consideration,

Winthrop Gross
4665 NW Seblar Terrace
Portland, OR 97210
Hoodview Chapter
Oregon Hunters Association
314 SE 202nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97233

October 19, 2009

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Avenue NE
Salem, OR 97303-4924

Subject: Public Comment - Sauvie Island Management Plan

To whom it may concern:

The Oregon Hunter's Association (OHA) boasts a diverse membership of over 10,000 members statewide, with 700 members in the Hoodview Chapter (Portland's East County) alone. Our mission is to "To provide an abundant huntable wildlife resource in Oregon for present and future generations, enhancement of wildlife habitat and protection of hunter's rights". We take our responsibilities very seriously and believe Oregon's hunters play a significant role in the management of Oregon's wildlife and the related natural resources.

The position of OHA regarding hunting and the management of our public lands and waterways is as follows:

Public resource management plans should provide for the utilization of our natural resources by all user groups including hunters. As a shared resource for all Oregonians, no user group(s) should seek to exclude another by denying the lawful access and utilization of our public lands and waterways. Hunting is an established and valuable part of science based wildlife management and it plays a key role in the state's wildlife management directive. Consequently, OHA believes that there should not be any reduction in public hunting opportunities on our public lands and waterways.

Additionally, hunter dollars fund the vast majority of Oregon's wildlife management through direct license/tag fees and by federal excise taxes paid by sportsmen. Any reduction in hunting opportunities will adversely impact the revenue stream for Oregon's wildlife management and certainly result in reduced support for the state's vital wildlife resource.

Please continue to support hunters and our wildlife resource by maintaining or increasing hunting opportunities on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Management Area.

Respectfully,

Catherine C. Hamell
OHA Hoodview Chapter President

[Stamp: RECEIVED OCT 30 2009]
[Stamp: ODFW OCT 29 2009]
[Stamp: Director's Office]
Dear Fish and Wildlife:

Please allow coonhound hunting on SIWA. This land was purchased by a hunter and is maintained by Hunting licenses. We already have far too many laws and prohibitions against private property owners, inflicted by a few on others they wish to force to comply with their own ideological value system. Please resist the urging of others to continue to mount one upon another restriction and/or prohibition on private property owners who are law abiding and taxpaying citizens that deserve the support of their government.

G. Talboy
PLEASE ALLOW BEAGLE AND COONHOUND HUNTING ON SIWA. THIS LAND WAS BOUGHT BY HUNTERS AND IS MAINTAINED BY HUNT LICENSES SO WHY EXCLUDE HOUNDS...

Unless someone has a good reason why hounds should not be allowed I think this is a no brainer...

emily walker
From: Don Gilbert \ A&D Counselor [mailto:dgilbert@cowcreek.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2009 3:22 PM
To: ODFW Commission
Subject: Hunting on Sauvie Island

1588 Troost St.
Roseburg, OR 97470
541-580-8974

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Ave. NE
Salem Or 97303
Re: Sauvie Island Wildlife Area (SIWA) 2009 Management Plan

Dear Commissioners
Thank you for providing opportunity to express my concerns regarding SIWA management plan.

After reviewing the information over the past two weeks regarding ODF&W’s proposed SIWA management plan I have to express my absolute objection. This plan appears to be a personal objective rather than a plan bases on science. In fact it appears to contradict ODF&W’s own mission statement. This plan appears to diminish as many hunting opportunities as possible while attempting to avoid potential backlash from hunter groups. This anti-hunting agenda appears to be hidden behind outdated population densities. Hunting means hunting by ODF&W’s own definition. There is NO reason to exclude rabbit or raccoon hunting other than what appears to be a personal agenda by Mr. Nebecker.

It is not the duty of ODF&W to assume the role of neighborhood compliance officers. If the people of Sauvie Island are truly unhappy with the presents of rabbit and raccoon hunters it is their responsibly to take appropriate measure.

I also find it troubling that the interpretation of administrative rule was so quickly changing following a 2007 court case to which the state was ruled against. ODF&W had allowed precedence be set by allowing rabbit hunting, therefore the procedure to change interpretation of the OAR changes according to APA.

Thank you, Don Gilbert
-----Original Message-----
From: houndhunter6969@yahoo.com [mailto:houndhunter6969@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 5:33 AM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Siwa land.

I don't think its right that trying to keep hounds men off of SIAW land. Most houndsman
don't just hunt with hounds.
Sent from my BlackBerry® wireless device from U.S. Cellular
It has come to my attention that the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area has recently made several types of hunting on the island illegal. This concerns me because the wildlife area is the only one in the northern Willamette valley. I would strongly encourage the commission to reinstate hunting on the wildlife area. As a taxpayer, I feel that limiting the hunting opportunities on the SIWA to essentially only birds does a big disservice to all of the citizens in the Portland area. This seems to be a pattern. For some reason hunting areas on the island that were put aside for hunting are being taken away from us all / Virginia Lake area. Please stop taking away our hunting lands.

thank you A native Island resident. Toni Akerill
2/23/10

ODFW

3406 Cherry Ave.

Salem, OR 97303-4924

Ref. Sauvie Island Management Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

I fail to understand why “furbearer, predators, unprotected and protected wildlife” will not be hunted on Sauvie Island.

The notice I got on this situation said that the reason rabbits would not be hunted is because the manager at Sauvie Island doesn’t like the barking of beagles. We who pay to support the area need a better reason than that one.

I teach Hunter Safety. The reason I do is not only to teach safety, but to encourage people (young and older) to get out into the outdoors and hunt. Hopefully those people will realize the need to protect wildlife habitat and help save hunting for future generations.

We teach that hunting is a wildlife resource tool to help manage wildlife populations. With no “furbearer, predators, unprotected and protected wildlife” being hunted, will there not be more predation on game birds and deer?

Another reason to enable more people to hunt is so they will buy licenses and tags to support wildlife management. So why shut down hunting opportunities?

Respectfully:

Bill Marquam
To Mark Nebeker & Brad Bales:

The Oregon Duck Hunters' Association (ODHA) represents hundreds of waterfowlers across Oregon, with most of them located in Northwest Oregon. Because of that, we are keenly interested in the proposed Sauvie Island Management Plan and its impact on duck hunters.

As stated in our bylaws, our primary objectives are to:

1. To assist and promote the perpetuation of migratory birds and their habitat in order to provide more and better bird hunting and recreation for Oregon hunters.
2. To assist and cooperate with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, and such other agencies and outdoor organizations whose purposes are within our Association's interest.

Consistent then, with our bylaws, we fully support all aspects of the Sauvie Island Management Plan that directly enhance waterfowl habitat to produce more birds and that provide waterfowl hunting opportunities on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area (SIWA). As was clearly stated in the management plan's introduction: "The wildlife area was established in 1947 with primary objectives of protecting and improving waterfowl habitat and providing a public (waterfowl) hunting area." This premise was further emphasized in the plan: "Public hunting is one of the primary reasons for the purchase and creation of SIWA and waterfowl hunting will remain a high priority public use on SIWA." ODHA offers its assistance to ODFW to achieve these goals. As an example, ODHA is funding the development of the David Boys Memorial Lake to provide more waterfowl hunting opportunities on the SIWA. We are active partners in the SIWA.

As the plan is finalized, proposed changes may arise that could pose direct conflict between waterfowl hunting and other uses on the SIWA. For example, it has been proposed to allow rabbit hunting with hounds on the SIWA. In conformity with the longstanding purposes and objectives of the ODHA, the opinion of the ODHA Board of Directors is that this activity would not be compatible with waterfowl hunting, for it would create a serious conflict of use and possible safety hazards for persons and animals. The decision must be made that supports waterfowl hunting over the such other activities. Waterfowl hunters essentially paid for purchasing the SIWA land through the Pittman-Robertson Act. The ODHA Board of Directors counts upon the ODFW to make the proper decisions regarding the priority of waterfowl hunting on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area.

Respectfully submitted,

John Gross, President
ODHA Board of Directors
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2010 10:10 AM
To: Nancy Breuner; Mark Nebeker; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Sauvie Island Management Plan

From: Tony & Debbie Vassallo [mailto:tonydebv@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2010 7:57 PM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island Management Plan

There are so few opportunities to hunt waterfowl in Oregon, especially western Oregon, that I hope ODFW will continue to maintain these options on Sauvie Island.

Anthony Vassallo
1533 Jordan Dr S
Salem, OR 97302
503-371-4203
Oregon Master Hunter
30 December 2009

Marla Rae, Chairperson
OR Fish and Wildlife Commission
3406 Cherry Ave. NE
Salem, OR 97303-4924

Dear Chairperson Rae:

I wish to express my objection to the proposed draft of a 10 year Management Plan for Sauvie Island Wildlife Area (SIWA). It is incomprehensible for me to understand the proposal to eliminate hunting for anything but game birds and deer. I strongly encourage you and the other Commissioners to remove the proposal from the proposed plan. I strongly believe the area or at least most of it should be open to hunting all legal game animals on the area within constraints of animal populations, and without interfering with waterfowl hunters. I also feel the proposal violates the mandate of the Department to manage game for conservation of species. My understanding of the term conservation is that it means the intelligent management and use of wildlife. The proposed SIWA violates this premise.

As I stated in an earlier letter, I wonder if Pittman-Robertson funds can be used to support the area with such a disregard for its intent. Furthermore, the proposal denies Portland and surrounding area hunters the opportunity to hunt close to home.

I sincerely hope the Commissioners will hold the meeting for discussion of the proposal either in Portland or Salem, where opponents have the opportunity to present their case.

Sincerely,

T.P. Kistner

Cc: Commissioners-Dan Edge, Jon England, Carter Kerns, Skip Klarquist, Bobby Levy, Zane Smith
Michelle Tate

From: Liz Dreith
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2010 4:26 PM
To: Michelle Tate; Mark Nebeker; Nancy Breuner
Subject: FW: Hunting on Sauvie Island

FYI.

From: ODFW Commission
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2010 9:52 AM
To: Liz Dreith
Subject: FW: Hunting on Sauvie Island

Comments regarding SIWA. – Teri Kucera

From: Bill Littlefield [mailto:blittlefield@bendcable.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2010 10:31 PM
To: ODFW Commission
Subject: Hunting on Sauvie Island

It has come to my attention that the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area has recently made several types of hunting on the island illegal. This concerns me because the wildlife area is the only one in the northern Willamette valley. I would strongly encourage the commission to reinstate hunting on the wildlife area. As a taxpayer, I feel that limiting the hunting opportunities on the SIWA to essentially only birds does a big disservice to all of the citizens in the Portland area.

There are other hunting opportunities that could be had and should be had. Other Wildlife Areas in the state allow much broader hunting opportunities and this unit seems to be singled out. I suspect there is strong prejudice in play here (and an injustice). It would behoove you to look closely at this issue and the proposed changes before making a decision that does not benefit Oregon taxpayers, citizens, or hunters.

Respectfully Submitted

Bill Littlefield, avid hunter, sportsman, concerned citizen, taxpayer, and volunteer.

60280 Bend, Oregon, 97702

541-312-2334
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2009 10:50 AM
To: Nancy Breuner; Mark Nebeker; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Sauvie Island update comments
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

From: Deschaller@aol.com [mailto:Deschaller@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2009 8:18 PM
To: Odfw.Comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island update comments

I will not be able to attend any of the meetings, but I do wish to share my thoughts on this plan update.

We should keep in mind that this wildlife area was purchased with Oregon fish and hunting license dollars. This is a heavily used area and I am sure that some of the users who like to see all hunting banned from the area. Hunting and fishing needs to be a major component of the use of this wildlife area. We are now having youth hunting seasons and BOW has used the wildlife area for some of their classes for women. Local hunters are able to hunt water fowl, some upland game birds and deer. Having these resources close to home is important to those who do not have a lot of time to devote to their sport.

Don Schaller
1625 NW 130th Ave
Portland, Or 97229

Shop Popular Dell Laptops now starting at $349!
Sauvie Island Management Plan  
ODFW  
3406 Cherry St.  
Salem, Oregon 97303-4924

September 14, 2009

Dear Sir:

Your draft of the "Ten Year Management Plan for Sauvie Island has language I would like removed from the plan. On pages 54 and 55, under Objectives 3.1: Strategy 1. The restrictive language stating "maintain the closure for hunting of furbearers, predators, unprotected and protected wildlife" needs to be removed.

This language is discriminating to the hunting community at large and should be removed from the plan.

Please honor my request and remove the language in question from the plan.

I await confirmation of my request and am available for comments concerning the matter.

Sincerely,

Jerry C. Ray

cc Commissioner Skip Klarquist
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 5:29 PM
To: Nancy Breuner, Mark Nebecker; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Sauvie Island Wildlife Area-Management Plan

From: Bearflip@aol.com [mailto:Bearflip@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2009 11:20 AM
To: ODFW.comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island Wildlife Area-Management Plan

To whom it may concern:
I am an Island resident having lived here for 10 years. I have also taken serious advantage, along with many others, of the Wildlife Area opportunities including Duck, Quail and Pheasant hunting, Dog training, Hunt tests and canoeing for the past 20 years. I have also helped brush and build "blinds" including both handicapped units. I am now retired and, when open, use the Area on a daily basis. My comments (in order of importance) on your "Plan" are as follows:

1. The West Side dog training opportunities, although at some times good, during the middle of summer totally lack sufficient "quality" water. This can be mitigated in the following ways:
   a. Open the East Side in the same area over the dike currently used for hunt and field trial tests. This area is minimally used from February first through September end except for those tests and one or two limited single day retriever picnic trials. The summer water there is "first class" compared to that on the West side (not nearly as manure filled). I never see geese or wildfowl using any of that area during those times. Obviously, access would be limited to no vehicles when seriously wet conditions exist. Those interested under wet conditions could walk across the dike.
   b. Use the pumps provided by the Oregon Duck Hunters to keep Mud Lake and related areas filled with available "quality" water.
   c. Keep the road to the fishing pier open so Grassy Lake, when filled, can be used. If littering is the reason for the closures, I am absolutely sure the fishermen are responsible. Just forbid fishing rather than hurt other usages.
   d. Deepen and enhance the water across from the Skeet area on the West side for improved longer lasting water.
   e. Pump grassy lake to reasonable sustainable "quality" water levels during the Summer.

2. The length of time available on the West side for training has come to be seriously limited. Opening on May first or fifteenth has reduced the available time by as much as a month. (Please remember that hunting regulations state that for downed birds a strong attempt to retrieve must be made. Trained retrievers help promote that rule). I personally have never seen any evidence of geese or waterfowl using the West side retriever training area at any time other than migration. Even then that usage seems to be minimal.

See number one above on how to mitigate.

3. I do not quite understand the "estimate" of 80,000 bird watching days. If my math is right that's 219 per every day. My experience is never seeing more than ten in a group. Even allowing for significantly more each day (50) the number cannot be anywhere 20,000.

4. I am also concerned about the "trap shooting" (skeet) number. I seldom see users except sometimes on weekends and just before hunt season.

Thanks for serious consideration and a return reply.
Phail Sperr

9/29/2009
RE: Sauvie Island Poaching and Nighttime Hunting

I attended the Sept 22 public meeting at the Sauvie Island School where I submitted written testimony, I wish to add the following comments to that testimony.

In recent months there has been an escalation of nighttime poaching using firearms in the Sauvie Island WMA area near our home. In three separate incidents I've interrupted poachers and called 911. The latest being this past Tuesday Sept 22, at about 11pm. OSP dispatch handled the call.

I mention these poaching incidents because at ODFW's Sept 22 public hearing several individuals advocated for nighttime raccoon hunting.

I am strongly opposed to nighttime hunting:

1. The disturbance effect on our household. Baying hounds and gunshots in the middle of the night are "alarm" noises guaranteed to wake one up.

2. There is no way we can distinguish coon hunters' shooting from poachers. We will continue to phone 911/OSP whenever there is nighttime shooting.

From my own experience, raccoons can be easily hunted in the early morning hours. Raccoon hunters are fully able to pursue their sport during the normal hours the WMA is open and do not need to be running their vehicles and dogs through the area at night and disturbing residents and wildlife, and prompting calls to OSP due to their shooting.

Thank you for considering this.

Gary Kish
Michelle Tate

From: ODFW Comments
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2009 10:50 AM
To: Nancy Breuner; Mark Nebeker; Michelle Tate
Subject: FW: Sauvie Island update comments
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

From: Deschaller@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2009 8:18 PM
To: Odfw.Comments@state.or.us
Subject: Sauvie Island update comments

I will not be able to attend any of the meetings, but I do wish to share my thoughts on this plan update.

We should keep in mind that this wildlife area was purchased with Oregon fish and hunting license dollars. This is a heavily used area and I am sure that some of the users who like to see all hunting banned from the area. Hunting and fishing needs to be a major component of the use of this wildlife area. We are now having youth hunting seasons and BOW has used the wildlife area for some of their classes for women. Local hunters are able to hunt water fowl, some upland game birds and deer. Having these resources close to home is important to those who do not have a lot of time to devote to their sport.

Don Schaller
1625 NW 130th Ave
Portland, Or 97229

Shop Popular Dell Laptops now starting at $349!
The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
Natural Resources Division
Phone: (503) 879-2424
Fax: (503) 879-5622
47010 S.W. Hebo Road
P.O. Box 10
Grand Ronde, Oregon 97347

September 18, 2009

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Ave. NE
Salem, OR 97303-4924
ODFW.comments@state.or.us

RE: Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sauvie Island Wildlife Area Management Plan. The Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon (Tribe) take great interest in natural and cultural resource issues occurring on Sauvie Island, since it is part of a larger area ceded to the United States by Tribal people in 1855. From time immemorial the Tribal people used the lands that are now the Wildlife Area for hunting, fishing, gathering, and cultural purposes, and continue to do so today.

As Environmental Resource Specialist for the Tribe, I offer the following comments:

- On page 22, in the last sentence of the 2nd full paragraph, please list "Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde" as one of the non-voting members of the Sturgeon Lake Restoration Planning Group.
- On page 28, in Table 3, please replace "Lampetra tridentate" with "Lampetra tridentata."
- On page 30, in the third sentence of the first paragraph under "Cultural Resources," please replace "Grande Ronde" with "Multnomah."
- On page 30, in the last sentence of the first paragraph under "Cultural Resources," please replace "none of this band exists today" with "during treaty negotiations, the Multnomah banded with the Oregon City Tribes with whom they had familial and linguistic ties and were removed to the Grand Ronde Reservation."
- On page 30, under "Cultural Resources," regarding the mention of housepits and tool manufacturing sites, please be aware that we have information on many sites on Sauvie Island that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) may not have recorded. For this reason, the Tribe's Cultural Resources Department should be consulted before and during ground-disturbing activities as to protection of existing sites and inadvertent discoveries of cultural/archaeological resources.
• On page 42, after the third full sentence, there is a line that reads: “However, do not (e.g. brood rearing habitat).” Please clarify/expand.

• On page 54, under Objective 3.1, regarding trapping of furbearers, the Tribe requests information on the disposition of carcasses taken due to damage control, specifically beaver and otter. Is there an opportunity for educational or cultural use of these animals?

• On page 57, under Objective 3.3, regarding maintenance of public facilities, the Tribe requests involvement in the development of new sites (e.g. nature trails) and interpretive materials (e.g. kiosks). Again, the Tribe requests consultation before and during ground-disturbing activities for the protection of existing sites and inadvertent discoveries of cultural/archaeological resources.

• On page 62, under Partnerships, the Tribe requests to be added as a partner.

• On page 14 of Appendix C, please place an asterisk next to Eastern Gray Squirrel and Nutria to denote non-native species.

• On pages 18-19 of Appendix F, please add “Archaeological Resource Protection Act” and appropriate State Cultural Resource Laws in the proper lists.

• As a general comment, the Tribe is interested in discussing a cultural gathering permit process for Tribal use of certain plant materials. Wapato is of primary interest; however, there is concern over the lead content in plants growing on Sauvie Island. The Tribe requests information regarding lead levels in Wildlife Area plants, wapato in particular.

As ODFW moves toward finalizing the Management Plan, I would be interested in receiving updates and may have further comments. If you have any questions or would like to discuss any of my comments further, please do not hesitate to contact me at 503-879-2423 or at brandy.humphreys@grandronde.org. Thank you again for this opportunity.

Sincerely,

/s/

Brandy Humphreys
Environmental Resource Specialist

Sent via email only
September 15, 2009

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
3406 Cherry Avenue NE
Salem, Oregon 97303

Dear ODFW,

West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District (WMSWCD) is writing in response to the proposed actions in the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)’s new Sauvie Island Wildlife Area (SIWA) Plan. We are specifically interested in the new management priorities for Sturgeon Lake and Oak Woodland/Savanna, and in the control of invasive species. The WMSWCD appreciates the original intent of, and demands on, the management of the SIWA for waterfowl, and also calls attention to the need to manage these habitat areas for other wildlife uses as well.

Sturgeon Lake, at 3,200+ acres, is one of the few remaining large off-channel habitats for anadromous fish, lamprey and other species on the Lower Columbia, yet is it highly degraded and warrants high prioritization for restoration. As we learn more of the life and habits of fish and lamprey in the Lower Columbia system, the more we find that off-channel habitat is not simply a pass-through between headwater spawning gravels and the ocean. Many species utilize these areas to grow strong before their journey out to sea or as a refuge from high water events. In addition, Sturgeon Lake supports the majority of the wintering waterfowl on Sauvie Island. With the introduction of dams and dikes along the Columbia, many historic off-channel habitats have been lost.

Sturgeon Lake-- an important large, open water habitat feature, still connected to the Multnomah Channel via the downstream end-- has been silting in since the 1940’s when the Sauvie Island Drainage District Levee was constructed. If siltation is allowed to continue, the open water will be lost as habitat for fish, other aquatic life, waterfowl and many other species. WMSWCD and ODFW are working hard to find a long-term solution that will preserve this valuable resource for generations to come. This includes the development of an action plan emphasizing sediment reduction, debris management, and restoration of flows from the Columbia River into Dairy Creek and Sturgeon Lake. Without the historic flushing from the Dairy Creek channel, soft unconsolidated sediments will continue to accumulate in Sturgeon Lake. This in turn reduces the amount of open shallow water and herbaceous wetlands such as bulrush, sedge and grassy flats. Aquatic areas are currently being replaced by broad willow thickets that are reducing open-water feeding areas used by salmonid species and waterfowl by over 30 percent.
Another extremely valuable, rare and declining feature of the SIWA is the expanse of oak habitats, including 180 acres of oak woodland and meadow at Oak Island. Once dominating the Willamette Valley and Sauvie Island, oak habitats have been reduced to a fraction of their former extent. Oak woodlands and Savannas provide habitat for hundreds of song bird species as well as mammals large and small, including the acorn woodpecker and western gray squirrel, both ODFW-designated “sensitive” species. These oak habitats are part of the Important Bird Area designation given by the Audubon Society. In addition, the oaks of Sauvie Island were a significant and abundant cultural resource as evidenced by a Native American “acorn factory” discovered on the south end of the island.

The district is pleased to see that the SIWA Plan recognizes the need to control invasive species such as reed canary grass, blackberry, purple loosestrife, thistles and scotch broom in the wildlife area. WMSWCD would like the plan to also include prevention measures, such as public education and an “early detection rapid response” (EDRR) protocol. Desirable actions include the cleaning of maintenance equipment in the SIWA, signage at boat launches and trailheads about how invasive species spread, and training users (hunters, birders, hikers) on how to identify and report new invasives. The WMSWCD EDRR program focuses on eleven species considered very problematic in our District and in the early stages of invasion. Two of these species, Amorpha fruticosa (“indigo bush”) and Lythrum salicaria (“purple loosestrife”), have been found in the SIWA. The District is happy to offer its continued support to ODFW staff to ensure that these species, and any other EDRR species, are identified, treated and monitored in a timely fashion. Such an approach is cost-effective and protects ecosystems. Additionally, we encourage ODFW’s Invasive Species Coordinator to provide Sauvie Island with a more concentrated focus.

WMSWCD commends ODFW’s efforts to look beyond traditional fish and game species management and to manage SIWA as a diverse assemblage of significant historic habitats. There are few opportunities, particularly in the North Willamette Valley and Metro Portland, to manage for large, rare habitat types such as the oak woodlands and the Sturgeon Lake wetland complex in the SIWA. We strongly support their inclusion as priority management activities in the SIWA plan. We also encourage and lend our support for the proactive management of invasive species.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian Lightcap, Board Chair
West Multnomah Soil & Water Conservation District