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Commissioners

Canadian wolves are not native to Oregon. Wolf introduction and expansion has not been supported by Oregon hunters.

I support any wolf management that controls population growth and reduces livestock incidences.

OHA Member

Brooks Smith
PO Box 749
Coquille, Oregon 97423
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Subject: Revision of the Oregon Wolf Plan

I strongly encourage the revised wolf plan to include public hunting as a method of controlling wolf numbers should the need arise. Let us not forget who pays for the existence of ODFW and the employees hired within. It is hunter and fishermen licenses and tags. While the mission of ODFW is to "protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and employment by present and future generations." It should be unthinkable that a new wolf management plan would take the tool of "hunting" out of the toolbox of wolf management.

Jerry C. Ray
ODFW Staff and Commission,

Thank you for your recent automated email acknowledging my Hunting/Fishing Lic. renewal.

I recently received news that ODFW Commission is reviewing possible changes to the current Oregon Wolf Plan and I wanted to give some feedback on this proposed change.

I see that the proposed change is: “Controlled take would be administered by special permit agent authorization only.” - Page 68, line 43.

I’d very much like to have a response to this inquiry, and would like to see the Commission be publicly accountable to explain the science-based reasoning behind these particular changes?

To many license holders in Oregon this seems at best disingenuous, and a repeated “moving of the goal posts” within larger Wolf Management policy.

Speaking as a “middle ground guy” on this particular issue, I can tell you that these types of changes made in this way, only help to further polarize Oregonians on this issue, and do no good service for our wildlife. At worst this seems to many as politically motivated erosion of hunting opportunities and traditional ways of life here in OR by non-elected officials. Many of these same people are folks most likely to have interaction with Wolves.

For the sake of hunting and fishing traditions here in Oregon, please do not make changes to policy for reasons other than those that should govern ODFW’s management of state owned resources, and when making policy changes be clear, publicly inclusive of license holders and those who recreate and work on the lands effected. Most of all, please make decisions that are balanced and science-based.

Thank you,

Jeff Red
Dear ODFW Commissioners,

While I am delighted that you are taking more time to edit the plan, I am also terrified that you are not considering the very severe impact allowing hunting and trapping of wolves as part of the revision will be. Please use this time to make sure our few remaining wolves are protected, and their environments are protected.

It's time you stand up and do the right thing here. We all know the proven result of reintroducing wolves into Yellowstone National Park back in 1995. We can follow suit and show the country and the World that we are the best in the West in managing our wild lands and our wild animals.

I know I am not alone in my passion for protecting wolves. I also know that Oregon's wild lands will flourish, rehabilitate and stabilize as long as we can find a way to coexist with this key predator.

I spoke to the majority of you back on May 19th at the hearing here in Portland, perhaps you might remember me saying; "there are three things in my life that are certain; my love for wolves, Willie Nelson and Whisky, in that order."
I implore you from the bottom of my wolf, whisky and Willie lovin' heart to please work to find non-lethal methods for wolf management in Oregon. Don't allow wolf hunts and find ways to work with the ranchers and farmers to find methods that are safe for everyone and don't involve killing the few wolves we have left in this state. Our future generations deserve to have healthy forests, ecosystems and an abundance of healthy wild animal populations all of which depend on the existence of wolves in Oregon.

I am counting on you to do the right thing for the future of Oregon, humans, the wolves and any other species that may be at risk of becoming extinct without our (your) protections. Please be the voice for the voiceless. They need you.

Forever in love with Oregon, wolves and humanity.

Sincerely,  
Ms. Jennifer Rapf  
2218 SE Clinton Street  
Portland, OR 97202
I am a retired forester and an active outdoorsman. I am fully in support of the Draft Wolf Plan (2017/18) and hope that the Commission also supports this plan. Please read the attached document that I created that voices my opinion. Keep up the good work.

Dennis Pope

house phone: 541-672-7673

cell phone: 541-430-7656
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Hello

So let me get this straight…

You are making the decision about the Wolf Plan at the April meeting, meaning you will have made up your minds previous to that meeting on your Plan to make your announcement as to what the Plan will look like, yet you are inviting ‘public comment’ meaning people will drive for hours and take days off of work and find coverage for other commitments that they may have to attend and submit ‘public comment’ when you will have already made up your minds about the Plan?

Can someone please explain this to me?
It makes no sense.

Why bother ‘letting’ the public submit comment at this meeting? Other than to be able to say “Well, we ‘listened’ to public comment” as the law requires I assume. Looks like window dressing to me.

I’d love to receive a response so that I may better understand your thought process here.

Thank you very much
Karen in Eugene

“Can we speak in flowers. it will be easier for me to understand.”

----Naggarah Waheed

Sent via my faster-than-Wi-Fi and totally safe HARD-WIRED internet connection
Having a healthy wolf population is important to the health of our environment. We are presently experiencing an overpopulation of coyotes that are invading our smaller towns, killing many household cats. Would the presence of wolves change this? I think so. I think the wolf is a escape goat for ranchers to blame any lose of there cattle on. Lets keep trying to work with ranchers and bring the wolves back also.

Mr. Craig Mackie
36300 Pacific Palisades Pl
Nehalem, OR 97131
503-368-3739
Wolves in eastern Oregon are becoming a problem for hunters and ranchers. I work in a sporting goods store and hear stories from hunters about wolf sightings and they do seem to have no fear of people. Their numbers are increasing at a rate that cannot be accurately tracked and are impacting deer and elk herds. I live 10 minutes outside of Cove and have wolf sign behind my house. Please support a plan for management before it's too late. It's what the majority of rational people who have to deal with them want.
Commissioners,
I write to urge you to use the delay of Oregon’s Wolf Conservation and Management Plan as an opportunity to strengthen the plan. Listen to the thousands of voices from the public and critiques from independent scientists, hunting, trapping, and killing wolves is not the way to manage this native specie or reduce conflict.
Wolf recovery is so very important to keeping our ecosystem intact. We must protect the wildlife to protect our environment. Consider our future generations, we want to leave a world in balance.

Jabrila Via
89846 Poodle Creek Rd
Noti Oregon 97461

Sent from my iPad
Date: January 9, 2018

To: Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission:

Re: Comments on the 2017/18 Updated Wolf Management Plan

In the interests of disclosure, I am a member of Oregon Hunters Association. However, I have no interest in hunting wolves. I am also a partner in a small livestock company in western Oregon. I did not get involved in the development of the original Plan or the 2010 revision and 2013 modification.

My comments do not address scientific or technical issues. Rather, they address general principles and concepts - philosophy, if you will - which would guide the overall development of the Plan.

I, and many others in Oregon, are not enthused about the return of the wolf to our state. However, I believe I can live with them, provided they are managed effectively. The Department’s management of wolves should be designed to ensure that we are in control of wolves. We should not allow wolves to control us.

I recommend that the Plan goal be modified to read as follows: “To protect the social and economic interests of Oregonians while ensuring the conservation of grey wolves as required by Oregon law.” This modification places humans first and wolves second. I object to placing a higher priority on wolves than on the citizens of Oregon. Your stated Plan goal implies just the opposite.

The History Section of the Plan does not explicitly state why wolves were extirpated from Oregon, though we can surmise the reason. Admittedly, this might be considered a subjective point. However, I believe it is an important one. It pertains to human attitudes toward the wolf. I believe most humans are willing to live with wolves. But wolves, by nature, are not capable of respecting humans. And humans will not tolerate the destruction of their property or the increased risk to their livestock businesses. Consequently, the attitudes of humans towards wolves a century ago are the same today, particularly where wolves occupy human habitat. Wolves were driven out of Oregon because they do not co-exist well with humans. Yes, wolves were here first. But, the reality is that humans have settled this land and we are here now. It might be helpful if this concept were acknowledged as the primary challenge faced by this Plan and by wolf management overall.

Finally, I support the Plan in general. In regions where de-listing has occurred, wolves should be included with, and managed similarly to, the other predators of the state. I urge you to retain the option of hunting wolves as an important tool for controlling wolf populations. Phase III management needs to be developed into an applied management program which establishes the wolf, along with cougar and bear, as a big game animal which may be hunted in Oregon to maintain their numbers at sustainable levels. I read a news article recently about the high costs (I believe is was stated at around $16,000) incurred by the Department to cull wolves out of a
bothersome pack. That is ludicrous. I believe the Department could easily sell a few wolf tags for that kind of money, resulting in net income to the State. Admittedly, there might be technical issues relating to timeliness of take, but I’m confident that creative staff in the Department can develop solutions.

I hope these comments are helpful.

Respectfully,

Kent Tresidder 541-396-5386
PO Box 158
Coquille, OR 97423

LT/.../Hunting-Fishing-Camping/2018 Wolf Plan Comment
While it is unfortunate that the grey wolf (a non-native sub-specie) was allow to be introduced into Oregon, they are here to stay. That said it is now time to setup the mean to manage that population. As a life member of the Oregon Hunter Association, I agree with there support of the proposed Draft Wolf Plan. It is essential that once the population of wolves reaches the management objective the population must be controlled for the sake of hunting, agriculture and many of the rural area economies. This population control can be accomplished most economically and efficiently through hunting. I urge the commission to adopt this plan to use sound management of this resource.

Thank you,

Marvin W. Hicks
P. O. Box 36
Crescent, OR 97733
I am writing this to express my concern for delaying the Wolf management program that was started in 2005 and updated in 2010 and 2013. All parties agreed to the plan and now the opposition cannot remember that using controlled hunting as a primary tool to control the population was agreed to. Will you please quit fooling around and get the job done. This has gone on way to long. The number of wolves will continue to get out of hand and you all know it.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Scott
1172 Delrose Dr.
Springfield, Or. 97477
541-746-8556

A pioneer hunter for over 50 years.
I am a member of the OHA, Oregon Hunters Association. I am in support of the Wolf Draft plan and here are a couple of points I would like you to consider:

Wolves have successfully re-established in Oregon, ODFW has been proactive in planning for them through an effective management plan process- which we at OHA support and agree with.

ODFW's proposed plan allows for continued growth and health of the wolf population, yet considers other key concerns for Oregonians, such as hunting for deer, elk, and other big game, and the agricultural activities of Oregon.

We are not proposing hunting at this time but feel this tool needs to be available once population numbers warrant number reduction.

Thank you in advance for supporting this plan as drafted.

Respectfully Yours,

Gary Prahl

Prineville, OR
Hello,

As a member of OHA and an avid outdoorsman I would like to offer any help possible on the proper management of the wolf packs here in Oregon. I'm in full support of a Phase III management plan.

Sincerely,

Taylor McEnroe
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to the Commission regarding the draft Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan. I am a member of the Oregon Hunter's Association and would like to register my support for the language adopted in this current draft.

This plan does articulate ongoing support for a healthy and more historically natural wolf presence, but also allows for the future need to control wolf populations. This plan wisely, and with scientific support, considers a variety of options to do this, including hunting, so that agricultural, recreational, economic and other interests can be preserved while still allowing for ecologic balance.

What many hunters have in common with wolves, actually, is that they are both often unfairly maligned as vengefully predatory. However, most of the hunters I know are as interested in conservation and ecological diversity as they are in harvesting game species. The current plan language includes an option for wolf hunting as part of a balanced future management strategy. This is important to many hunters and the current language reflects a responsiveness to their interests which will further engagement. Fostering engagement of interested groups is critical as the complexity and scope of issues affecting shared natural spaces only increases with time.

What is most critical is that any conservation strategy is based on strong science, the best available data, and respectful discussions between interested parties, and I think the current draft reflects these priorities. While this issue feels personal for some, the science of a strategy should not be.

I would like to thank everyone involved closely in this issue for all the work you have done, which is certainly much more than most individuals are aware of.

Sincerely,
Daniel C. Wieking, MD
As a member of the Capitol Chapter of OHA I am writing to you to support the adoption of the revised Wolf Management Plan. Since its initial adoption in 2005 the plan has worked toward the successful re-establishment and effective management of wolves in Oregon. Now that management activities have ensured that the wolf population do not decline below Phase II levels there needs to be plans in place to make sure population levels do not increase to the point that there are conflicts with other land uses such as livestock grazing and deer and elk population levels. One way to help keep wolf population levels in balance with other land uses is the controlled take of problem wolves by either ODFW or hunters via special controlled hunts. Populations of other large Oregon carnivores such as cougars and black bears have undergone similar impacts. They were driven almost to extinction, but under proper management including hunting they were brought back and are now considered widespread and common. The same success can be achieved with wolves under this plan.
I am a life member of the Oregon Hunters Association (OHA), and a life-long resident of Eastern Oregon. We know from Idaho’s experience that real “numbers management” is essential with wolves if there is going to be any harvestable surplus of big game left for sport hunting. Wolves have successfully re-established in Oregon, and ODFW has been proactive in planning for them through an effective management plan process – supported by OHA. ODFW’s proposed plan allows for continued growth and health of the wolf population, yet considers other very important concerns for Oregonians, such as hunting for deer, elk and other big game, and the agricultural activities of Oregon (cattle and sheep). When and where needed, hunters can aid ODFW in controlled take, lowering financial impact on ODFW’s strained budget, most of which now comes from hunters and anglers. Any controlled take would be done with close concern for the species abundance and effect on other economic interests, such as livestock raising and big game hunting.

H. Brent Lewis, CPA

LEWIS, POE, MOELLER, GUNDerson & ROBERTS, LLC
Certified Public Accountants

PO Box 1024
1121 Adams Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850
(541) 963-4191 ph
(541) 963-9434 fax
blewis@lagrandecpa.com

* * * * *

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice contained in the email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the Lewis, Poe, Moeller, Gunderson & Roberts, LLC client engagement letter.
Dear ODFW

I am a member of Oregon Hunters Association and support the ODFW wolf plan.
I urge your support of this plan which manages the ever growing wolf population in the State of Oregon.
Because wolves prey on game (elk and deer) that are managed, they should be managed as well!

Thank You

Dave Wand
21399 SE Bohna Park Road
Damascus, Oregon 97089
Having learned that you extended the timeline on the review of Oregon’s Wolf Conservation and Management Plan, I am writing to urge you to use this delay as an opportunity to strengthen the Plan. Please incorporate provisions that more closely align with the best available science and the values expressed by a majority of Oregonians who - like me - value wolves and other native wildlife.

As you’ve seen from the thousands of comments which have been submitted by the public, and critiques from independent scientists, hunting, trapping, and killing wolves is not the way to manage this unique native species or reduce conflict.

The latest iteration of the draft Wolf Plan not only opens the door for future hunting and trapping of wolves, but allows these methods to be used as a management tool now. Phrases like “special permit agents” and “management approach similar to other wildlife in Oregon” are efforts to get a foot in the door towards sport hunting. And it’s unacceptable.

I encourage the Commission to ensure that any policies found in the Wolf Plan make killing an option of last resort and prioritize enforceable requirements for implementation of meaningful non-lethal preventative measures.

Oregon also needs to more seriously address the pervasive poaching problem which affects all wildlife in our state, but especially our native carnivores.

Oregonians are counting on you to pass a Wolf Plan that is scientifically defensible and reflects Oregon values of protecting native wildlife for future generations.

Thank you,
Judi Johnson

Ms. Judi Johnson
63193 Boyd Acres rd
Bend, OR 97701
Michael Finley  
Chair of the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Salem, Oregon  

Dear Chairman Finley:  

In previous public testimony before the Commission, I expressed a concern that the draft Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan contained no information for Oregonians indicating why wolves were ecologically important and that plan instead seemed to continually stress the potential for conflicts between wolves and other user groups. Thus, for the updated Plan (11/17/2017) to have within the Introduction a Subsection D entitled the “Role of Wolves in Ecosystems” represents a significant step forward. However, it seems like any ecological importance that the authors of this section “giveth” in the early paragraphs they seemingly “taketh away” in the closing paragraphs. Below, I offer some overview comments regarding the paragraphs that comprise this section of the plan.  

Paragraphs 1-3, pp. 3-4  

Paragraph 1 contains several general sentences about large carnivore effects in ecosystems. Paragraph 2 leads off discussing the “removal and restoration” of apex predators, but the comments that follow generally consider only “restoration”. The concept of a “trophic cascade” is mentioned in the 2nd sentence of this paragraph. Paragraph 3 spends nearly all of its efforts on the effects of restoration on plant communities except for a single sentence near the end where Berger et al. (2001) is included to indicate the effects of large predator loss on riparian vegetation and birds.  

While these first three paragraphs contain information about trophic cascades and are not “wrong,” a more systematic presentation might better identify the important role wolves can have in ecosystems and be more useful to Oregonians that read this plan. I would suggest these paragraphs could be much more informative if they contained something like the following:  

(1) Use this paragraph to introduce and briefly explain the concept of a “trophic cascade” associated with apex predators, such as wolves. It has been my experience that many livestock owners, hunters, and other Oregonians really don’t have a good grasp of the trophic cascade concept.  

(2) Follow the introductory paragraph with a summary/synthesis of the various studies across the western US and Canada that have identified ecosystem effects of apex predator removal, i.e., subsequent increases in herbivory by native ungulates with widespread effects on plant communities and the capability of these
highly altered plant communities for meeting the physical habitat and food-web needs of numerous wildlife species.

(3) Next include a paragraph summarizing the ecosystem changes that begin to occur when an apex predator, such as wolves, is restored. The most recent synthesis of what has been happening to riparian plant communities over the last two decades in Yellowstone, published in 2016 but not mentioned in paragraph 3 of the updated wolf plan, indicates the following:

**Abstract** During the seven decades of gray wolf (Canis lupus) absence in Yellowstone National Park intensive browsing by Rocky Mountain elk (Cervus elaphus) suppressed the growth of young deciduous woody plants within the park’s northern ungulate winter range. Since wolf reintroduction, 24 assessments of deciduous woody plants in riparian areas have been published, including eleven on willow (Salix spp.), six on aspen (Populus tremuloides), five on cottonwood (Populus angustifolia and P. tricocarpa), and one each on berry-producing shrubs and thinleaf alder (Alnus incana spp. tenuifolia). All but two of these studies found increases in plant height, stem diameter, stem establishment, canopy cover, or recruitment. More than half of the studies measured ungulate browsing and, in all instances, increased growth/cover of woody plants over time occurred concurrently with a decrease in browsing. Almost half of the studies also compared observed plant community changes to climatic/hydrologic variables but the results of these analyses were often inconsistent. Although the long-term warming and drying trends underway in northern Yellowstone appear unlikely to have contributed to the occurrence of improved riparian plant communities during the last two decades, these vegetation changes were consistent with reestablishment of a tri-trophic cascade involving an intact large predator guild, elk, and woody plant species. This early stage of vegetation recovery in northern Yellowstone, although not occurring everywhere, represents a major departure from the wide-spread suppression of woody plants by elk browsing that occurred in the decades when wolves were absent (Source: Beschta R.L., Ripple W.J. 2016. Riparian vegetation recovery in Yellowstone: The first two decades after wolf reintroduction. Biological Conservation 198:93-103)

**Paragraph 4, pp. 4-5**

Paragraph 4 focuses on what has been happening in Yellowstone and identifies a number of studies that seem to support a conclusion that wolf effects in that area have been “equivocal.” These studies, published between 2010 and 2013, are ones generally indicating a trophic cascade (i.e., an improvement in vegetation) was not occurring for all vegetation species, was not occurring on sites where elk were vulnerable to predation, or any improvements in vegetation may have instead been associated with bottom-up factors, such as snow depth and soil moisture.

I understand that what is happening in Yellowstone may not be perfectly understood and some studies, particularly early ones, may have seen what is happening through different lenses. However, I would strongly suggest that this paragraph does not provide an accurate representation of what the vast majority of Yellowstone studies are indicating with regard to trophic cascades (see abstract above). The ongoing decreases in herbivory in Yellowstone did not always occur immediately after the return of wolves, did not begin to occur everywhere, and varied in time and space following the return of wolves, however reductions in herbivory have been of sufficient magnitude that various plant species (cottonwood, aspen, willow, berry-producing shrubs, and others) have begun to recover in many areas (thus providing improved habitat for birds, beaver, bears, elk, etc.). Furthermore, it is this reduction in herbivory has also allowed natural disturbances and other factors to affect the rate of recovery. Thus, variability in growth responses of deciduous woody plants, often identified as
an indication a trophic cascade was not occurring, actually represents the expected signature of a recovering ecosystem. This type of variability has also occurred in Canadian National parks where wolves have returned.

To strongly imply that the effects of wolves in Yellowstone are “equivocal,” as is done in paragraph 4’s not really consistent with the vast majority of research, nor the most recent research. I suspect it leaves any reader confused.

**Paragraph 5, page 5.**

This paragraph seems to be making several points:

1. Ecosystem level responses have been largely observed in national parks and protected areas.

   National parks and protected area are indeed where the ecosystem effects of apex predators have been largely studied, and there are good scientific reasons as to why this is the case. Overall, various national parks (across a spectrum of ecosystems) are where the principle effects of large predator removal and restoration upon the structure and functioning of plant communities (i.e., trophic cascades) have been repeatedly demonstrated. Thus, if wolves can reach an ecologically effective density outside of national parks, it would seem that there may be significant likelihood of achieving ecological benefits similar to those found in national parks.

2. Land management activities, as well as climate and site productivity, affect ecosystems.

   I agree and would additionally indicate that it is not yet known if, and to what extent, these factors might alter the trophic level effects of an apex predator. We are indeed in need of studies outside of national parks. However, missing from the list of factors that might influence a trophic cascade is the hunting of wolves. Of all land uses, this could well be the most significant factor affecting the capability of wolves to naturally function and effect a trophic cascade, but it is not discussed. This is a serious oversight.

3. Observed behavioral effects of human hunters on ungulates are greater than those associated with wolves.

   This concept implies that: because there is human hunting of ungulates, and because the behavioral effects of hunters are supposedly greater than that of wolves, there is no need to have an apex predator on the landscape. I’m not a wolf/ungulate biologist and thus my opinion may not count, but I feel that there may be a major problem with this concept. For example, even if the behavioral effects of hunting were relatively strong while hunters were in the field, such effects would likely be strongest during that relatively limited period of time. Wolves, by contrast, are wide ranging and present throughout the year. Is there any evidence to indicate that a month or two human hunting has a greater overall behavioral effect than 12 months of relatively continuous predation pressure by wolves?

4. Ecosystem level effects from wolves are unknown in areas with livestock grazing and where ungulates are “carefully” managed through hunting.

   Livestock grazing, as practiced on many federal lands, can effectively obliterate any trophic effects wolves might have on plant communities. Thus, it seems a bit miss-directed to blame wolves if such effects don’t occur in areas frequented by livestock. In Yellowstone there is perhaps an ecological surrogate of the livestock issue. In Yellowstone we are increasingly finding that areas of high bison use can effectively prevent plant community recovery.

   In many areas of eastern Oregon, the capability of aspen to recruit (i.e., sprouts grow above the browse height of elk into tall saplings, and eventually trees) has been greatly reduced and, in other areas, riparian
plant communities have been heavily impacted due to high levels of herbivory. Even on public lands these impacts are often from livestock but increasingly they include the effects of both livestock and wild ungulates. This ongoing loss of biodiversity is likely to continue unless something changes. With regard to wild ungulates, it may well be that an ecologically effective density of wolves within the state may be our best, and perhaps only hope of sufficiently affecting ungulate behavior and density enough to sustain/recover the biodiversity of native plant communities in many areas.

Overall, it looks like ODF&W has taken a baby step forward by now including the topic of trophic cascades in Subsection D of their amended wolf plan. It’s good to see the start but I would strongly suggest that there appears to be a considerable way to go before it represents a more balanced synthesis of this important topic that can be of use to Oregonians.

Should you have any questions regarding my comments above, please let me know.

Sincerely,

RLBeschta

Robert L. Beschta, PhD
Emeritus Professor
Forest Ecosystems and Society¹
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97330

¹ Affiliation provided for information purposes only.
Having learned that you extended the timeline on the review of Oregon’s Wolf Conservation and Management Plan, I am writing to urge you to use this delay as an opportunity to strengthen the Plan. Please incorporate provisions that more closely align with the best available science and the values expressed by a majority of Oregonians who - like me - value wolves and other native wildlife.

As you’ve seen from the thousands of comments which have been submitted by the public, and critiques from independent scientists, hunting, trapping, and killing wolves is not the way to manage this unique native species or reduce conflict.

The latest iteration of the draft Wolf Plan not only opens the door for future hunting and trapping of wolves, but allows these methods to be used as a management tool now. Phrases like “special permit agents” and “management approach similar to other wildlife in Oregon” are efforts to get a foot in the door towards sport hunting. And it’s unacceptable.

I encourage the Commission to ensure that any policies found in the Wolf Plan make killing an option of last resort and prioritize enforceable requirements for implementation of meaningful non-lethal preventative measures.

Oregon also needs to more seriously address the pervasive poaching problem which affects all wildlife in our state, but especially our native carnivores.

Oregonians are counting on you to pass a Wolf Plan that is scientifically defensible and reflects Oregon values of protecting native wildlife for future generations.

Thank you,

Mrs. Maria Smith
1418 Center St
Lafayette, IN 47905
765-404-4298
Roxann B Borisch

From: Wayne Lannen <wayne.lannen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 7:16 AM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Please Support the Draft Wolf Plan (2017/18)

I am Wayne Lannen I am an O.H.A. member of the Bend Chapter. I wanted to voice my support for the Wolf Plan and the O.D.F.W. that allows for the management of the Wolf population. As shown wolves are an important part of the ecosystem, but their numbers will need to be managed in order to balance the big game hunting in Oregon, especially Elk and Deer. It only make sense to use the public hunters for the job of population management. The time will come when Wolves are to abundant and hunting for them will be a necessary tool for management.

Thank you for your time in this matter.

Sincerely
Wayne Lannen
Bend Or.
541-420-1318
January 18, 2018

Chairman Finley & Commissioners

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife

Re: Wolf Conservation and Management Plan

Dear Chairman Finley & Commissioners,

As you review further the adoption and implementation of the wolf management plan, please consider that it is time to act without further delay. Continued delay will make management and conservation a more difficult task as the wolf population continues to grow and spread through Oregon. The edits were minor or technical in nature and a consensus of all interested parties will never be reached - a compromise with a wide array of tools available to your staff is the best you can hope for.

Nobody doubts the important role apex predators play in the ecosystem, that wolves are beautiful and interesting, that they are intelligent and adaptive, that they are effective predators, or that they generally belong. It is all of these elements that makes for the contentious state of this plan and further makes this effort understandably difficult. However, having a functioning, forward looking and workable plan that can be flexible enough to serve the future and the certainly unforeseen situations that will arise is paramount. Provisions for a full array of tools to have at the disposal of those who must undertake this management task should outweigh the emotional crisis that many are pleading about.

Part of those management tools, due to human encroachment and involvement, will and should include population control and removal of a certain percentage of animals so that an appropriate balance of the land and animals is met. Controlled take, in the form of culling and eventually hunting should be maintained as a part of that effort. Identification of wolves as a game mammal and hunting provide a very important element to conservation and management - they always have. Besides providing the direct benefit of population and depredation control, hunting and management as a game mammal will offset expenditures of government hired and funded culling operations. Tag fees will even provide income directly associated with management and the management program.

It is well documented that wolves have successfully re-established in Oregon and many other states across the country, and ODFW has been proactive in planning for them. However, we need to understand that the population is a whole
From: Lynn Stein <danlynnstein@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:49 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Astoria meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the Commission:

I'm curious as to why you chose Astoria--as far removed from Eastern Oregon as you can get almost--as your site to discuss wolf management. The problem isn't in Astoria. It's here, in Eastern Oregon. It would make more sense, then, to hold your meeting in a place more convenient for the voices of those who are most affected by the wolf problem. Must the playing field ALWAYS be in Western Oregon's favor?

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Dan and Lynn Stein
62182 Prairie Creek Rd.
Joseph, OR 97846
Dear Commission members,

I am curious why the revision of the current Wolf Plan is being discussed at the upcoming meeting in Astoria. There are no current wolf packs in that area and no affected producers close by who could conveniently attend that meeting. I see on your schedule that there is a meeting in Baker City on June 7th and 8th. Is there some reason why the meeting could not be held there to discuss the Plan where producers, who now have tons of experience trying to deal with depredating wolves, could easier attend?

Holding a meeting of this importance to the economics of Eastern Oregon in a location as remote as you can get from the center of the problem is just exacerbating the divide between ODFW and producers. This shows no connection to a desire to find equitable solutions to an exploding problem as wolf numbers exponentially grow. The new Plan will not only be ineffective in that case, but will drive a bigger wedge between those who live clean lives producing food products and urban dwellers, whose naivety regarding the true nature of wolves drives them to support fantasy over fact.

There has to be a sense of reality in wolf management not related to the political climate in Oregon. Just as I could have a high regard for, say raccoons or field mice or slugs, and not want anyone killing them to keep them in check, my voice should not outweigh the need for public safety and "the pursuit of happiness" (as in a clean home or yard) that is guaranteed us in our Constitution. You may receive 10 times the comments from those who want to see wolves in Oregon, but in any intelligent analysis, the people affected by the wolf, as an apex predator destroying private property, should be the ones who are protected by the Plan, not hobbled by it.

I would sincerely want to know why you can't move this meeting to the eastside. If you showed any hint at all of wanting to protect producers, you would find them a workable group to deal with.

Sincerely,

Richard and Connie Dunham
Enterprise, OR 97828
541 426-3315
group — not just Oregon limited. Management could be successfully implemented similar to the sage grouse conservation efforts where lessons are shared and populations conserved and managed as a consortium of interested parties. Place emotion aside and understand the greater population and effects that exist.

As a conservationist and outdoor enthusiast, I urge the commission to please stay ahead of the game on wolf conservation and management in Oregon by adopting the current plan including controlled take and consider all the important concerns for all Oregonians throughout the state. Do not lose what the effort that our staffers and scientists have worked so hard for.

Regards,

Jeff Price

Portland, Oregon
As an OHA member with a BS degree in wildlife management, I feel we should let science and not emotion determine how wolves are managed in Oregon. Controlled hunting should be considered to maintain numbers at a level determined by biologists. Thank you for accepting my input. David A. Bowman
Greetings!
As a college student who cares deeply about protecting wildlife, I respectfully urge ODFW to carry forward the parts of the Wolf Plan that worked to reduce conflict and recover wolves. Non-lethal controls are effective and help to reduce conflict. They should be an integral part of the Wolf Plan, with clearly defined, enforceable, and meaningful requirements. Research shows that killing wolves is not an effective strategy for reducing livestock depredations, nor does it increase social acceptance of wolves.

Stronger protections are needed to ensure wolf recovery. Wolves are still too limited in numbers and in distribution to be considered “recovered”, or to maintain sustained populations. We are concerned that shrinking populations in neighboring states, combined with delisting in Oregon will not ensure sufficient genetic diversity or connectivity. Particularly in light of threats from poaching and other sources of mortality, our small wolf population continues to be in jeopardy of extinction.

Strong protections are needed to ensure public acceptance of wolves. In areas where killing wolves is legally acceptable, public support of wolves may decrease. State-sanctioned killing of wolves actually increases controversy and discontent about wolf presence. We are opposed to killing wolves, especially on public lands.

Thank you for your time and kind consideration!

Respectfully,

Rebecca Canright
Hi there,
I am writing as a concerned mother who wants to preserve wild biodiversity for future generations. I support safeguarding wolf populations. I ask ODFW to please carry forward the parts of the Wolf Plan that worked to reduce conflict and recover wolves. Non-lethal controls are effective and help to reduce conflict. They should be an integral part of the Wolf Plan, with clearly defined, enforceable, and meaningful requirements.

Non-lethal works! The Wood River Project in Idaho, run by Defenders of Wildlife is an example of successful coexistence of livestock and wolves. The Wood River Project has been going strong for eight years, and uses non-lethal management to protect more than 25,000 sheep that graze annually on the Sawtooth National Forest. It has one of the highest concentrations of wolves and livestock sharing the same landscape, yet the project area has the lowest rate of loss due to wolf depredations across the state. The Wood River program has been so successful that Blaine County, where the project is located, unanimously passed a resolution in 2014 requesting that the state use non-lethal tools over lethal tools. (10, 11, 12, 13) On the other hand, where killing wolves in response to depredations has been emphasized, depredations have gone up. These results are consistent with the 2014 Wielgus study showing that killing wolves in response to livestock depredations actually causes more depredations (14).

Good-sense economic strategy favors strong ecological protections, and strong protections for wolves. Oregon’s natural landscapes are one of its most valuable economic assets. Oregonians receive tremendous economic gains from clean water, livability, outdoor recreation activities, tourism, and other resources associated with our breathtaking natural heritage. Wolves indirectly and directly contribute to these economic gains (15).

Thanks for your time,
Zinnia Cardamomum
To The Oregon Department Of Fish And Wildlife Game Commission

2-28-18

Dear Commission, I have been an Oregon resident for 66 years and an avid outdoorsman. I have participated in fund raising and helping researchers learn more about our state's game to manage it better. The current draft wolf plan must be approved and not sidelined until the population is completely out of control. It is a reasonable scientific based plan and not one derived from hot emotions. We have seen the results of our neighboring states and need to take action now before there is no game to manage. We have employed professional biologists to come up with a fact based plan. Do not let the emotionally driven anti hunter arguments sway your opinion from the facts. To delay is to invite disaster to our local herds which will mean fewer hunters, less dollars recruited and an uncontrolled death spiral of our big game populations.

Sincerely,

Tom Vanasche M.D.
Hello,
Wolves are here and deserve all the protections given to humans. I live in southern Oregon in the land of the Rogue Pack. I have personally witnessed some of these amazing animals. I am thrilled to live in an environment that can host a healthy wolf population. These are our neighbors same as mountain lions bears and coyotes. None of these should be hunted for sport. Hunting is for food!

Wolves are among the most majestic creatures in Oregon. They are intelligent, highly social, and they are critical to healthy landscapes - and their population is just starting to recover.

Wolves should never be killed for fun, and in other instances, non-lethal measures must be exhausted first. Research has shown that non-lethal deterrents are the most effective means of protecting livestock in the long run. We must demand that the best available science be used in management planning. If there is a conflict between livestock and wolves I say the livestock needs to go. Livestock is the non-native, unnecessary intruder on this land, not the wolf.

No to sport hunting wolves or other predators and no to killing predators due to livestock conflicts! Livestock is the invader.

Michael DiGiorgio
72 Nursery St
Ashland, OR 97520
541-531-7467
Good Afternoon,

My name is Brooke Smith. I am a member of the Oregon Hunters Association, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and am an avid hunter and outdoors person.

Besides being a avid hunter, I am also involved in the logging and ranching industry. The wolf debate is one that hits close to home with me. I have spoken with many hunters in the past two years who have been hunting in Montana as well as the North Eastern portions of Washington for years, and that last two years they have noticed significant changes. You can’t hardly find an elk by bugging or cow calling. They are there but they will not answer as to not reveal there location to the wolves. While calling for elk however they have been successful to call in the wolves.

While hunting in the Desolation unit this year, friends of mine could not get away from the wolves. Hiking in to the wilderness they saw a lot of sign and tracks and then on there way out the wolves had walked in there tracks from that morning.

Big game has a lot of predictors, and it appears that the wolves are becoming one of there biggest ones. The winter of 2016-17 took a huge impact on deer and elk numbers especially in Central and Eastern Oregon. Throw larger wolf pack numbers on top of that and it is a recipe for disaster.

I understand that that proposal is eventually have controlled hunts for Wolves in Oregon, possibly in 2022, but can we afford to wait that long? What will our elk and deer herds look like in four years with the wolf numbers growing?

I understand that some are wanting a sustainable wolf population in our state. I also know that there is a substantial amount of revenue gained by the sale of Big Game Animal tags in our state. What is the impact on that revenue going to be when we have to lower that amount of tags that are handed out because I herd numbers have dropped so much due to the wolf kills? If we began allowing wolf population control now, ODFW can reap the benefit of that revenue and it will help sustain the elk and deer revenue in the long run.

I mentioned above that I come from a logging and ranching family. As passionate as I am about wildlife I am more passionate about livestock and the families that make a living with there livestock. Wolves are not afraid of a beef cow and a new born calf cannot defend themselves as they are laying along the edge of a meadow on a brisk winter morning. Steam rolling off of there wet hair, the cow licking the afterbirth off and trying to get the blood circulating in that calf. Just as it makes it’s first attempts to stand up and eat it’s first meal a family of wolves approaches, the herd is on high alert, cows are balling hunting for there calves. The new mom is dancing around trying to protect her newborn who is either going to get stepped on by it’s mom or killed by a wolf. Either way it is a 800.00 loss for that hard working family.

Wolves are not afraid of us, they have no respect for us. We cannot afford to wait till 2022 for a plan on controlling the population. We need to start controlling the numbers now.
Thank you for your time in this highly sensitive matter.

Thank You,

Brooke Smith
541-419-6539
Browninggirl85@gmail.com

Creator of Rafter BT Creations
Oregon Hunters Association Board - Ochoco Chapter
USA Archery Level 2 Instructor
Ladies Hunting Camp Board Member/Instructor

Central Cascades Archery Prostaff
Nature’s Paint Prostaff
C4LLanyard Prostaff
Hips Archery Targets Prostaff
Mountain States Game Calls Prostaff
From: mike haaskan <mahaaskan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 11, 2018 11:51 AM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Oregon Wolf Management Plan

Oregon needs to implement the draft wolf management plan now instead of waiting until 2022. The numbers and the science are clear: Big Game and domestic livestock predation are increasing as the wolf population increases. Wolf numbers need to be managed now rather than waiting 4 years because we don't want the numbers that Idaho and Montana have. The fewer big game available for hunting the fewer licenses you will sell, causing you to raise license fees resulting in hunting being available only to the rich, like in Europe; bad policy! Please implement the wolf plan sooner than later.
Sincerely, Mike Haaskan, Sportsman
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to express my deep concern over recent actions by the Commission and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). I am strongly opposed to any form of wolf hunting or trapping in our state, and I am strongly opposed to any delay in the implementation of the compromise agreement to phase-out the use of gillnets on the Columbia River.

During the Commission’s debate to strip Endangered Species Act protections from Oregon’s tiny population of less than 100 wolves, several of you noted that the decision would not automatically lead to wolf hunting. Now, just over a year later, staff with ODFW are proposing changes to the Wolf Conservation and Management Plan that would in fact do exactly what you said would not happen--allow hunting and trapping in our state.

I ask you to oppose hunting and trapping of wolves in Oregon in any form, and reject any request by ODFW to erode protections that make it easier to kill wolves. Additionally, I encourage you to adopt a plan that has strong sideboards to determine when and how ODFW is allowed to take lethal action.

I am also deeply disturbed by the decision the Commission made last fall to abandon the 2012 compromise agreement to phase out the use of gillnets by non-tribal commercial fishing operations on the Lower Columbia River. Later this month, you will have an opportunity to revisit this decision. Washington is moving ahead with these reforms, and Oregon should do the same. The compromise resolved decades of conflict over gillnets, and it would be deeply irresponsible for the Commission to blow up the agreement.

The Commission is supposed to represent the interests of all Oregonians, not just those who hunt and fish. I urge you to honor your commitment to do so, and oppose any proposal to allow hunting and trapping of wolves, or keep wildlife-killing gillnets on the Lower Columbia River.

Let’s start the year off on the right foot.
Karen Murphy
324 Woodbrook Run
Newport News, VA 23606
For many, wolves are a symbol of freedom, wilderness, and the American west. Science continues to
demonstrate the positive impacts of wolves on the landscape and the critical role played by big
predators, and interest in their return is fueling tourism in Oregon’s wolf country and elsewhere in
the west.

Still, wolves are threatened by a purposeful campaign of misinformation and fear. A small number of
vocal anti-wolf activists, along with industry lobbyists and their political allies, continue to work to
undermine already weak protections for wolves and other wildlife.

For a state that prides itself on its green reputation, the extermination of wolves is one of our
greatest environmental tragedies. Their return represents an opportunity at redemption. Recovery
remains tenuous. Many of the state’s wolves are pups less than a year old and Oregon can no longer
count on recovery in neighboring states to bolster populations here.

Please put their continued recovery first. Finally provide them with a management plan they have
deserved and needed since they were systematically killed and removed from their native lands years
ago.

Respectfully

Jennifer Sofinowski
Apr 11, 2018

Commission Chair Finley

Dear Finley,

I want to express my deep disappointment in the latest, weakened version of the Oregon Wolf Plan. It appears that over the last few months, ODFW and the Commission have ignored the feedback of Oregonians who want to see continued protections for wolves. Instead, the plan makes it easier than ever for the state to justify more killing. And the Commission is making it harder for people like me to make our voices heard by preventing public testimony on the issue until January - the same day the Commission will vote on the final plan.

While the first draft of the Oregon Wolf Plan unacceptably lowered the bar for killing wolves in response to livestock depredations, this latest version takes things a step further. I was shocked to see a new provision that gives the ODFW Director broad discretion to authorize killing wolves after two confirmed depredations, without any time or place restrictions. This is an untenable standard.

The latest draft also makes it easier to hunt wolves. It creates a special hunting permit so that local residents can do the agency's "lethal removals." It also adds a vision statement that shifts the intent of the state to one day manage wolves like cougars and black bears - a euphemism for hunting. It seems the Commission was more concerned with getting a foot in the door for hunting than it was with addressing serious threats like poaching.

In the last month, there have been at least three poaching incidents in Oregon - not including the wolf that was shot by an elk hunter in what was reported as self-defense. Yet this plan fails to meaningfully address this issue. There is no strategy to coordinate with enforcement agencies or to close loopholes in our existing wildlife laws. This sends a powerful and dangerous message about how little the state values its imperiled species.
As it's written today, the draft Oregon Wolf Plan fails wolves and the majority of Oregonians who wish to see them recover.

Sincerely,

Dr. Bryan Brock
SW 2nd Ave
Portland, OR 97239
(503) 477-7703
bbriggidy@hotmail.com
4-10-2018
In the March OHA magazine about Oregon's moose, ODFW is wondering "What happened". I have been saying for a while, when the wolves came we would never be able to build up a moose population. They both came from Idaho into the same NE corner of Oregon.
ODFW has collared a few moose and say they have not found predation. I worked for ODFW for 13 years on deer and elk projects from the Roseburg office and retrieved the collars that were on mortal signnal. It would be very difficult to find uncollared mortalities in wilderness country. A friend of mine did see a carcass of an animal they thought might be a moose by the long snout of the skull, in the Imnaha unit last fall. They were busy packing out their elk so didn't go out of their way to check more closely.
I find it interesting that ODFW says they want outdoors people to report moose sightings, when they don't respect reports of wolf sightings, "So you think you saw a wolf".
I have talked to several people, that I trust, in Douglas County that have seen wolves in the Umpqua National Forest. Recently I hear of wolf sightings in Klamath area and the north Cascades.
ODFW has no idea how many wolves are in Oregon. Their study area is still focused in the NE corner of the state.
OR7 has been at Crater Lake for several years following the Known deer migration from Crater Lake to northern California. There could be 120 wolves in the Cascades from Crater Lake to California, they don't know. When wolves aren't eating livestock, which is most of the time, they are eating deer, elk and Moose.
In 1995 the elk population of Yellowstone Park was 19,000 today there are 4,000 elk in Yellowstone Park. The western border of Yellowstone is in Idaho's Lolo unit, mostly a wild area. Idaho estimated 300 wolves just in that unit and noted a heavily damaged elk population. Several years ago they tried to reduce the wolf population by at least 100 using all means hunting, trapping and helicopters. They killed 60 in one season. The wolves learned to avoid helicopters.
Wyoming stood up to the Federal government, they allow 200 wolves in the NW corner of their state which includes Yellowstone Park. Outside of that area in Wyoming it is legal to shoot wolves on sight, no license, no :ag. They are not going to let 100-150 pound wild dogs ruin their state.

I am an animal lover as much as anyone. Wolves should never have been reintroduced, they were extirpated for a reason. They are not going extinct. There are 60,000 wolves in Canada, 12,000 in Alaska. Canada has 40 million people, Alaska less than one million. With a wilderness land area the size of the whole lower 48 states. There are 340 million people in the lower 48.
We need to manage wolves in Oregon before things are out of control, before we are seeing declines in our
other wildlife. We need to manage wolves according to real statistics and real wildlife science, not be stopped by the emotions of a very few animal rights people.

I am an animal lover and a respecter of life, and I am a hunter. Like I said I worked at fish and wildlife for 13 years and have hunted 40 years. We do not have the numbers of animals in Oregon to let this top predator reproduce out of control.

Jeff Orr, PO Box 34, Umpqua, Oregon 97484 541-580-7404, 541-459-3513.
Apr 11, 2018

Commission Chair Finley

Dear Finley,

I want to express my deep disappointment in the latest, weakened version of the Oregon Wolf Plan. It appears that over the last few months, ODFW and the Commission have ignored the feedback of Oregonians who want to see continued protections for wolves. Instead, the plan makes it easier than ever for the state to justify more killing. And the Commission is making it harder for people like me to make our voices heard by preventing public testimony on the issue until January - the same day the Commission will vote on the final plan.

While the first draft of the Oregon Wolf Plan unacceptably lowered the bar for killing wolves in response to livestock depredations, this latest version takes things a step further. I was shocked to see a new provision that gives the ODFW Director broad discretion to authorize killing wolves after two confirmed depredations, without any time or place restrictions. This is an untenable standard.

The latest draft also makes it easier to hunt wolves. It creates a special hunting permit so that local residents can do the agency's "lethal removals." It also adds a vision statement that shifts the intent of the state to one day manage wolves like cougars and black bears - a euphemism for hunting. It seems the Commission was more concerned with getting a foot in the door for hunting than it was with addressing serious threats like poaching.

In the last month, there have been at least three poaching incidents in Oregon - not including the wolf that was shot by an elk hunter in what was reported as self-defense. Yet this plan fails to meaningfully address this issue. There is no strategy to coordinate with enforcement agencies or to close loopholes in our existing wildlife laws. This sends a powerful and dangerous message about how little the state values its imperiled species.
As it's written today, the draft Oregon Wolf Plan fails wolves and the majority of Oregonians who wish to see them recover.

Sincerely,

Dr. Bryan Brock
SW 2nd Ave
Portland, OR 97239
(503) 477-7703
bbriggidy@hotmail.com
Dear Chair Finley and Commissioners:

I am writing to ask the Commission to direct ODFW to refrain from any future wolf kill orders until the overdue revised version of the Wolf Plan is adopted. Allowing an expired Wolf Plan to continue to drive management decisions is unfortunately proving itself to be irresponsible as it leads to more controversy, conflict, and dead wolves.

Since being statewide delisted in 2015, our wolf population has increased by only 14 wolves. In that same period, at least 19 wolves have been killed by humans - 15 wolves have been killed by people (12 by ODFW - 4 in 2016, 5 in 2017, 3 in 2018- at least 4 by poaching, 2 under controversial circumstances, and 1 “accidentally taken” by a Wildlife Services M-44).

This year’s claim of an 11% population increase is deceptive. I clearly recall last year listening to ODFW’s biologist acknowledge that last year’s count was likely much lower than it really was due to the inclement weather conditions. If that is true, then this year’s population should have well exceeded an increase of 11%. Most likely, there was no population increase and possibly a decrease in population. Please keep this reality in mind as you consider the current stability or instability of our wolf population in making your decisions.

Last year wolves were responsible for a total loss statewide of 11 calves, 1 llama, 1 alpaca, and some domestic fowl in a single incident. In response the state issued kill orders for 10 wolves. This is close to one wolf per incident. This is far from a plan which claims to place conservation as a priority.

I’m very concerned with this trend. ODFW has not shown itself to be capable of upholding Oregon’s conservation values. Oregon should become the state which values wolves, their rightful place in the landscape and the vital role they play as keystone species. Until wolves are truly a stable recovered population, conservation and recovery goals need to become the driving factors in our wolf management plan. It needs to become a plan that prioritizes the use of clearly defined and enforceable non-lethal methods.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns and requests.

Sincerely,
Joan Beldin
10223 N. Hudson St. Portland 97203
Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to express my deep concern over recent actions by the Commission and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). I am strongly opposed to any form of wolf hunting or trapping in our state, and I am strongly opposed to any delay in the implementation of the compromise agreement to phase-out the use of gillnets on the Columbia River.

During the Commission’s debate to strip Endangered Species Act protections from Oregon’s tiny population of less than 100 wolves, several of you noted that the decision would not automatically lead to wolf hunting. Now, just over a year later, staff with ODFW are proposing changes to the Wolf Conservation and Management Plan that would in fact do exactly what you said would not happen--allow hunting and trapping in our state.

I ask you to oppose hunting and trapping of wolves in Oregon in any form, and reject any request by ODFW to erode protections that make it easier to kill wolves. Additionally, I encourage you to adopt a plan that has strong sideboards to determine when and how ODFW is allowed to take lethal action.

I am also deeply disturbed by the decision the Commission made last fall to abandon the 2012 compromise agreement to phase out the use of gillnets by non-tribal commercial fishing operations on the Lower Columbia River. Later this month, you will have an opportunity to revisit this decision. Washington is moving ahead with these reforms, and Oregon should do the same. The compromise resolved decades of conflict over gillnets, and it would be deeply irresponsible for the Commission to blow up the agreement.

The Commission is supposed to represent the interests of all Oregonians, not just those who hunt and fish. I urge you to honor your commitment to do so, and oppose any proposal to allow hunting and trapping of wolves, or keep wildlife-killing gillnets on the Lower Columbia River.

Let’s start the year off on the right foot.

Sincerely,
Roxann B Borisch

From: ODFW Info <odfw.info@state.or.us>
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 12:23 PM
To: Shawna Hasel; odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: RE: Please support my chances of hunting big game in the future

Categories: Forwarded to Wildlife, printed

Shawna,

I have forwarded your email to the ODFW Commission for their consideration. The Commissioners formulate general state programs and policies concerning management and conservation of fish and wildlife resources and establishes seasons, methods and bag limits for recreational and commercial take. They can be emailed directly at odfw.commission@state.or.us

Matthew A. Falk
Public Information Assistant, Information and Education Division Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE
Salem, OR 97302
Ph: (503) 947-6027
Web odfw.info@state.or.us

---

From: Shawna Hasel [mailto:shawnahaselnd@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 29, 2018 8:34 AM
To: odfw.info@state.or.us
Subject: Please support my chances of hunting big game in the future

Our predator population is out of control. Each year I have bow hunted, I see more and more cougar and bear. Now I understand there is yet another wolf pack, down around my father's cabin in SummerLake. What happened to the management goals of a certain number of wolf packs before we declare this species off the endanger list...are we not there yet? I also understand it is monitored closely with trail cameras placed all over and these shetland pony-sized wolves all being radio collared and monitored. How much ODFW money goes to protecting Canadian Timberwolves?? What about their prey (deer & elk) and human hunters...how did they become so unimportant? Who wants to buy a license when it is getting so difficult to get big game in public/national forests? That is unless you are a wealthy land owner that culls your property...

You are wasting my money on something I don't want in our forest. You very effectively are reducing populations of prey and hunters already with bear and cougar. Don't even get me started on the pheasant populations...they used to be very robust here in Oregon in the 70s, 80s and even early 90s. What happened there?

ODFW's mission is reduce game and therefore reduce hunters-that's what I've seen in my forty odd years...

Please provide me some other explanation of your goals-
Shawna Hasel
ODFW Commission,
I attended the Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management plan in the Dalles on August 30th, 2018. It was a well attended meeting, with several ODFW staff in attendance as well as members of various conservation, hunting, and ranching organizations. A representative from the Governors office was also present.

I was the only member of the public in attendance, and I stayed for the entire 7 hour meeting. There was a spot on the agenda (made by professional facilitators Kearns and West) for public comment in the last 15 minutes. Sadly, those 15 minutes came and went and I was not allowed to comment despite openly requesting my due time. I had 6 pages off notes, and several relevant questions for both sides of the table.

Finally, well after many participants had packed up and left, I was given the opportunity to "speak". I opened with one of my questions, and the facilitator looked at me and said "Eric, you are welcome to speak now". I was confused, I asked my question again. Again, she said the same thing. So I asked her "Am I not allowed to ask questions"? She repeated again, "Eric, you may now speak". Huh? A member of the PUBLIC attending a PUBLIC meeting hosted by a PUBLIC agency that MY tax dollars fund, and I can't ask QUESTIONS?!? As you can tell even weeks later, this situation was very frustrating.

I implore you, please, let someone from the general populous speak for the public at these meetings. ODFW has an obligation to the public, you are using OUR money. We deserve a spot at a table, we deserve to be considered in the fate of wolf management. Hunters and ranchers get a spot at the table, but not the general public. It's nonsensical.

Please, on the record, allow the public to participate in this process.

Thank you,

Eric Lubell
916-616-9938
John Day, Oregon, 97845
Good afternoon ODFW Commission,

On October 4th, ODFW announced the next CMP meeting. Sadly, it was slated for October 9th which is only FIVE DAYS notice. I live in John Day, a solid five hour drive from Salem, the location of the next meeting. I'm positive that the "stakeholders" who ODFW chooses to invite get significantly more than 5 days notice. It's quite clear that ODFW does NOT WANT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.

Another clue, is that in the meeting agenda Kearns and West has added "as time permits" next to "Opportunity for Public Input". This is a clear indication they will strip me, once again, of the meager 15 minutes slotted into the agenda for public comment. This is another shameful attempt at silencing the public.

And I've yet to receive meeting minutes from Kearns and West from the meeting on August 30th. Could your crack team, spending my tax dollars, be any more inept? It's been WELL over a month, and no meeting minutes? Or maybe they decided they could not read my email address or some other excuse to exclude me.

These cattle are most often grazing on FEDERAL USFS OR BLM LANDS. Being that I am a law abiding, tax paying citizen if this country, I should have a say on what happens on those lands. I don't get free beef. But I see a lot of destruction caused by open range cattle, all through the west. ODFW should not be protecting the private industry of a couple of ranchers. ODFW should be protecting the fish and wildlife, not livestock. If the ranchers don't want their cattle to be eaten, they can fence them in on their own private ranches. Period.

So this will once again get included in the record. You are failing your obligations to the people or Oregon, to owners of federal public lands, and to the wildlife that rely on vast tracts of uninhabited lands. Wolves don't know they most dangerous thing they can eat is a fat, slow, stupid cow. We should not be punishing them for it. Get a grip on your priorities, and stop kowtowing to a the ranching and hunting PRIVATE industries. Bullshit.

With great frustration,

Eric Lubell
From: Derek J Broman  
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2018 3:06 PM  
To: 'lubelksi@gmail.com' <lubelksi@gmail.com>  
Subject: Wolf Plan Update

Hello Eric,

Thank you for your message and your involvement in the update of the Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan. The plan update has been underway since early 2016 and has consisted of numerous Commission meetings held around Oregon. The public has participated in these meetings and provided comments in person, via letters and emails. Earlier this year, following the eighth ODFW Commission meeting on the topic, ODFW enlisted the services of a professional facilitator to find stakeholder agreement on the remaining unresolved issues with the draft Wolf Plan update.

The facilitated process engaged the stakeholder representatives that were heavily engaged throughout the entire plan update and are committed to providing input on the remaining topics to discuss. While all members of the public are stakeholders, these groups have contributed an enormous amount of time, content, and detail to the plan update while also representing much of the general public (as indicated by your email quoting Oregon Wild). However, all facilitated meetings have been open to the public and public comment from folks who are not members of the invited stakeholder groups are provided an opportunity to comment at the end of each meeting. Public comments are included in each meeting’s agenda. To create a productive environment, the facilitated meetings required these invited participants to be present. This was even the case for the short November 5 conference call where attendees had to be present at one of two possible locations. The upcoming January 8, 2019 meeting in Portland will abide by these same expectations.

We encourage your continued involvement in the Wolf Plan update by signing up for wolf email updates and monitor the ODFW Commission webpage for agenda items regarding the Wolf Plan update. When the Wolf Plan next comes before the Commission you will again have ample opportunity to review rules and materials before the meeting and provide written comments and/or testify during the meeting. At this time, we have yet to confirm when the Wolf Plan final draft will be presented to the Commission. You may monitor our website or the Secretary of State’s website for that information as well as the proposed rules.

Sincerely,
Derek

Derek JA Broman  
Carnivore-Furbearer Coordinator  
Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife  
4034 Fairview Industrial Drive SE  
Salem, OR 97302  
Office 503.947.6095
Pleased keep controlled hunting and trapping of wolves in the plan. Wolves are moving down into populated rural areas and killing cattle. They don’t stay in the mountains of Western Oregon and that creates too much hardship on ranchers. We also want to keep elk and deer populations healthy for hunting where the State can make some money for management purposes. We need to have some control on the numbers of wolves as they reproduce.

Betty Applebaker
Klamath Falls, OR
Dear Commissioners,

Please keep controlled hunting and trapping of wolves in the wolf plan. Once outlined wolf numbers are met, we must be able to manage them with hunting and trapping. We Oregonians want ungulate numbers to be healthier, we don’t want livestock killed, and we want the Oregon economy to stay healthy. Keeping controlled hunting and trapping of wolves in the plan is the only reasonable way to do this.

Daniel Ray

Salem, OR
Dear Commissioners,

Please keep controlled hunting and trapping of wolves in the wolf plan. I see this as the best way to manage the wolf numbers. I also do not want wolves damaging livestock or deer and elk populations.

Thank you,

Dr Kenneth R. Winokur

Dallas, Oregon