

IX. FISH & WILDLIFE

General Fish & Wildlife Statement 9.005

1 The state fish and wildlife laws and rules must be built on a sound
2 basis that recognizes the general benefit of business and encourages
3 individual enterprise. (07)

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODF&W) 9.010

1 ODF&W is encouraged to cooperate with private landowners.
2 Landowners are recognized as full and equal partners in resource
3 management policies that are adopted by resource agencies.

4 We are opposed to ODF&W having the authority to require a private
5 landowner to adopt a wildlife management plan in exchange for the
6 approval of a building permit. (04), (08)

Fish Hatcheries 9.030

1 We believe that the State's fish hatchery program is an important
2 and necessary tool in the process of recovering and protecting our
3 region's salmon and steelhead. Sound hatchery management will have a
4 more positive than negative effect on our region's fish.

5 Excess fish returning to hatcheries should be used in a manner that
6 helps with the State's efforts to protect our fish populations or provides
7 recreational opportunities for Oregonians.

8 Excess fish should be used to support the hatch box programs,
9 introduce fish to waters without populations or allowed to spawn naturally
10 in the water they have returned to.

11 Excess salmon should not be killed other than for egg and spawn
12 harvest or for scientific purposes. (00), (09)

Elk Production and Sales 9.040

1 We support the raising and selling of domestic privately owned elk,
2 deer and buffalo and the products resulting from the production of such
3 animals, except in cases where the USDA/APHIS, Oregon Fish &
4 Wildlife, or Oregon Department of Agriculture have issued an
5 import/export moratorium. (00), (02), (08)

Game Animal Transplanting 9.050

1 A moratorium should be instituted on the transporting and
2 transplanting of big game animals until new guidelines can be
3 established from an impact study by representatives of the livestock
4 industry, the U.S. Forestry Service, the Oregon Department of Fish and
5 Wildlife, and the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

6 We support requiring health inspections on all game and non-game
7 wildlife, including avian species moved interstate or intrastate, including
8 movements by state or federal agencies.

9 The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife should be required to
10 meet the interstate health laws for domestic livestock and the
11 introduction or reintroduction of game animals should not reduce the
12 allotted Animal Unit Months (AUMs) for private livestock producers that
13 use public lands.

Domestic Sheep

9.075

1 All sheep (ovine) privately owned and in production should be
2 classified as domestic and private property and accorded full protection
3 in accordance with the law, except in cases where USDA/APHIS has
4 issued an import permit stating a different classification.

Game Animal Numbers

9.100

1 We believe that large game animals, predators, and other wildlife
2 numbers are the result of rules or management objectives adopted by
3 the Fish and Wildlife Commission and that when damage is done to
4 farms due to of the large numbers of game animals, predators, and other
5 wildlife the land owner should be compensated with funds derived from
6 the sale of game tags or by allocation of a portion of limited permits of
7 big game species tags to affected landowners. (09)

Hunting and Fishing License Cost

9.110

1 Hunting and fishing licenses be at a price that all can afford to buy
2 them.

3 We support allocation of sufficient General Fund dollars to the
4 Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife so that the department is not
5 overly reliant on hunting and fishing fees to fund their management
6 program. (15)

Closure of Hunting Season

9.120

1 State or Federal Wildlife departments should not be allowed to close
2 an entire hunting season on game animals or birds because of a
3 subspecies' low population when natural processes are the predominate
4 cause for the loss of the subspecies. (04)

Wildlife Refuges

9.130

1 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be required to plant or
2 maintain adequate acreage of crops suitable for winter feed for wildlife
3 on all National Wildlife Refuges.

4 Any water used should be obtained without adversely impacting
5 historical uses of or creating a precedent for water.

6 We propose that the funds from the Pittman Roberts Act be used to
7 seed refuges for the feeding of the wildlife and waterfowl. (04)

Goose Depredation Plan 9.140

1 In order to implement an effective plan to reduce the amount of
2 damage done to agricultural products by geese, all five six of the
3 following points must be put into effect:

- 4 1. The goose population must be reduced so that there are fewer
5 geese on agricultural land.
- 6 2. Take maximum advantage of statewide hunting opportunities of
7 geese. We must maintain hunting at a level that will allow
8 effective hazing of geese on agricultural lands.
- 9 3. Refuges should be farmed to grow crops that will attract and
10 feed the waterfowl population and must be maintained at
11 optimum levels to attract geese away from agricultural land.
- 12 4. Stable funding must be provided to USDA/APHIS Wildlife
13 Services to help alleviate damage cause by geese.
- 14 5. There should be a compensation program that reimburses
15 producers for lost crop yields. (03), (04), (09)
- 16 6. Non-migrating/resident geese should be exempt from the
17 Migratory Bird Treaty Act. (10), (Referred to AFBF, 10)

18
19 We support the increased hunting of resident geese by adding an
20 additional hunting season. (05), (07), (09), (10)

21 We recommend to ODF&W to begin the Goose Hunting Season in
22 the fall when the birds start arriving no later than the opening day of
23 Duck Season which is around the middle of October. Hunting shall be
24 allowed everyday during hunting season. **(15)**

25 Oregon and Federal Fish & Wildlife design a landowner preference
26 tag program similar to the one for deer and/or elk that can be used by
27 farmers and ranchers throughout the state.

Predator Management 9.200

1 Predator management must be an essential part of an overall wildlife
2 management program to maintain a reasonable compatibility with other
3 wildlife, to reduce livestock losses, and for the public interest, health and
4 welfare including control of rabies and other diseases that may be
5 transmitted to humans.

6 Property owners should be allowed to haze or take action to
7 eliminate predators before they cause damage.

8 The keeping of recognized breeds of Livestock Guardian Dogs that
9 are used specifically for predator management is an acceptable farm
10 practice. Livestock Guardian dogs should be officially included in statute
11 as a farm animal.

12 We support the use of leg holding traps, snares and livestock-
13 protection collars as a necessary means of predator and rodent control.

14 We support the supervised use of chemical toxicant as part of a
15 management program and request that research be conducted to find
16 additional new methods for control. Financing for research should
17 include appropriations from the federal government, state general fund,
18 game fund and counties.

19 We support an amendment to the rodent control law to authorize
20 county governments to establish rodent or predator control districts. (05)

21 It is at the animal owner's discretion if they want to have any
22 additional health care exams or treatments when they only want to have
23 vaccinations given to their animals. (15)

Cougar Hunting

9.205

1 We support the use of dogs to assist in controlling cougar numbers
2 where a perceived threat to livestock or humans occurs. (03)

Animal Damage Control

9.210

1 We recognize that certain management programs are being
2 conducted to reduce wildlife depredation of crops. We request legislation
3 requiring the established authority charged with the control of wildlife,
4 including endangered species, find some effective way to avoid this
5 damage, or provide depredation permits or reimburse farmers who suffer
6 losses from wildlife depredation of crops.

7 We oppose elk wildlife overlay zones in land use planning. When
8 wildlife overlay zones are designated, a management plan involving the
9 landowners, neighboring landowners and producers that are impacted by
10 the overlay zone will be developed with the wildlife management
11 agencies whether state or federal or both to manage the wildlife in that
12 zone.

13 We support the law allowing farmers or ranchers who experience
14 damage to their property by wildlife, the right to obtain a permit in order
15 to control the offending wildlife.

16 The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODF&W) should be
17 required to return to the traditional rule of requiring a minimum of 40
18 acres for land owner preference tags throughout the state and to refrain
19 from making rules which violate the constitutional rights of a portion of
20 the citizens of the State of Oregon.

21 We encourage and support efforts to meet with the Oregon Fish and
22 Wildlife Commission for control and management of big game animals.

23 The landowner should be supplied with a complete list of
24 unsuccessful hunters and a predetermined number of permits. When
25 there is crop damage and after the local ODF&W office approves the
26 hunt, the landowner or his representative should be able to contact the
27 number of hunters needed to control the wildlife. When a hunter is
28 successful in taking the wildlife causing the depredation, the hunter can
29 take the permit and animal head to the local commission office for
30 verification and payment of additional fees.

31 Private landowners should be allowed to designate preferred non-
32 family persons to obtain landowner preference tags to be used on the
33 landowner's property.

34 People who live and/or work in their prescribed local hunting unit
35 should receive first preference upon ODF&W issuance of hunting tags
36 before those individuals who do not live and/or work in their prescribed
37 local hunting unit.

38 The U.S. Department of Agriculture should maintain control of the
39 Animal Damage Control (ADC) Program.

40 The state or federal government should reimburse farmers and
41 private property owners for damage to crops and livestock caused by
42 wildlife, whether the wildlife is endangered or controlled by government
43 agencies.

44 United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oregon Department
45 of Fish and Wildlife should be held responsible for the damages done by
46 species they regulate.

47 When publically funded, USDA Wildlife Services equipment
48 (traps, snares, large bear/ cougar traps etc.) are properly set to
49 remove dangerous/ damage causing animals and are vandalized,
50 damaged or destroyed, the state shall prosecute those
51 responsible or act to protect both public and private interests. (15)

Animal Unit Months Allocation Ratio and Game Numbers 9.230

1 We support a program to establish game herd numbers and a
2 reasonable animal unit month allocation ratios which does not damage
3 private or public rangelands. (04)

Wolf Hybrid Registration 9.250

1 We support legislation to require the registration of all canine with
2 wolf blood, either raised in Oregon or brought into the state, and to
3 require such animals to be tattooed for permanent identification.

4 If a canine with wolf blood is caught by a trapper or shot by a hunter,
5 the trapper or hunter should not be in violation of the Endangered
6 Species Act. (07)

Gray Wolf 9.255

1 We support the removal of Gray Wolf from the Oregon Endangered
2 Species list and we oppose any efforts by the Oregon Department of
3 Fish & Wildlife Commission to create a Gray Wolf recovery plan.

4 However, as party to the wolf conservation & management plan, we
5 support a wolf control management plan to facilitate the federal and state
6 delisting of the Gray Wolf. Within 12 months of when criteria is met, the
7 state should honor its agreement to delist the Gray Wolf statewide.

8 Additionally, any plan should include the opportunity to compensate
9 livestock owners for economic losses from wolves and should allow
10 livestock owners the ability to take wolves on public lands and private
11 property that are a threat to humans and/or domestic livestock.

12 We support allowing the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to
13 manage wolves in Oregon using lethal and other methods. (04), (05),
14 (07)

**Policy No. 9.260, Oregon Wolf Management Plan, was combined
with 9.255 (07)**

Trap Lines 9.275

1 All traps and snares set or used for the taking of furbearing
2 mammals or non-game mammals unprotected by law or the Department
3 of Fish and Wildlife regulations shall be inspected not less than every 48
4 hours, and all trapped animals removed. This regulation should not apply
5 to the taking of predatory animals.

Special Designation 9.300

1 We oppose any policy that requires protected areas on private land
2 and forbids any farming and/or forest operation in such area. (04)

Horse and Burro Management 9.350

1 We support repeal of the Federal Wild Horse and Burro Act. We
2 support the repeal of the Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. Further, all
3 public land agencies with horses and burros, be they wild, feral or
4 abandoned domestic, on their districts should be required to maintain
5 herd numbers no greater than set forward in their most recent
6 management objectives. (09), (Referred to AFBF, 09)

7 If wild horses and burros are found to be contributing or causing
8 rangeland health standards to be exceeded within Bureau of Land
9 Management/Forest Service grazing allotments and wild horse and burro
10 populations exceed applicable management objectives, the Bureau of
11 Land Management/Forest Service should be required to reduce herd
12 levels to management objectives before it may require any changes to
13 livestock grazing management. (15)

Feral Pigs 9.375

1 We oppose the importation of feral pigs into Oregon for the purpose
2 of stocking hunting ranches and we support the eradication of existing
3 stocks of feral pigs. (06), (07)

Endangered Species Act 9.400

1 We support a regional approach to achieving sustainable native fish
2 stocks in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Plans of action must be
3 socially, scientifically and economically verifiable in order to be effective

4 and implemental. All planning must be sensitive to management
5 practices initiated by irrigated agriculture that is intended to protect fish
6 habitat. We support reform of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to
7 prevent creation of incentives to sue and recover attorney's fees on
8 issues that the federal government and communities are working to
9 address. We support a prohibition on citizen suits to enforce the
10 Endangered Species Act when the federal government or communities
11 are actively working to meet their obligations under the Endangered
12 Species Act. We also support limitations on the entities that can recover
13 fees under the Endangered Species Act, including limitations related to
14 the value of the assets of non-profit organizations who seek attorney
15 fees under the act and a cap on the amount of fees and hourly rate an
16 entity may receive. We also support the creation of legislation that
17 requires those seeking attorneys' fees to win on each claim prior to being
18 able to recover any funds for any lawsuit. We also support the creation
19 of legislation that requires individuals or groups to post a bond if their
20 lawsuit will have an effect on producers. We support continuing to keep
21 pressure on agencies and the DOJ regarding misuse of ESA citizen suit
22 provisions. (16) (Referred to AFBF 16). Cost effectiveness of
23 implementation of plans is essential to obtain long term positive results.
24 Local participation in the planning process is equally essential.

25 We support the protection of any sea going threatened or
26 endangered fish species by enforcing a 200 mile limit on any foreign
27 fishing vessel.

28 The national and Oregon Endangered Species Act should be
29 amended to provide that:

- 30 1. Listing a species as endangered shall be upon an endangered
31 basis alone, and not on the basis of "rarity";
- 32 2. Encroachment upon economic agricultural or silvicultural
33 practices should be prohibited;
- 34 3. Proof of species endangerment should be upon the petitioner or
35 the Department of Fish and Wildlife and not on the general
36 public;
- 37 4. A person proposing an animal or plant's designation as an
38 endangered species should be required to post a bond for
39 damages incurred by a land owner if the species is subsequently
40 not found to be endangered;
- 41 5. The state and federal government should be strictly liable for any
42 and all injuries or damages to property caused by, or in any way,
43 arising out of the allocation or re-establishment of an
44 endangered species, especially carnivores such as wolves and
45 bears;
- 46 6. Before the Endangered Species Act may be used to enjoin any
47 public or private activity, the party seeking the injunction should
48 post a bond with the court in the amount of three times the

- 49 estimated damages that may result to the enjoined person or
50 entity from the issuance of such injunction.
- 51 7. Scientific data supporting the inclusion of a species should
52 receive wide dissemination to landowners and private
53 organizations which represent the rights of landowners;
- 54 8. Where there is a conflict, human need for food and energy
55 should have priority over the protection of endangered species;
- 56 9. Endangered species should be taken or removed from private
57 lands if it is causing damage to private property, or if payment of
58 compensation for the damage is not allowed by the state or
59 federal government;
- 60 10. If endangered species are transplanted into other areas by the
61 Department of the Interior or Oregon Department of Fish and
62 Wildlife, that the act does not provide endangered species
63 protection or prohibit insect control in the area of transplanting;
- 64 11. In an area where an endangered species has not been sighted
65 for two years, the area should be withdrawn as a designated
66 habitat;
- 67 12. An economic impact study should be required of all actions taken
68 under the Act that would perpetuate the existence of an
69 endangered species;
- 70 13. Any agency, organization or person requesting a rare or
71 endangered species classification to be placed on species or
72 requests a critical habitat designation should be required to:
- 73 a) Provide and fund an environmental impact report with
74 emphasis on the economic impact of the action;
- 75 b) Conduct a DNA analysis on the proposed species to be
76 introduced to ensure that it is qualified as a unique,
77 genetically pure species.
- 78 14. Before a fine is levied against a landowner for causing the death
79 of an endangered species animal a scientific necropsy (to be
80 paid for by the fining agency) should be conducted by an
81 independent lab or fish biologist to determine the exact cause of
82 death. Written results of the findings should be made available to
83 the alleged violator. Inconclusive or suggestive results should not
84 be used as a basis for fines.
- 85 15. Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act should not be applied
86 to federal insurance programs, such as the National Flood
87 Insurance Program and crop insurance programs. The
88 Endangered Species Act should be amended to expressly not
89 apply to federal insurance programs and those programs should
90 be made non-discretionary for purposes of the Endangered
91 Species Act. (16) (Referred to AFBF 16)
- 92

93 We oppose label restrictions on essential agricultural pesticides for
94 the protection of endangered species when such restrictions jeopardize
95 agricultural production.

96 Until effective and economically affordable alternative chemicals or
97 methods of control are approved and are available for use; label
98 restrictions under the proposed plan are premature and should be
99 withdrawn.

100 We oppose the introduction or reintroduction of endangered species,
101 wolves and bears on public and private lands or the spread of these
102 animals outside of experimental population areas. We encourage
103 counties to develop ordinances that would prohibit such activities. In
104 addition, animals and their subsequent offspring from experimental
105 programs should not be classified as endangered when they escape the
106 experimental area. We support laws that would make it legal to take said
107 species that have wandered onto private lands.

108 We support the right of landowners to protect themselves, their
109 families, livestock and properties from all predators including bears,
110 mountain lions, wolves and those listed on the Endangered Species Act.

111 We support a program of landowner/operator compensation for
112 protection given the endangered species.

113 Because a threatened or endangered species is deemed to be of
114 social value, no single industry or facet of society should be called upon
115 to bear a disproportionate share of the responsibility or cost of recovery.
116 (03), (05)

117 Any artificial reintroduction of anadromous fish stocks into state
118 waterways, previously stopped by hydro and irrigation dams should be
119 defined as artificial fish stocks and not considered endangered. (07), (09)

Removal of Species from Threatened and/or Endangered List 9.410

1 We petition the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife and the
2 Oregon Department of Forestry and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to
3 remove the spotted owl from the threatened species list.

4 Efforts should be made to expedite the process of removing a
5 species from either or both the federal or state threatened or endangered
6 species list(s) when it is scientifically warranted. (09)

Marine Mammal Protection Act 9.450

1 We support amending the Marine Mammal Protection Act to allow
2 easier use of lethal control measures on seals and sea lions deemed
3 detrimental to protected fish species. Marine Mammal Protection Act
4 should not apply to fresh water in the Western states. (11), (Referred to
5 AFBF, 11)

Grazing Fee Formula **9.500**

1 We support retaining the present federal grazing fee formula, which
2 is tied to cattle prices and other factors. We do not oppose reasonable
3 grazing fee increases calculated within the formula.
4 Research of other types of grazing fee programs should be
5 continued as an appropriate option for the benefit of the grazing industry.
6 Any alternative to the Public Rangeland Improvement Act (PRIA) formula
7 must consider all factors affecting a permit holder's ability to use the
8 resource.
9 We encourage the establishment of a grazing fee formula on the
10 basis of economics and scientific principles for federal lands. We oppose
11 an administrative approach to reform federal land management without
12 congressional approval. We support the continuation of permit holder
13 advisory groups with the possible addition of two local members from the
14 general public in the affected areas.

Grazing Permit Applications **9.510**

1 A federal or state land management agency should respond with an
2 affirmative or negative answer within 30 days after a grazing permit
3 application is filed. If a successful applicant suffers economic loss due to
4 delays on the part of a federal or state agency, the federal or state
5 agency should be held financially liable.

Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative **9.520**

1 We endorse the national Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative for
2 private grazing lands and recommend that the American Farm Bureau
3 Federation also endorse the initiative. (05)

Range Improvement **9.530**

1 We support appropriating sufficient funds to implement the Range
2 Improvement Act. We support government agencies' efforts to increase
3 range productivity.
4 We recognize the value of prescribed burning as a tool of forest
5 (woodlands) and range management. (05)

Weed and Brush Control **9.600**

1 We support aggressive legislation and management that will result in
2 more effective noxious weed and brush control.
3 State and local weed enforcement rules should be enforced.
4 We recommend public financing for control of priority noxious weeds
5 as determined by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.
6 We support research by the State of Oregon and/or Oregon State
7 University and chemical companies for biological and chemical control of
8 declared noxious weeds. The control of all noxious weeds should be

9 mandatory for each individual or government agency holding land within
10 the state.

11 It should be the physical and financial responsibility of the holders or
12 owners of confiscated and foreclosed property to maintain adequate
13 weed control and levels of activity to prevent reversion to non-managed
14 classification for wetland delineation.

15 However, we favor the ability of operator/landowners to commercially
16 cultivate and harvest plants normally considered to be noxious weeds.
17 Such persons should be responsible for containment of the plants. If the
18 plant is an "A" Class weed, the operator/landowners must work with the
19 local and/or state weed board. At the point when such commercial
20 cultivation ceases, the landowner should be financially responsible for
21 the eradication of the noxious weed on such land.

22 Weed and brush control provisions should be extended to artificially
23 created wetlands.

24 If the state of Oregon grants an easement across state lands, the
25 grantee shall maintain a noxious weed abatement program (along with a
26 performance bond) for noxious weeds within the easement as defined by
27 the Oregon Department of Agriculture and the County Weed Board,
28 where the easement resides.

29 All state and county road right-of-ways must be managed to prevent
30 the spread of weeds that cause economic problems for agriculture.

31 Before the state, a county, and/or a municipality purchases any
32 additional land, money must be budgeted and designated to maintain in
33 perpetuity the acquired land free of weeds that can move off site. (07),
34 (09)

35 Any federal or state entity who funds a conservation program near
36 agriculture lands will be required to ensure that the land enrolled in the
37 conservation program has noxious weed control program ensuring that
38 weeds do not spread onto privately owned farm or ranch land.

39 We support rules that would require the use of only Oregon
40 Department of Agriculture Certified Weed Free Forage on all state lands,
41 including forests and parks.

42 An adequate percentage of gas tax be dedicated to road right of way
43 noxious weed control. (15)

Wild Bird Seed

9.605

1 Wild bird seed should not contain noxious weed seeds, unless the
2 seed is sterilized. Sterilization should be verified through germination
3 testing by the Oregon Department of Agriculture.

No Spray Signs

9.610

1 When a landowner places a "NO SPRAY" sign on a road or right of
2 way, the landowner should be responsible for controlling the weeds and
3 brush or for the damage they cause.

1

1 Crop Pollinators

9.615

2 We support and encourage the scientific community including
3 Oregon State University search for solutions to Pollinator Population
4 decline. We recognize the general benefit to agriculture of a healthy
5 pollinator population. We encourage all farms to enhance pollinator
6 habitat.

Fencing

9.700

1 We support legislation to require cooperative cost sharing on fencing
2 or the value thereof of a legal fence between adjoining land owners and
3 between land owners and federal or state land only when necessary for
4 control of livestock in an open range that becomes a closed range
5 livestock district. Fencing required because of a change to a closed
6 range livestock district, should be funded and maintained by the
7 enforcing government agenda.