

Exhibit D

**Supplemental
Public Correspondence received as of
September 11, 2019**



Roxann B Borisch

From: Tom Vanasche <tomvanasche@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 4:12 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Canyon Creek closure

Dear Commissioners,

I'm Tom Vanasche, board member of the Professional Bowhunters Society, Pacific region representative for the organization and life long Oregonian. I'm writing to encourage you to keep the Canyon Creek area near John Day a traditional bow hunting area instead of removing it as proposed. This is truly a heritage site. It was the first bow only area west of the Mississippi and many of the past archery greats from Fred Bear to Howard Hill hunted there. It is a revered site to those who know the history. Currently traditional archery is on the upswing. In Hollywood, movies from AVATAR to the HUNGER GAMES celebrate it. This area can be a focal point to recruitment and retaining of new archers. In the last set of regulations there were 45 hunts set aside for muzzleloaders and two for traditional archers. Please don't restrict it further.

Sincerely,

Tom Vanasche M.D.

Roxann B Borisch

From: ODFW WildlifeInfo
Subject: FW: Disabled veteran tags

From: Bill Dudley <billdud46@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2019 4:27 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Disabled veteran tags

As a disabled veteran with mobility issues, I would like to see special hunts for us especially elk hunts and the bag limit be 1 elk.

Is there any chance of this happening?

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: Sig Sauer BDX Rangefinders and Riflescopes

Importance: High

From: Andy York <Andy.York@sigsauer.com>

Sent: Friday, August 30, 2019 12:40 PM

To: odfw.commission@state.or.us

Cc: Joseph Fruechtel <Joe.Fruechtel@sigsauer.com>; Craig Pfeifer <Craig.Pfeifer@sigsauer.com>; Jake Love <Jake.Love@sigsauer.com>; Scott Smith <Scott.Smith@sigsauer.com>; Jason Clark <Jason.Clark@sigsauer.com>

Subject: Sig Sauer BDX Rangefinders and Riflescopes

Importance: High

To The ODFW Commissioners,

The 2019 General Hunting Regulations included a change that impacted one of our optics products, the new SIERRA3BDX riflescopes and rangefinders. The change in question is the one found on page 15 of the 2019 hunting regulations that makes it unlawful to:

• *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, including scopes with electronic rangefinders and scopes that receive information from a rangefinder or any electronic device. This does not include battery operated sights which only light the reticle.*

This same verbage is repeated on page 18 in the General Weapons Provisions for Hunting Game Mammals, where it states it is unlawful to hunt game mammals with:

• *Infrared, night vision, laser or any other sight that projects a beam to the target, including scopes with electronic rangefinders and scopes that receive information from any electronic device.*

The Sig Sauer BDX system does NOT have an integrated electronic rangefinder and it can be used in Four (4) ways while hunting:

1. You can use the riflescope as an ordinary riflescope, with illuminated reticle on or off, it is just a normal riflescope when used this way. **There is no communication in the field with any electronic device while using in this mode.**
2. You can use the riflescope with a preset illuminated ballistic reticle based on your ballistic information, with multiple holds points, for say 100, 200, 300 and 400 yards. This is no different than any other holdover ballistic BDC style reticle that has been in use for decades. **There is no communication in the field with any electronic device while using in this mode.**
3. You can use the rangefinder as an ordinary rangefinder, including the ability to use ballistic profiles/groups to allow the rangefinder to compute holdover adjustments in MOA or MILS and display that information along with the distance to the target. This information can then be used with any riflescope reticle or dials from any riflescope manufacturer to adjust for holdover manually. This type of rangefinder has been in use for years and

In the end it is our belief that this system will allow hunters to make more accurate and more ethical shots. Estimated holdover "holding on the top of the back" of an Elk for example or using Kentucky windage can result in wounded animals. This system continues the allowed tradition of using holdover reticles and rangefinders that compute holdover, BDJ just does it slightly differently. It is not a "Smart Scope", it just receives an MOA holdover value from the rangefinder an illuminates the corresponding holdover dot. To encourage more ethical shots, we included our KINETHC™ feature in the BDJ system. This feature allows the hunter to set the minimum allowable kinetic energy or feet per second (FPS) value that they feel will result in an ethical harvest, and then the system can notify the hunter by flashing the reticle when the ranged target is too far and the bullet will fall below that value and not have the power on target to perform and make a clean and ethical harvest.

shot.

case 4 is not doing anything new that was not already allowed. It is not lowering Fair Chase standards. It is not the equivalent of a drone or a thermal sight. It is a new way of allowing the hunter to use holdover to make a MOA hold. Again, that is the exact same point that the BDJ reticle would illuminate. The BDJ system in use Oregon. This reticle may have a fixed reticle marking at 5 MOA, in this case the hunter would just use that 5 system. Alternatively, some folks have ballistic holdover reticles that are also allowed for hunting in moved your reticle in the rifle scope to the EXACT same spot that we are illuminating with the BDJ an LED. It is the same spot you could have dialed to in a few seconds on your elevation turret. This would have distance ranged to target. The only new feature that BDJ introduced was to light that spot on the reticle with decades. The hunter then simply turns the elevation 5 MOA for example to move the reticle to adjust for the that is already allowed. Rangefinders that compute holdover adjustment in MOA have been allowed for use case 4 does not change the nature of the hunt or give the hunter any new advantage over the equipment all of these things change the nature of a Fair Chase hunt and should be prohibited. However, the BDJ system in enabled trail cams accessed while hunting, thermal vision used for hunting and would force the answer that yes allowable equipment for hunting". This type of question would catch things like hunting with drones, cellular provide a new and unfair advantage while hunting, something that diminishes Fair Chase from the current that the analytical tool we should use when looking at "new" technologies could be, "does this new technology the word "smart scope" and instantly have a negative reaction. Understandably so. However, I would propose discussed this at length with the Boone & Crockett Club, of which I am a professional member. I think folks hear "smart scope" or offers some new advantage which is not in keeping with principles of Fair Chase. I have 2. The final use case #4 is prohibited. I suppose because it is perceived that this new BDJ capability is some type of it to match as "it is unlawful to use...."

1. There is confusion by hunters in Oregon that "BDJ is illegal to use". It is not prohibited if it is used in any of the use cases 1-3 outlined above. The key word here is "USE" in the regulations. As long as BDJ is not being USED as outlined in USE CASE 4, then it is legal to use. This is similar to a hunter using a flashlight while hunting, you can possess the flashlight, you can use the flashlight correctly, but you cannot illuminate game and "spotlight" game with the flashlight. I think there is confusion. Not sure of the solution, but it does say "USE" on page 15 in the General Hunting Regulations section, but then in the General Weapons Provisions it says "unlawful to hunt game mammals with...scopes with electronic rangefinders and scopes that receive information from any electronic device". I suppose "hunt game animals with" is the equivalent of "USE", but it would be simplified to just write it to match as "it is unlawful to use...."

We have two primary concerns at this point.

4. You can bond the rangefinder and rifle scope such that they can communicate in the field with Bluetooth, and once a distance to target is acquired by the rangefinder, it will use your ballistic profile/group to compute the correct holdover adjustment and will send that MOA holdover information to the rifle scope and the rifle scope will then display the single correct holdover dot on the reticle. According to the new regulations for 2019, this mode of use in prohibited while hunting in Oregon, as the rifle scope is "receiving information from any electronic device"
- is allowed in Oregon for usage while hunting. There is no communication in the field with any electronic device while using in this mode.

There is a lot of information here to ponder and discuss. We wanted to get his out to you for consideration and would welcome the opportunity at Gold Beach to go into more detail and answer any questions. Please let us know if that is an option and how best to proceed from here. We are asking the commission to consider modifying the language of the hunting regulations to clarify use cases 1-3 as being allowed, and to also allow use case 4 while hunting big game in Oregon.

Best Regards,

Andy York

President Electro-Optics Division

SIG SAUER

27100 SW Parkway Avenue

Wilsonville, OR 97070-9225 USA

M - 603-686-4528

O - 603-610-3881

andy.york@sigsauer.com

SIGSAUER

27100 SW Parkway Ave
Wilsonville, OR 97070
USA

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: input on hunting changes

From: fred worsley <ifworsley1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2019 12:38 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Fwd: input on hunting changes

I also wish to forward this chain of e-mails to the Commission for consideration and also to express a concern that I have not heard from the Willamette or Rogue personnel. I would have thought I should have at least deserved a response or communication from them and Todd Lum has not contacted me as to anything they may have communicated to him?

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tod Lum <Tod.M.Lum@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: input on hunting changes
Date: July 17, 2019 at 5:42:35 PM PDT
To: fred worsley <ifworsley1@gmail.com>

Mr. Worsley,

Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the proposed 2020 big game hunting regulations and for copying your comments into an email format that I can open and see.

I forwarded your email to our Public Information Officer with regards to your Roseburg Public Meeting communication concerns. I also forwarded your hunting regulation comments to our Wildlife Division staff in Salem, the Upper Willamette Wildlife District (Indigo), and the Rogue Wildlife District (Dixon and Evans Creek) for their review and consideration.

Tod Lum
Douglas District Wildlife Biologist
Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife
4192 N Umpqua Hwy
Roseburg OR 97470
541.440.3353voice
541.673.0372fax
tod.m.lum@state.or.us

From: fred worsley [<mailto:ifworsley1@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2019 5:33 PM
To: Tod Lum <Tod.M.Lum@state.or.us>
Subject: Re: input on hunting changes

Tod let me know that you received this.

July 15, 2019

Tod Lum
ODFW
Roseburg Regional Office

Re: Public meeting held July 19, 2019 for proposed hunting regulations.

Tod,

I wish to add my input to this meeting that was held last Tuesday. First, I and some of my hunting partners were not aware of this meeting. How was this communicated to the public? I usually read the news paper each day and did not see any notice. I apologize if I missed the notice in the paper but it seems lately the ODFW does not communicate well as they use to in the local paper on local matters, ie fish counts, hunting stats, weekly fishing and hunting reports etc. I know the pat answer will be the computer and e-mail but not all use this form of communication on a regular basis. If this was not broadcast by news, radio, and paper why not? You use to do it and I think you have missed some of the public by not doing this. I would have attended this meeting had I known about it.

Second according to the article in the paper after the meeting, July 12, it stated the ODFW finished a two year review of hunting regulations. Where was the public involvement on this? From being here my whole life I know you folks meet with the OSP game division I think yearly to discuss problems, simplifications, etc. Why not involve the public at this time? I think this is where many of the public feel left out and believe the decisions are already made and that the public meetings usually in the summer/fall before the Commission rules are just for show and have met the requirement of having a public meeting. I think a change in process is needed where by the public feels more involved in the ORIGINAL up front meetings with the actual biologists and OSP personnel. Why not have a public aspect/presence at this time before things are formalized and drawn up in a formal proposal change? I think you will have a much better public trust factor knowing they had a say in the original work up.

As an example of what I just said in paragraph two, I had a conversation with Officer Jason Stone,OSP, earlier this year on what the OSP/Stone proposed to you folks,ODFW, about the muzzleloader buck deer hunt at the end of November each year for the South Indigo unit. Jason and his various hunting partners hunt this almost every year. What I gathered from that conversation there was a meeting/conversation with OSP and ODFW personnel to put forth a change in the regulations for this particular hunt and likely for other changes in the hunting regulations. Why not, before a change is put in writing at this time, involve the public instead of weeks/months later? My input at that time would have been a flat no to combing the North Indigo and the South Indigo unit in one hunt and expanding the available tags.

I think I trump most of the people at the ODFW office and OSP personnel for having hunted and recreated in and around the Steamboat, Boulder Creek, Toketee, and Lemole area. I have seen the dramatic decline in our deer and elk populations primarily due to lack of managing our public timber lands (no logging and causing lack of habitat). Yes you may say there are plentiful deer and elk around but they are mainly now on private managed lands and in our lower elevations. Let's be honest, the South Indigo muzzleloader deer hunt is primarily a trophy hunt. Yes there are a few that hunt for just the meat alone but they are by far in the minority. The deer are in the rut and it is very common knowledge the trophy bucks will be running with the does.

By changing this to blend with the North Indigo hunt will only create more pressure in those areas that hold more deer and that is the Boulder Creek, Ilahec, Medicine Creek, and Lemolo 2 areas. We have hunted this area for years and these areas draw many of the 50+ tags for this special hunt. If you expand it to 150+ tags will only create more competition and strain on the limited amount of deer/trophy deer in this area. It will ruin this very limited special hunt for a trophy buck. You are only fooling yourself and ruining a very special hunt if you think those extra 100+ tags are going to likely hunt elsewhere in the unit. Why did you move our South Indigo hunt back to the latter part of November and let the North Indigo hunt around the middle of November? You know why. The OSP had hunters from North Indigo cheating and coming over into the South Indigo unit, ie upper Boulder Creek area.

I have talked to you about this over the years in moving the timing of the hunt back and still feel the OSP needs to do their job and moving our South Indigo trophy hunt back was the wrong decision. If we could have had public input at the time that decision was made with just the ODFW and OSP we may have come to a different outcome. This again is an example where the public was left out at the INITIAL discussion.

If you change the South Indigo hunt to combine with the North Indigo unit will ruin this hunt. Leave it alone. It is not simplifying a thing. You have the two hunts separated as to timing that you went to great lengths to change a few years back at the request of the OSP. Plus the deer numbers in the Boulder Creek, Steamboat, and Toketee areas, where a good share of the tag holders hunt, are considerably lower due to lack of deer due to no logging and poor forest management. You know this as well as anyone else and I believe you no longer do your deer counts in this area like you use to. In fact we very seldom see any to the ODFW personnel in these areas like we use to in past years when active logging was common. I think you and Jay Potter will agree that our deer and elk numbers on public lands (BLM and Forest Service) are down considerably. The common saying among us hunters, especially older ones, for the Cascade bull elk season in this area is "you are lucky if you see a fresh track nowadays". Your own elk surveys in this area prove this out and to get your numbers for the Indigo unit you have to look on lower private land where logging and management is common. That then gives you the numbers to justify a general hunt season drawing more revenue than having a special hunt with very limited tags due to the number of elk on public lands. Our numbers of elk on Forest Service land up the North Umpqua is a disaster and being allowed to perpetuate for money as you can justify numbers on private land that is off limits to the average hunter.

I have talked to you about establishing a rotation for the muzzleloader deer hunt whereby we give the South Indigo unit a break for a year or two so that what few deer we have in those "hot spots" like Boulder Creek can have the potential to establish a few more trophy size bucks instead of continually pounding the same unit over and over again. If we had better habitat by logging and forest management we could sustain and increase our deer numbers but you and I know this will not happen. We do not need to increase our number of tags for this hunt especially public Forest Service/BLM lands. The rotation of this hunt should seriously be considered with other adjacent or nearby hunts. What about rotating with North Indigo, Dixon, possible Evans units? This would allow relieving pressure just on one unit year after year where each of these units has seen decline in deer numbers on public lands.

And Tod please don't give the excuse you gave me about the one biologist that will not allow the Tiller deer herd to be hunted by such a hunt due to some special genes these deer have. I don't know what pull he/she has but it is time to address this issue. Hunting is a management tool and as long as the appropriate tags and enforcement are in place the public has a right to expect the ODFW to manage for the citizens of the state and not for one person or philosophy. I would like to know this person's real reason why a hunt of this nature can not occur. We as hunters for the many many years we have hunted the areas I have mentioned consider this Boulder Creek area having "special" genes as well yet we are not denied hunting this special hunt?

Further, it looks like you want to change to a visible antler for deer the same as Eastern Oregon. My individual input on this is no. We are divided by eastern and western Oregon tags and have to purchase accordingly. That does not involve simplification to me. Also, I think a forked antler on one side is ok and to me it allows those spikes to grow and mature to the next year. Those people that are interested in meat only have the opportunity in this area to apply for doe tags where appropriate and allowed. As to mistakes and shooting a spike, I think this is the exception and does not justify changing the regulation. The same thing can happen even if spikes are legal there is the potential that someone thought they saw an antler and turns out it was a doe. In summary, because we are so divided east and west and must purchase a tag accordingly I see no simplification whatsoever.

Finally, one comment on the elk numbers on public land and the general Cascade but elk season. We need a limited number of tags and would even like to see a three point or better on the harvest of elk for the general rifle season. Our numbers on Forest Service land (public land) are horrible and you know it. If we are meeting our bull to cow ratio for up the North Umpqua area it is only because of the lower elevation PRIVATE lands that for the most part are off limits to the average hunter. Correct me if I am wrong but I have not seen much if any landowner/ODFW cooperation for allowing the average hunter to hunt on the lower elevation private lands/ranches where most of our elk reside. Montana seems to have a successful program of such but I don't see it here in Oregon, especially on the west side.

Tod, while I was typing up this e-mail you returned my call and I did learn that the ODFW did put a notice in our local paper and sorry I did not see the notice. As you can see I am very passionate about this area and in particular both the hunting and fishing. I have grown up my entire life in this area from the time I could walk to working college summers at Toketee and Diamond lake for the Forest Service. I have seen what I call in my life time the best times and am now seeing some of the worst times and not looking to get better any time soon. These management decisions many times do not make sense and couple that with feeling that the public is not being heard/listened to does not sit well. I would like to see much better communication at the initial stages of these management discussions where you have the ODFW, OSP, and the public involved with the goal before any proposal is drawn up, to find common ground and arrive at a consensus. This to me done at the regional level with the three groups of stakeholders involved is a much better approach than having the Salem ODFW decide what is best for our area and having their regional staff blend it to match Salem's wishes. It is the top down backward shove it in your face approach and you wonder why people were quoted in our local paper say "it really doesn't, matter what I say they have already made up their minds". Tod please forward this on to the higher ups as well and would very much like to have an influence in this decision making before it is too late.

Fred Worsley
150 Akin Lane
Roseburg, Oregon 97471
Phone: 541-672-8307

Roxann B Borisch

Subject: FW: Unused Premium Tag Proposal

From: Kevin Madison <kevin.madison@tuality.org>

Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 11:20 AM

To: odfw.commission@state.or.us

Subject: Unused Premium Tag Proposal

I recently read in Staff Proposals documents that included ODFW Staff proposals for changes to the 2020 Big Game Regulations that in 2018 two Premium deer tags and four Premium elk tag went unsold. I propose there be a tag sale deadline of August 1st after which any unpurchased tags go to a person at the top of a waiting list. This would require perhaps 4 names being drawn in the initial draw in order to create the waiting list.

These Premium tags are truly special tags and it's a real shame to see them going unused. This proposal seems like it would be simple and inexpensive to install and ensure these tags don't go to waste in the future.

Sincerely,

Kevin Madison

Roxann B Borisch

From: Kelly Warren <kellywarren009@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 8:47 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us; AnneMary Myers; Shannon Hurn; Douglas Cottam
Subject: Comments from Public Meeting and for commission
Attachments: Final ODFW changes.pdf

Hi all

I was planning to attend the meeting next week but some things came up. Here are some thoughts of this years proposals. Thank you for the transparency and the public meetings.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Kelly Warren

To ODFW and ODFW Commission

I am writing to provide input on potential regulation simplification and proposed changes. Below are comments based on my background, experience in the field, hunting, and discussions with landowners, farmers, ranchers and other hunters in the state of Oregon.

Proposed simplification changes:

General archery elk: September 1st-30th. A streamline approach used by numerous western states. This would assist in hunters taking vacation from work as they would know the standard season. I have also heard that most hunters would prefer to hunt the rut which over the long term has seemingly been later in September and into early October.

Western Oregon Spike Buck Regulation:

I am very concerned by the proposal for ODFW to change the spike bag limit. Numerous hunters and I, that hunt blacktail in western Oregon have seen population and presence of blacktail deer impacted and decreasing for many years in certain regions. Liberalizing regulations to kill even more deer is not the answer when populations are diminished. While these are observations it is a drastic change from historical to present.

There are numerous things that are impacting blacktail populations, and it is ODFW's responsibility to manage healthy game populations for a balanced ecosystem and the people of Oregon.

Impacts to blacktail populations include:

- **Urbanization:** Deer escaping predators and having readily available food sources.
- **Hair loss:** While not in all areas it has wiped out significant populations in some areas.
- **Predators:** Over the last 10 years predators have increased substantially which .
- **Lack of habitat:** Farming and Timber management changes has impacted western Oregon habitat.

This regulation change is a significant risk that will take decades to reverse if there are negative impacts to populations due overharvest of spike deer. With already declining populations due to the factors described above; a conservative approach is more applicable for long term management, population management and sustainability for healthy populations and for future generations of hunters.

In the local meeting an issue identified was that those in favor of this based their perceptions on a single area that is doing well and not Western Oregon in its entirety. Additionally, it is appreciated that ODFW is doing case studies on this spike buck change. Well thought out data and reasoning will be important in implementing such a change. Of those people I have reached out to personally who are in the field nearly the entire western Oregon season, are associated with conservation hunting groups, and are dedicated to the future of Oregon's wildlife and future hunting; 14/15 people do not want to see this change. And most hunting conservation groups also do not want to see this change due to potential long-term impacts to blacktail deer populations.

General season Elk Damage Tag:

After the elk damage bills came out, I decided to reach out to many private landowners I know around the state. It seems these bills did not reflect most landowner/rancher perspectives and certainly not those on the west side of the state whom I discussed this with.

It seems that there has been a change in elk behavior and presence in eastern Oregon that are doing damage to crop fields, fences and farmland. Presence of elk has not been a huge issue until recently in many areas. So why are these elk changing their patterns?

There is no definitive conclusion but there are some educated guess' as to why this might be happening:

- **Predators:** It is well known that predator's presence is increasing and causing conflict with ungulates.
- **Habitat:** Availability of food sources. National forest service land is not providing the forage it once was for ungulates. Therefore, during harsh winter months they must go elsewhere to find food sources.

Of the farmers and ranchers, I talked to statewide it seems that many are satisfied or even happy with the current damage control program. Based on my conversations it seems that most farmers and ranchers and their issues and perceptions are not being represented. Those that want easier access to tags simply want to kill elk. Elk in our state are the peoples and should be treated as a valuable resource for all. ODFW's protection and sound management should come into play when farmers/ranchers want more elk to kill especially when these are units that are carefully managed. In many of the proposed reasons it is not justified to kill elk in the proposed amounts. For instance, Rocky Mountain Elk by nature are migratory. If they don't have the right food sources, they will migrate further to find suitable forage. Many of the critical units in eastern Oregon that are managed by the state have elk that are migrating into the proposed areas for the damage control hunt. Meaning critical populations of elk will be severely impacted by this proposed hunt. This means ODFW will also have to tighten restrictions on hunting in those units making long waits for the unit for hunters (currently 7-20 years) even longer. It also means ODFW will not acquire critical money from applications and tags from those units.

There should also be much greater consideration of lessons learned from previous tags that are private land only. An example (one of many) The current 615 tags used to be an every year tag in the late 90's early 2000's. Now they are about every 4 years and the vast majority are obtained by hunters who have no access to private lands. This causes significant impacts on:

- The hunt itself and the goals its attempting to accomplish.
- The hunters who do have private land access and don't draw tags for 3+ years.
- Hunter recruitment in areas that are closer to home and would be utilized.

My fear is that many of these tags would be wasted by those that believe they can get access. I have personally seen this with 615, 215 A-1 and 215 A-2 tags. Many of the landowners have people they trust and will allow to hunter their land (friends and family). There have been many issues over the years with people trespassing or people who do not treat the land they obtain permission on with respect which is why it is ONLY trusted individuals. Trespassing is going to be a major issue with this proposed hunt.

Another concern is that we are attempting to fix a problem that opens the doors for further liberalization of damage hunts down the road that may come forth in bills such as what was seen last year. ODFW's damage control program worked great and offered landowners many tools to assist with damage. And allowed more elk to be harvested than probably should in regions (as high as 50-100 per property in years past) and if those cows were pregnant at least 25% more. Right now, we are at a pivotal time with many wildlife changes in our state; wolves, increased predators, habitat degradation and more. It is pivotal that careful and conservative approaches are considered for big game management. This is not the current approach for either of the proposed Western Oregon Spike deer change and the Damage Cow General Season tag.

Potential Ideas to appease damage:

1. Much of the damage in eastern Oregon is elk infiltrating barns and eating hay. This is often times a small sum of damage and money and perhaps ODFW can use funds being saved by the online system, or the other money saving endeavors and allocate that money for damage. Other states have done studies on what an elk is worth to the people of the state and a bull elk is \$1000+ and a cow \$500+. Often the amount of damage is significantly under what an elk should be worth to the state or five elk if those five damage tags are allocated.
2. Continue current damage control program and with new commission take another year to look at potential strategies and elements for new program that represents the majority.
3. Damage should be viewed on a case by case basis unless it is in an elk exclusion zone. If the damage is minimal it should be paid out and tags should not be issued for harvest unless located in an exclusion zone.

I ask the commission and ODFW to take some additional time to analyze options, involve collaborative partners in discussions (conservation and hunting), and sort through these proposals accordingly before finalizing. These could have significant ramifications on blacktail deer, elk, hunters, famers, ranchers and the general public of Oregon.

Thank you for your consideration,

Kelly Warren

Roxann B Borisch

From: Paul Anderes <panderes@union-county.org>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2019 4:54 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us; Nick Myatt; Kevin Blakely; michelle.l.tate@state.or.us; Shannon Hurn; jeff.yankee@state.or.us; Jon Paustian; Nick Myatt
Cc: Rocky.dallum@tonkon.com
Subject: Proposed GSEDT



**UNION COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

*Donna Beverage, Commissioner
Paul Anderes, Commissioner
R. Matthew Scarfo, Commissioner*

Dear Chair Finley, Commissioners, Director Melcher,

1106 K Avenue La Grande, OR 97850 PHONE (541)963-1001 FAX (541)963-1079 TTY 1-800-735-1234

ODFW's statement; **Over the last few decades, elk populations in many areas have increased on private land adjacent to row crop or irrigated agricultural lands. This has led to increased social conflict and economic damage to private agricultural landowners as well as decreased hunter opportunity in many units.** Could not be truer.

The issue came to a head during the 2019 Oregon legislative session with multiple bills aimed at solving the problem. As you well know, some of these bills were passed, some were referred to ODFW to be resolved through O.R.S., and some did not make it through the legislative process. From my prospective, these legislative proposals were designed to provide private property owners relief from wildlife damage, specifically elk damage. I believe that most these efforts will provide ODFW with more options, more tools in the toolbox, to solve elk damage on private property.

I am in full support of the proposed **General Season Antlerless Elk Damage Tag.**

The proposed tag would allow hunters to work in unison with landowners to deal with elk that are causing damage to private property and keep the elk hazed away from private property. The proposal allows for hunters (with landowner permission) to cross property lines. I see this as an advantage over damage tags. This

proposal offers timely relief without taking too much of either ODFW staff or landowner time. The ability of hunters and private property owners to work together has the potential to be a win – win for all involved.

As I said in my testimony in front of the Oregon House Committee on natural Resources Elk are incredibly majestic animals. I truly believe that the proposed General Season Antlerless Elk Damage tag is a positive step in dealing with elk conflicts.

I encourage you to approve this innovative solution to elk damage.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Anderes, Union County Commissioner

Paul M. Anderes
Union County Commissioner
1106 K. Ave
La Grande, OR 97850
panderes@union-county.org
541-963-1001



Roxann B Borisch

From: Dale Webb <ikesays@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 11:30 PM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Subject: Big game recommendations.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing you today in regards to the recommendation to include spike bucks in the general season bag limit for Black-tailed deer. As you are probably well aware of, this idea has been battled for several decades. You are also aware that our Black-tailed deer populations have declined greatly over the decades, with the proof being the harvest stats. I do not believe that adding spike antlered bucks to the legal bag limit will help this situation at all and will most likely be detrimental to the overall populations.

The Starkey Experimental Forest project has pointed out in our elk herds that older aged class bulls are necessary to good herd health, I believe the same is true with deer. I believe that one of the reasons for our Black-tailed deer herds declines is that we have actually been over harvesting Black-tailed deer bucks leading to poorer fawn crops and survival. The proof of this over harvest is actually confirmed by ODF&W's own survival studies as analyzed by Kavyn A. Groot in his Master Thesis paper in 2015. It can be seen in the analysis that there are significant drops in buck age class representation once they become legal for harvest. Making spikes legal for harvest will accelerate this decline in age class.

Recently research has created a stir in that it is showing significantly more bucks on the landscape through DNA analysis than on spot light surveys. I too was first struck by this claim of 55 bucks per 100 Does. It doesn't take long though to understand that a significant amount of these bucks are fawns of that year (15-20 per hundred Does), many yearlings of that year (many are not legal for harvest) and then adult bucks that escape harvest. I have helped on the spot light surveys over the years and it has to be recognized that small spike bucks at distance are either misclassified or listed as unknowns which would result in an under count bias. Fawn bucks are not counted, they are classified as fawns. Once this is fully understood the 55 bucks per 100 Does discovery is not so remarkable at all. We must also recognize that buck ratio's don't equate to lots of deer. Once again the harvest stats are the single biggest and most accurate survey of your Black-tailed deer herds that you will ever have. Black-tailed deer buck harvest is near the all time lows and hunter success is low also. This is not a hunter issue, it is a landscape population issue, which may very well be driven by low fawn survival (as has been recently shown by research). This low fawn survival may be driven by low adult buck survival.

In closing I must note that both recent Master Thesis papers analyzing deer survival using ODF&W radio collared deer (both Mule and Black-tailed deer) conducted by Elizabeth M. Mulligan and Kevyn A. Groot have suggested that over harvest of males may be an additive mortality factor and leading to herd declines.

I strongly oppose the spike general season Black-tailed deer bag limit recommendation.

Sincerely yours,
Dale E. Webb

Roxann B Borisch

From: ODFW Commission
Subject: FW: Crossbow

From: Bryce Honer <bryceahoner@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 1:46 PM
To: odfw.info@state.or.us
Subject: Crossbow

Lots of residents want a crossbow season!

We could make it easy and just combine it with muzzleloader season since the two are on equal footing.

Can we make this happen?

Bryce Honer

Roxann B Borisch

From: Jones Excavating <jonesexcavating@frontier.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 12:31 PM
To: ODFW.Commission@state.or.us
Subject: Change of Hunt in Wallowa County

Sept. 09,2019

Terry Jones
P.O. Box 87
Lostine, OR 97857

O.D.F.W.

As a landowner in both the Minam unit and the Sled Springs unit I have some serious concerns about the proposed changes for the Whiskey Creek cow elk hunt and the Alder Slope cow elk hunt. Changing these hunts to a four month general season hunt is not acceptable. This will create a nightmare for private landowners like myself. I will be subject to repeated requests from hunters I do not know and from trespassers who do not bother to ask for permission. There is no public land in these areas, it is all private.

The current hunts along with damage hunts if needed allows me to control what happens on my property. As I see your proposal this will put a very big burden not only on me but also on all other private land owners in this area. There appears to be no limit on the number of tags that can be sold for this new general season, therefore no management on the elk population.

I am opposed to this proposal and hope that ODFW will reconsider changing these hunts!

Respectfully,
Terry Jones
Landowner

Roxann B Borisch

From: Brian Ray <bray@nheri.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 1:29 AM
To: odfw.commission@state.or.us
Cc: Ray Bri
Subject: Proposed changes to 261A1 and 261A2, Clear Lake-Deadhorse hunts for 2020

Dear Commissioners,

Re: the proposed changes to 261A1 and 261A2, Clear Lake-Deadhorse hunts

***would you be so kind as to confirm receipt of this e-mail?

I think that this change is unadvisable, but if you are going to change it to have only one 261A Clear Lake-Deadhorse hunt then this proposed change is better than eliminating the later 261A2 (December).

I would like to attend the meeting in Gold Beach but I cannot due to my schedule, therefore I am writing you. Here is a little context before my comments and reasoning. I have a B.S. in biology from the University of Puget Sound, and M.S. in zoology from Ohio University, and a Ph.D. in science education from Oregon State University. I have "loved animals" since I was a child. I did not begin hunting and seeing many, many places in Oregon until I was in my early 40s; now I am in my early 60s. I have hunted all over Oregon. I have been really enjoying hunting northeast Oregon during the past 10 years.

Here is why I think you should leave both 261A hunts as is:

1. The two hunts have been effective in moving around the overly dense elk on these grazing lands.
2. Although I am from Salem, I have developed a positive relationship with a rancher/landowner in the area and he tells me that the two hunts have been effective at meeting the ODFW's and his objectives.
3. I am working to develop a good relationship with at least one more rancher/landowner in the area.
4. The local ODFW biologist says the hunts have been effective.
5. They have been effective at moving the elk more into the canyons.
6. It has helped in making the plant/grass life healthier.
7. Having both hunts available gives hunters more opportunities, with differing weather conditions and therefore with differing "adventures."
8. I do not think ranchers/landowners have complained about having 2 hunts.
9. If having two hunts means more overall tags, this should be more revenue for Oregon.

10. If having two hunts means more overall tags, this is more hunting for more hunters.

Here is why I agree with your proposed change (keep 261A2, December) and eliminate 261A1 (November), as you have proposed, if you think you must eliminate one:

1. The 261A2 (December) has been effective at dispersing the elk.
2. 261A2 has been effective at helping the plant/grass be healthier.
3. The rancher/landowner tells me 261A2 has been effective.
4. The biologist says 261A2 has been effective.
5. More elk are living in denser conditions in the Clear Lake-Deadhorse area during December than earlier in the year, and therefore dispersion is more needed.
6. The later 261A2 in December, due to more winter-like weather conditions than the A1, offers a wonderful and different hunting adventure than the earlier A1. This serves more hunters better. Other earlier elk hunts exist for those who want to hunt in October and November.
7. The later 261A2 in December, due to more extreme winter-like weather conditions than the A1, offers a great and more challenging hunting adventure than the earlier A1, and this is something that many of us hunters from the Willamette Valley cherish. It gives us thrills and joy to be able to hunt in some more extreme weather and experience things in the outdoors, with the flora and fauna, that we almost never get to experience. This serves more hunters better.

Please e-mail or call me if you would like to discuss this more.

Thank you for listening and considering my thoughts!

Sincerely,

Brian

Brian D. Ray, Ph.D.
Salem, Oregon
5030364-1490.