

**Exhibit K**  
**Public Correspondence**

**Public Correspondence received as of**  
**May 23, 2014**

**From:** [ODFW Commission](#)  
**To:** [Amanda Mckenzie](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Changes recently made to the CMP after the April 25th meeting  
**Date:** Monday, May 12, 2014 10:11:13 AM

---

For the June Commission Packet. – Teri Kucera

---

**From:** Fred/Iambie Worsley [mailto:ifworsley@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 5:31 PM  
**To:** [odfw.commission@state.or.us](mailto:odfw.commission@state.or.us)  
**Cc:** [Timothy.R.Walters@state.or.us](mailto:Timothy.R.Walters@state.or.us); [Ed.Bowles@state.or.us](mailto:Ed.Bowles@state.or.us); Gene Mitchell  
**Subject:** Changes recently made to the CMP after the April 25th meeting

Commissioners,

Since the April 25th meeting of which several of us anglers testified and submitted a Statement of Opposition with 1,097 signatures (within 6 weeks time period) we have heard informally that their have been changes made to the CMP Plan as submitted. While the Fish Division may have changed the sliding scale on harvest somewhat please consider that 1,097 people opposed the CMP plan as written for the Umpqua Basin. Those people were in agreement that the spring chinook run on the South Umpqua was viable, health, stable, and has not changed in status since records have been kept. It is at a 95% confidence level by ODFW data. These 1,097 people believe that the spring chinook harvest on the Main and North Umpqua do not need further restrictions and should stay at the 2/20 harvest level for both areas as it currently is in the regulations. Viability, biological data, health, consistency in runs over many many years, drought, habitat, floods, etc all support the current harvest regulations for both the main and the north. Please consider the facts as they are and not the bias of wild fish ideology. As an example of this and of which I testified at the April 25th meeting, the North Umpqua harvest changes should not have even entered into the discussion. If there was supporting evidence for a change in harvest in the main Umpqua because of the South Umpqua spring run why would you change the harvest levels in the North Umpqua? Please ask that question and review the complete facts. I believe the reason is a true bias within the Fish Division on wild fish!

Another example of this that I submit to you is that the plan allows for no harvest of wild winter steelhead anywhere in the Umpqua basin. The Fish Division's own words were/are that the winter steelhead on the Umpqua system are "healthy, abundant, and robust" with sufficient numbers to justify a limited harvest. I ask you why then are we not allowing for the opportunity for some harvest, and in line with your mission statement? Could it be another example of wild fish bias/mentality? What else could it be? You have 1,097 people who support a limited harvest, an OSU survey that significantly favored a limited harvest, you have two meetings one in Roseburg and one in Reedsport that favored a limited harvest, seven public proposals that were submitted in 2012 and deferred to now that support a limited take, of which one submitted by Vance Hird had 383 supporters (proposal #'s 56-P, 125-P, 75-P, 31-P, 18-P, 66-p, and 85-P)! Significant time and effort have gone into this appeal to you from numerous citizens, anglers and sources with significant and overwhelming biological facts and economic concerns that should support our position of maintaining the current harvest levels on spring chinook throughout the Umpqua basin and justify a limited take of wild winter steelhead in the Umpqua Basin to include the North and South Umpqua. Frankly, the evidence is compelling and overwhelming and the citizens and anglers are asking for you to make the right decisions based on facts not bias.

Just because the department gave a little on the harvest levels after the 1,097 people said no to the plan does it justify any change in current harvest levels for springers and still not allow a limited harvest on wild winter steelhead. The facts, not bias, support our position with respect to harvest levels for springers and limited take of wild winter steelhead.

**From:** [ODFW Commission](#)  
**To:** [Amanda Mckenzie](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Coastal Multi-Species Management Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 20, 2014 9:44:15 AM  
**Attachments:** [ANWS Comments Coastal Plan May 2014.pdf](#)

---

For June 6 packet. Teri Kucera

-----Original Message-----

From: Ian Fergusson [<mailto:ian.fergusson@comcast.net>]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 3:50 PM  
To: [odfw.commission@state.or.us](mailto:odfw.commission@state.or.us)  
Subject: Coastal Multi-Species Management Plan

Dear Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commissioners:

Attached are the comments of the Association of Northwest Steelheaders regarding the Coastal Multi-Species Management Plan.

We applaud ODFW for undertaking a plan of such scope. We approve the plan in general, with some specific concerns detailed in the attachment.

Thank you for your commitment to public service for the citizens of Oregon.

Ian Fergusson  
Resources Director  
Association of Northwest Steelheaders



## Association of Northwest Steelheaders

6641 SE Lake Rd. • Milwaukie OR 97222

503-653-4176 • 503-653-8769 (fax)

office@anws.org • www.nwsteelheaders.org

Established 1960

May 19, 2014

To: Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission  
Fr: Ian Fergusson, Resources Director  
Re: Coastal Multi-Species Plan

The Association of Northwest Steelheaders is committed to enhancing and protecting fisheries and habitats. Healthy fisheries require robust wild populations and abundant opportunities for consumptive and non-consumptive angling. This can be a difficult balancing act. We struggled with it as we formulated our positions throughout the development of this plan, and we recognize that ODFW did as well.

We commend ODFW for its proactive approach in undertaking a plan of such broad scope. If it is true, as ODFW asserts, that there is currently not a crisis in conservation or fishing, there must have been strong temptation to defer this effort. Nevertheless, the Native Fish Conservation Policy requires management plans for all native fish, and this is a necessary step.

The latest draft of the CMP shows that ODFW listened to public input and technical review, and made some modifications to the plan in response. The final result will not please everyone, nor could any plan, given the breadth of constituent viewpoints. We could argue forever over the details and never move forward. We believe the plan represents a modest move toward improved conservation, and a modest improvement in harvest opportunity.

We recommend the Commission adopt the plan, with consideration given to some of the points that follow.

The lack of robust baseline data is disturbing. Given the current budgeting environment for ODFW and other natural resource agencies, the prospects are dim for gathering significant data in the future. Certainly it is highly unlikely that funding will be found for monitoring the entirety of the proposed changes. Intensive monitoring on important populations, rather than a diluted scattershot approach, has the best chance of providing information that can guide other actions. Prioritization is essential. We agree with the establishment of Pilot Implementation Programs that assign the highest priority to the least viable populations: Elk River fall Chinook and South Umpqua spring Chinook. Changes should continue to be prioritized as implementation moves forward.

We approve of ODFW's plan to enlist the help of the Hatchery Research Center. Cooperative research and monitoring are essential. Effort should be directed at understanding the impacts of hatchery programs on wild fish abundance and productivity. The current suite of hatchery tools (weirs, acclimation sites, tributary releases, run timing), as well as Wild Fish Emphasis Areas, all need to remain in use and be evaluated.

ODFW needs to clearly document monitoring needs and show lawmakers the gap between what is necessary and what is possible with the current and proposed budgets. Some of the most

*Anglers dedicated to enhancing and protecting fisheries and their habitats for today and the future.*



## Association of Northwest Steelheaders

6641 SE Lake Rd. • Milwaukie OR 97222

503-653-4176 • 503-653-8769 (fax)

office@anws.org • www.nwsteelheaders.org

Established 1960

important work that ODFW can undertake is securing funds for understanding and managing fish populations. Minor program consolidations and other internal efficiencies will not be enough.

Finally, although we commend ODFW for looking for ways to increase harvest opportunity, we continue to oppose increasing wild steelhead harvest beyond the level already allowed. We support the goal of achieving wild populations healthy enough to sustain harvest; however, for steelhead this is not the right time. The limited amount of baseline data, the prospect of inadequate funding for monitoring, the increased administrative and enforcement costs, and the lack of public demand, all support the desirability of deferring this action and focusing on more important ones.

Thank you for considering our comments.

**From:** [ODFW Commission](#)  
**To:** [Amanda Mckenzie](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CMP Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 21, 2014 8:15:26 AM  
**Importance:** High

---

For the June Commission packet. Teri Kucera

---

**From:** JEFF DOSE [<mailto:jfdose@msn.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 20, 2014 11:41 AM  
**To:** [odfw.commission@state.or.us](mailto:odfw.commission@state.or.us)  
**Cc:** [pjtronquet@aol.com](mailto:pjtronquet@aol.com); [lenv@pcez.com](mailto:lenv@pcez.com); [joannferg@comcast.net](mailto:joannferg@comcast.net)  
**Subject:** CMP Comments

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to provide my wholehearted support for the proposal in the latest version of the Coastal Multi-Species Management and Conservation Plan (CMP) that would retain the existing no harvest regulation for wild winter steelhead in the Umpqua River. I was a member of the Stakeholder group for the Umpqua Strata and, while there was no consensus, the vast majority of the group overwhelmingly supported the current no harvest regulation. Although some political entities and some local anglers would like to revert back to harvest, they are, albeit vocal, in a distinct minority. I also provided the same support for the current regulations in my testimony before you at the North Bend Commission meeting. The Umpqua contains one of the most abundant and unique populations of winter steelhead in the United States, if not world-wide. The current requirement for catch and release, in force since 2008, has been an extremely valuable economic force for Douglas County and elsewhere in SW Oregon. Under the current no-harvest regulations, anglers come here from all over the country to have a tremendous day of fishing, where they might catch multiple steelhead and have an opportunity to land a very large, trophy fish, that can't be matched anywhere else. Initiating a regulation that would allow harvest could put this invaluable resource at risk, with virtually no positive economic or biologic impact - in fact, it would likely have adverse impacts.

As I mentioned in my testimony, I am a retired Fisheries Biologist, after 35 years, with nearly all of that in the Umpqua River system. Also, as I mentioned in North Bend, the Department has made some estimates of wild winter steelhead abundance that are based on, with the exception of the North Umpqua, only the sketchiest of information. As a colleague, I frankly would be ashamed to even put those estimates out as meaningful information. My extensive knowledge of the stream habitat conditions in the Umpqua basin further supports how utterly ridiculous those estimates for the South and mainstem really are. Based on the stream habitat conditions, as well as the abundance of predatory smallmouth bass in both of those sub-basins, the estimates almost certainly gross overestimates. By far, the most productive spawning and (particularly) rearing habitat in the basin occurs in the North

Umpqua system, not only in the tributaries but also in the mainstem North Umpqua.

Research from as far back as the late 1980's has shown that as many as 50+% of the age 1+ juvenile steelhead rear in the mainstem North Umpqua, most of which outmigrate as 2+ and 3+ age smolts. There is absolutely no such opportunity in the South and mainstem due to lethal summer water temperatures and the presence of smallmouth bass.

Thank you for your service and the opportunity to comment.

Yours,

Jeffrey J. Dose  
1306 Fisher Road  
Roseburg, OR 97471