

Exhibit J

**Public Correspondence received as of
May 24, 2018**

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: Regulation Change Suggestion
Attachments: Artificial light letter....docx

From: MorganOlson@BC.com [mailto:MorganOlson@BC.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 4:54 PM

To: nick.a.myatt@state.or.us

Subject: Regulation Change Suggestion

Nick,
Here is a letter from the Union/Wallowa County Chapter of OHA. We are requesting a regulation change to include coyotes along with bobcat, opossum, raccoon, and fox to be hunted with the use of artificial light. It would be great to see this change in 2019.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Thank you,
Morgan Olson
541-786-1283



Oregon Hunters Association
Union/Wallowa County Chapter

To Whom It May Concern,

As stated in the 2018 Oregon hunting regulations...

Prohibited Methods

It is unlawful to:

- Hunt any wildlife with infrared or any other night vision sights.
- Use an artificial light for hunting any wildlife, except raccoon, bobcat and opossum provided the light is not cast from or attached to a motor vehicle. This includes laser sights or any other sights which project a beam to the target. This does not include battery operated sights which only light the reticle.

In an effort to create additional hunting opportunity, control predator numbers, and to simplify the regulations we suggest the following statements to read...

Prohibited Methods

It is unlawful to:

- Hunt any wildlife with infrared or any other night vision sights, except raccoon, bobcat, fox, coyote, and opossum.
- Use an artificial light for hunting any wildlife, except raccoon, bobcat, fox, coyote, and opossum provided the light is not cast from a moving motor vehicle.

Thank you,

Morgan Olson

Chapter President

Union/Wallowa County Chapter

Roxann B Borisch

From: J Coyier <jcoyier@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 7, 2018 9:44 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Cc: treatmj68@comcast.net
Subject: Draft Regulation Simplification Proposals

I support removal of the closure for the Columbia Basin Unit Archery season (#24).
I oppose #18 allowing use of mechanical broadheads.
I oppose #19 allowing use of rearward devices on bows
I support #20 simplifying minimum draw weight bow to 40# for all big game hunting.
I oppose #31 allowing any electronic devices on bows or arrows.

My primary hunting has been elk and grouse with a 50# recurve. My age is 67 years.
Thanks for considering my preferences on these proposals.

John Coyier
395 Oak Villa Rd
Dallas, OR 97338

Roxann B Borisch

From: Bob McMahan <bmcman@bendbroadband.com>
Sent: Monday, May 7, 2018 10:06 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Potential regulation changes.

Dear Commissioners,

As an archer and a bowhunter I would like to make my feeling known about the following items on the "Simplification of Regulations"

#18, mechanical broadheads. Many African guides and outfitters do not allow mechanical broadheads to be used in their hunting concessions. In making their decisions, they have seen firsthand the failure rate of MBHs. Its appropriate to know their thinking as turning away paying clients who want to use that type of broadhead does cost them money and potential referrals.

#19, There is no need for drawlocks. They are no longer manufactured as the market place said "no" to a bad idea.

#20, Keep the current bow weight requirements. Until there is some science to support lower draw weights, please leave it as is.

#24, It only makes sense to open up that area to bowhunting. Although the area is private land it is an additional potential bowhunting opportunity.

#31, No, no and no. If someone wants to record their hunt they can certainly do that with head or chest type camera mounts. It's only a matter of time until someone combines a range finder and camera together as one unit.

Thanks for the job you do!

Bob McMahan
2079 NW Lakeside Pl
Bend, Or 97703

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: HUNTING REGULATION SIMPLIFICATION

From: Nick Myatt
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 8:12 AM
To: Roxann B Borisch <Roxann.B.Borisch@coho2.dfw.state.or.us>
Subject: FW: HUNTING REGULATION SIMPLIFICATION

From: Rich Thompson [<mailto:rich@kathykellydesign.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 2, 2018 8:53 AM
To: nick.a.myatt@state.or.us
Cc: odfw.info@state.or.us; Mike Treat <treatmj68@comcast.net>
Subject: HUNTING REGULATION SIMPLIFICATION

Hi Nick,

Thanks for your excellent REGS presentation to the Sport Group Leaders last week and getting the updated matrix of proposals out to all.

I would like to point out one item of concern regarding **ARCHERY REARWARD DEVICE** item, commonly known as the **DRAWLOC** back in late '90's. Traditional Archers of Oregon brought this to the attention of the ODFW Commission at the time and it was ultimately seen for what it really was, a "vertical" crossbow and was banned from use for hunting big game like horizontal crossbows.

The matrix stated the reason for proposed change is "these bows are no longer manufactured" however, if you look up their [website](#), the device is still being offered for sale at \$750 with an active shopping cart. Admittedly, the wording in the regulation is confusing but thorough and it was drafted specifically for the DRAWLOC.

As you probably realize from previous crossbow discussions (2013), sport groups representing Oregon archers were united in their opposition to crossbows in archery seasons. I would like to suggest that you reconsider dropping the DRAWLOC device from the simplification process.

Best Regards,
Rich Thompson

Roxann B Borisch

From: Nick Myatt <Nick.A.Myatt@state.or.us>
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 8:13 AM
To: Roxann B Borisch
Subject: FW: Regulatory Simplification Proposals

From: Craig [mailto:craig1945@centurylink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 8:19 AM
To: nick.a.myatt@state.or.us
Cc: Kevin Blakely <kevin.l.blakely@state.or.us>; Doug Cottam <douglas.f.cottam@state.or.us>; Tom Thornton <thomas.l.thornton@state.or.us>; Chris Willard <chris.a.willard@state.or.us>
Subject: Re: Regulatory Simplification Proposals

Nick,

I probably should have added one (1) issue to my earlier message that I didn't mention last evening.

If ODFW is serious about simplifying the regulations and making them more consistent, it is (well beyond) time to finally eliminate the limitation on archery deer hunting in the Ochoco unit unless the hunter has an Ochoco archery elk tag (unused or used). That requirement no longer exists for any other hunt in Oregon and the current situation cries for consistency. This outdated approach to limiting archery deer hunting in the Ochoco unit dates from 2006 and its continuation flies in the face of a recommendation from the 2013-14 Archery Review Public Advisory Committee (ARPAC) process. After I raised this concern to the Commission in an E-mail back in December 2017, I had an E-mail response from Doug Cottam suggesting that addressing the issue may not occur until Phase 3 of your project. However, this issue does not involve hunt scheduling or bag limits as was indicated for Phase 3 in your discussion. Addressing the situation now seems more consistent with Phase 2 proposals #26-28 than does waiting yet another year to (maybe) deal with it.

Craig Starr

From: Craig
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 7:16 AM
To: nick.a.myatt@state.or.us
Cc: Kevin Blakely ; Doug Cottam ; Tom Thornton ; Chris Willard
Subject: Regulatory Simplification Proposals

Nick,

It was good to meet you and hear your presentation on the effort to simplify Oregon's big game hunting regulations last evening. I am sending this message as I mentioned I would to reiterate a few of the comments I made during or following the meeting.

First, I would be cautious with the proposal to open the Wallowa Lake Refuge area to big game hunting. While, as I mentioned, there are obviously many unincorporated communities around Oregon with relatively dense development, few, if any, of those communities have the heavy transient recreation / tourist population of the Wallowa Lake area. When, not if, someone trespasses to shoot a landowner's "pet" buck or shoots one from a road, there may well be a statewide outcry rather than the local concern that would occur if

a similar situation occurred in most other unincorporated communities. Even a perfectly legal kill done in what is now the Wallowa Lake Refuge area could very well incite a lot of negative response from out-of-the-area individuals. Unfortunately, when it happens, it will be hunters, not ODFW who will get the big black eye and we don't need more of that!

Second, with respect to muzzleloaders, I think you may want to consider that effective range is not the only factor that makes open ignition muzzleloaders "primitive weapons". As I mentioned in the meeting, at least half the battle of using an open ignition muzzleloader is getting it fire in western Oregon's often rainy weather. I don't have any experience with the relatively new in-line muzzleloaders, but my impression is that one of the reasons for their popularity in spite of their nontraditional appearance is their consistency of ignition. Based on my experience with muzzleloaders of several years ago, I can say I would have had considerably more success if my gun had fired consistently in wet weather. I suspect better firing consistency would mean increased harvest success which might require fewer tags. I don't hunt with a muzzleloader any longer, but, if I did, I'm not sure I'd like that tradeoff!

Finally, the proposal to address LOP bag limits for some limited elk hunts brought a pang of disappointment that ODFW didn't include dealing consistently with LOP tags for special limited-opportunity Mule Deer hunts, including the late Metolius archery buck hunt (#139R1), the Interstate youth hunt (#175T) and the Klamath Falls muzzleloader hunt (#132M). As I mentioned to you, over 2,000 bowhunters apply for 20+/- tags for the late Metolius hunt each year while a very small number of LOP landowners (probably 15 or so) get as many as 31 LOP tags for the hunt year after year. I quickly scanned the 2017 preference point summary report and there are few, if any, Mule Deer controlled hunts requiring more points for a tag than the late Metolius archery hunt – not even centerfire rifle hunts that draw applicants from a much larger base of hunters. Every special limited-opportunity hunt for centerfire rifles has a limit on LOP tags as do the four (4) other limited-opportunity archery hunts far less popular than the late Metolius hunt while one (1) of the most popular limited-opportunity hunts in the state has no limit on LOP tags. While I don't care if ODFW addresses the LOP bag limit for elk on a hunt-by-hunt basis based on a limited demand for LOP tags, I don't understand why ODFW piddles around with a relatively obscure LOP issue while ignoring a major inequity except, of course, that the current proposal could benefit landowners while the benefit of dealing with a real LOP issue would accrue to public hunters.

Thanks for last evening's presentation and for considering my comments.

Craig Starr