

# RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Wolf Working Group Members (WWG) and WDFW Staff  
**FROM:** Paul De Morgan and Rob Williams, RESOLVE  
**SUBJECT:** Action Items from the May 9-10 Meeting #2 – Final Version  
**DATE:** June 7, 2007

This memo includes action items agreed to during the May 9-10 meeting, a list of future meeting dates, and a brief summary of WWG discussions for your information.

Please note that action items may include some tasks applicable to all WWG members. Please review the action item list for tasks assigned to you and/or the Working Group in general (highlighted in yellow), and let us know if we missed any action items or if you have questions.

Upcoming Meeting	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
WWG Meeting #3	Thurs-Fri, July 12-13 <i>Ellensburg, WA</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of initial drafts of Ch. 3, Conservation and Ch. 4, Livestock Conflicts</li> <li>• Initial discussion of Ch. 5, Ungulate Interactions</li> <li>• Presentation and initial discussion of issues related to Ch. 6, Interaction with other Species and Ch. 7, Human Interactions</li> </ul>
WWG Meeting #4	Thurs-Fri, Sept. 13-14 <i>Ellensburg, WA</i>	

### I. ACTION ITEMS

Task	Who	Completed by
1. <u>Action Items Memo</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribute draft memo for review</li> <li>• Provide edits/comments on Action Items Memo to RESOLVE</li> </ul>	RESOLVE WWG Members	Wednesday, May 15 Wednesday, May 23

Task	Who	Completed by
2. <u>Discussion Topics and Schedule</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise Discussion Topics and Schedule document and distribute to WWG</li> </ul>	RESOLVE	Wednesday, May 15
3. <u>Operating Principles</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribute agreed-upon operating principles to WWG</li> </ul>	RESOLVE	Wednesday, May 15
4. <u>PowerPoint Presentations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribute PowerPoint presentations made by speakers at May meeting to WWG members (likely as handouts)</li> </ul>	WDFW	Friday, May 25
5. <u>Credentials of Technical Advisors</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide Curriculum Vitae for members of Technical Advisors Group to WWG</li> </ul>	WDFW	Friday, May 25
6. <u>Cost of Wolf Specialist</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide cost estimate info to WWG for a wolf specialist to respond to incidents and investigate</li> </ul>	WDFW	Friday, May 25
7. <u>Hard Copy Packet Distribution</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mail complete packet of information to Daryl Asmussen</li> </ul>	WDFW	Friday, May 25 (and ongoing)
8. <u>Chapter 1 and Chapter 2</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide comments or redline strikeouts on Ch. 1 and Ch. 2 to WDFW</li> </ul>	All WWG members	Friday, May 25
9. <u>Draft Plan</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide initial draft of Ch. 3 and Ch. 4 of Wolf Management Plan to WWG members based on initial discussion</li> <li>Provide initial thoughts/language regarding Ch. 6 and Ch. 7</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Remove "DRAFT" watermark or insert in outline format to make more legible when printed</p>	WDFW  WDFW	Friday, June 8  Wednesday, June 27

Task	Who	Completed by
10. <u>Map of Washington</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bring large map of Washington for reference in future WWG meetings</li> </ul>	WDFW	At July 12-13 meeting
11. <u>Website</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update website as necessary</li> </ul>	WDFW	Ongoing
12. <u>Definition of Extirpation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include definition of extirpation in Glossary section of Plan</li> </ul>	WDFW	December 6

## II. OVERVIEW OF DISCUSSIONS

### A. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Harriet Allen, WDFW Endangered & Threatened Species Section Manager, welcomed the members to the Wolf Working Group (WWG) meeting and thanked participants on behalf of WDFW for their involvement. She then introduced the facilitator, Paul De Morgan of RESOLVE who initiated a round of introductions (for a list of attendees see attachment A below).

The focus of the meeting was described as building a common platform of understanding for WWG members to use during development of Wolf Management Plan recommendations. Mr. De Morgan reviewed the meeting groundrules and the following issues were noted:

- Desire for WWG members to receive materials with more time for review in advance of meetings.
- Ensure participants who do not have email access are receiving materials via snail mail.
- An exception to the agenda was made to allow for one participant to provide public comment since he was not able to remain until the public comment period at the end of the meeting (comments are captured in the Public Comment section towards end of document).

#### *Discussion Topics and Schedule*

The *Discussion Topics and Schedule* document originally indicated draft versions of Chapter 3, Wolf Conservation and Chapter 4, Wolf-Livestock Conflicts would be available for discussion at the second WWG meeting; however, WDFW indicated that upon reflection, WWG discussion of the issues would help better inform development of a first draft. Revisions to the *Discussion Topics and Schedule* document were proposed and agreed-upon as follows:

#### Meeting #3

- Discussion of initial draft of Chapters 3 and 4
- Initial discussion regarding Chapter 5

Meeting #4

- Discussion of initial draft of Chapter 5
- Discussion of initial draft of Chapters 12 and 13 (if possible)
- Review of revised Chapter 3 moved to Meeting #5

Meeting #5

- Review of revised Chapter 3

WDFW indicated these changes should not affect the overall schedule.

## **B. Draft Operating Principles**

The WWG reviewed and accepted redline changes made to the draft *Operation Principles* document based on the February 28 – March 1 meeting. The group then agreed to the following definition of consensus, "...members can live with the recommendation or decision." The group also inserted language in Section VIII. Schedule, to indicate WDFW will share proposed changes based on the peer review process with WWG members in advance of distributing the draft plan to the public.

## **C. Legal Review**

Presentation: Sheila Lynch, WA Attorney General

Sheila Lynch from the Washington State Attorney General's office provided general information and background on legal issues to inform WWG discussion. She indicated that state agencies do not have the ability to take actions unless authorized by the state legislature through Washington Administrative Code (WAC). The Fish and Wildlife Commission is the body that adopts rules and regulations for WDFW through authorizing statute RCW 77.12.020 and implementation authority for listing, delisting, and downlisting of endangered, threatened, and sensitive species is detailed in WAC 232-12-297 (included in meeting packet). Discussion covered the following:

- The determination of species extinction is covered in federal law, not state law
- Species listing determination is made by biological population status
- The Commission can make other rules to address public health or economic concerns
- The state can have different management areas and delist species, but does not have authority to delist sub-populations
- Recovery plans for endangered or threatened species, or management plans for sensitive species must include the following:
  - Criteria for reclassification;
  - Implementation plan for reaching population objectives;
  - Public education needs; and
  - Species monitoring plan.
- Current law is not explicit on the definition of malicious actions
- Wolf hybrids were excluded from recent "dangerous wildlife" legislative distinction

*One public comment statement was taken at this point and described below in L. Public Comment.*

**D. Wolf Biology and Ecology**

Presentation: Curt Mack, Wolf Biologist, Nez Perce Tribe

Curt Mack provided baseline information about wolves to help inform WWG management implication discussion. He indicated the wolf has the largest distribution of any known land mammal, is a “habitat generalist” concerned more with abundance of prey than habitat considerations, and prefers open areas to run down prey, hence evidence of predation is generally more visible than for other predators. As territorial animals their population expands in geographic representation but not density and though wolves can travel up to 500 miles their dispersal is usual around 50-60 miles. In Idaho the density is 1 wolf to 63 square miles, but the rate of population growth experienced in Idaho is not expected in Washington due to the lower percentage of contiguous public land. They are pack animals and though pack size is dynamic it generally stabilizes at 8 animals.

Mr. Mack summarized the main management considerations from his presentation as follows:

- Wolves need to be managed on a large scale
- Wolves are habitat generalists with wide dispersal capabilities and large territories
- Wolves will colonize a variety of landscapes both private and public
- Wolf management is a social not a biological challenge
- Wolves should be managed to reduce conflict
- Long-term population levels will be determined by the social not biological carrying capacity (e.g., Idaho can probably support a 1000+ wolves, but the public will never tolerate that)
- Management challenges include addressing:
  - Wolf – ungulate conflicts
  - Wolf – livestock conflicts
  - Public expectations
- Management framework should be adaptive, based on science and include public involvement
  - This holds for implementation as well
  - Politics, fear and emotion often play dominant roles in management of wolves, therefore it is important to have a mechanism or process to bring in the science and bring in the most and best information possible

**E. Introduction to Wolf Conservation: Using the Oregon Experience**

Presentation: Mark Henjum, USFS (retired ODFW)

The State of Oregon recently completed development of a Wolf Management plan. During that time Mark Henjum worked with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and was integral to the plan development. Mr. Henjum provided background on Oregon’s process, highlighted lessons learned and suggested that Oregon’s plan development could serve as a model for Washington because both are states without established wolf populations but are preparing for their eventual arrival. He predicted that Washington will be “overwhelmed” when the first collared wolf shows up in the state and suggested that outreach and town hall meetings can help reduce the emotional response. He also referenced the management implications of the following quotation from *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology and Conservation*, Edited by L. David Mech and Luigi Boitani:

There cannot be a single recipe for wolf conservation that can be applied in all ecological and social contexts. Rather, there are several diverse solutions depending on the needs of both humans and wolves at the local level.

The Oregon wolf management plan ended up dividing the state into a western and eastern management zone with a conservation population objective of 4 breeding pairs for 3 consecutive years and a management population objective of 7 breeding pairs for 3 consecutive years. Mr. Henjum summarized the following key discussion topics from Oregon's plan development:

- How many wolves?
  - Consider scientific literature
  - Consult wolf experts
  - Set realistic population goals
  - Breeding pairs or packs
  - Remember Idaho recovery goal 10 breeding pairs is in the best habitat in North America
  - Examples of small wolf populations
- Where?
  - Many uncertainties
  - Where is "suitable" habitat located
  - Habitat modeling – did not do any in Oregon - reference "Places for Wolves" by Defenders of Wildlife that provides estimates for numbers of wolves different areas can support – these types numbers can create problematic expectations
  - Establishment of wolf populations dependant on success of dispersing individuals
  - Timeframe – could be decades – this is not the last word now, we do not have to do it all right now
- Conflicts
  - Acknowledge wolf-livestock problems
  - Pet concerns - rare but public concern
  - Human safety – rare but public concern
  - Non-lethal techniques – recommend first in early stages when building towards meeting delisting criteria, tough go early with more flexibility later
  - Phased approach in OR provides flexibility – do not tie hands of biologists

## **F. Section III – Wolf Conservation**

Harriet Allen provided a brief overview of WDFW current thinking. She indicated it was likely the Department would use Oregon's approach of phases but with some differences given the need to move from endangered to threatened before delisting. The overall goal would be to establish a stable population to allow for delisting, therefore target numbers would be needed for the endangered to threatened, threatened to delisted phases. Ms. Allen also indicated that one objective was likely for the state with more conservative management once the wolf was delisted. The following flipchart notes were taken during WWG discussion.

### Flipchart Notes from Conservation Discussion

- Determination of "range" being considered – not just one area?
- Work from definition of endangered and then develop plan with goal to delist
- What is designation of wolf after threatened?

- Big game / non-big game
- Create clarity on habitat requirements
- Look to other states dealing with wolf management issues that have small populations (e.g., Colorado, Utah, Michigan, Montana)
  - Concern about Oregon as model because it is theoretical with no experience actively managing wolves
- Distinct Management Zones?
  - Are there three zones?
  - If delisted statewide, how do you deal with zones where there are no wolves?
- Statewide recovery goal (as opposed to regional goal) would give more flexibility more quickly
- Who pays?
  - Society's responsibility
  - Compensation (ongoing?)
- Key concerns:
  - Suitable habitat
  - Adequate numbers
  - Range
- Goal – get to delisting of wolf ASAP through use of a range of management tools

**G. Introduction to Wolf Interactions with Livestock and Other Domestic Animals and Chapter 4 – Wolf-Livestock Interactions (Management)**

Presentation: Rick Williamson, Wildlife Services, Idaho

Presentation: Carter Niemeyer (retired USFWS and Wildlife Services, Idaho)

Presentation: Donny Martorello, WDFW

Rick Williamson provided a PowerPoint presentation concerning depredation issues and Carter Niemeyer offered additional thoughts. They characterized conflict management as the ‘nuts and bolts’ of wolf management. Though they indicated depredations losses by wolves were not a large percentage of loss incurred by producers and that other species (e.g., mountain lions) may have a greater effect, they did indicate that wolves can create financial expenses other than just predated animals (e.g., weight loss of other animals, hiring additional hands for protection). They talked about the importance of holding town meetings to educate producers and others regarding steps to take to limit predation and what to do in the case of depredation to make the cause of death determination more successful. They also indicated that there is time to establish a plan for wolves in the State of Washington and from their perspective based on years of experience, wolves ‘do not have to be a big deal’ if a management plan is created properly.

Mr. Williamson provided the following wolf depredation numbers for the State of Idaho:

<u>Sheep</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>
Probable	12	35	30 (124 missing?)
Confirmed	157	148	182
<u>Cows</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>
Probable	0	6	10
Confirmed	17	18	23

Donny Martorello provided a handout with an overview of livestock depredation issues as a possible draft outline for Chapter 4, Wolf-Livestock Conflicts. The overview provided an issues statement, objective, phased approach (3 phases), and the following potential tools:

- 1) Provide livestock owners with locations of collared wolves
- 2) Non-contact harassment by livestock owners
- 3) Non-lethal contact harassment by state/fed
- 4) Non-lethal contact harassment by livestock owners
- 5) Relocation
- 6) Provide compensation for confirmed livestock losses
- 7) Provide compensation for unconfirmed livestock losses that are above historic levels
- 8) Identify wolf conservation areas versus wolf management areas
- 9) Lethal take by state/fed
- 10) Lethal take by livestock owner
- 11) Population management/control

Mr. Martorello had WWG members complete an exercise before lunch where they checked boxes indicating which potential tools would be acceptable for use during which of the proposed management phases. The survey results can be found in Attachment B.

Mr. Martorello indicated he would take this input results as one piece of information along with the ensuing discussion (captured in flipchart notes below) to inform the drafting of Chapter 4, Wolf-Livestock Conflicts for further discussion.

#### Flipchart Notes from Interaction / Management Issues Discussion

- Staffing for wolf specialist in State of Washington
  - What are costs?
  - What is availability – provided by department or state?
- How deal with problem wolves? Kill or relocate?
  - Look at options, but costs and bad press from problem wolves can be very high
  - Relocation of a problem wolf generally creates a problem elsewhere
- Non-lethal techniques
  - Use first if possible
  - Ongoing research and continued development of new tools, examples include:
    - Radio activated guard boxes (radio-collars)
    - Fladry
    - Turbo (electrified) fladry
- Issues with non-lethal techniques
  - Habituation – over time wolves will get used to techniques if not changed
  - Size – fladry has been used on a 40 acre parcel
  - Cost
- Human reaction/tolerance
- Every new community, county, or state that encounters a wolf requires a new outreach and education approach
- Need to focus on how to help those landowners affected by wolves
- Relocation issue – How best use tool for success?

- Use relocation before wolves are a problem
- Reach agreement on where wolves are wanted or can be located
- Problem of people at the 'other end' of the relocation
- Problem – will wolves stay where relocated
- Soft vs. hard release
- Long memories
- Tracking
  - Use of radio collars to track packs and share with landowners
  - Provide mechanism for landowners to get information and provide information on pack movement and issues
- Landowner challenges:
  - Hire more range riders
  - Run more dogs (with sheep especially)
  - Cattle weight loss
  - Depredation – big issue but there are many other issues such as those listed above
  - Multiple requirements (wolves and other species)
  - Pressure/Changes in allotments
- Compensation
  - Compensation is generally done for the value of the animal lost but not future potential
  - Use of Net Present Value (NPV) to make compensation calculations
  - Remember landowners can be supportive but need assistance so they do not bear burden of all costs
- Landowner actions/options
  - Change breeding/calving times
  - Work with land management agencies to coordinate/change allotments based on wolf pack movement
  - Use cameras as a low cost monitoring option

#### *Management Tools*

- Provide producers with receivers
- Relocation
  - Only if pre-predation
  - Consider relocation intent issues
    - Move if caught in trap
    - Move to reestablish in particular management area
    - Move into areas where likely to populate on their own
- Zoning
- Habitat analysis

## **H. Habitat Modeling**

Harriet Allen presented the results of a habitat model in its first iteration based on the research work “Habitat Selection by Recolonizing Wolves in the Northern Rocky Mountains of the United States” by John K. Oakleaf, et al. She stressed that wolves are notorious for locating wherever they want, the model is in its first iteration, and it may be a useful tool to begin the discussion of where wolves are likely to locate. The model included the following parameters:

<u>Model parameters</u>	<u>Wolf Probability of Use</u>
Increasing forest cover	Positive
Increasing Elk density	Positive
Human density	Negative
Increasing Sheep Density	Negative

Participants suggested running the model with additional layers such as, deer population, possibility of dispersal from Canada or Idaho, ungulate winter feeding ranges, adjacent wolf populations, grazing lot assignments, and public/private land ownership. It was noted that this model may serve as a surrogate for suitable habitat to help determine the right number of wolves for Washington. One member also suggested that habitat in the Olympics should not be considered because wolves were not likely to establish themselves in that location on their own and moving wolves to this region would be analogous to a reintroduction which is costly.

## **I. Discussion of Chapter 1 - Introduction**

Note: All page-line numbers reference the printed version distributed at meeting.

- Need for clarification on sideboards – in addition to not “no wolves” and “no reintroduction,” incorporate the idea of “full recovery to historic levels is not an option” and the idea of “needing to achieve a sustainable population” as context in the next version
- Pg. 1 - Line 29-31 – State not included in recovery area but wolf was listed in state (clarify)
- Pg. 1 - Line 32 – strike “at that time”
- Pg. 1 - Line 41 – ask landowners to take actions to not injure animal, even no action is action
- Pg. 2 - Line 22 – goal of plan – suggest removing “all” from all citizens of the state

The preceding comments were made during the meeting. WWG members were requested to provide additional comment (and/or redline strikeout) to WDFW by Friday, May 25.

## **J. Discussion of Chapter 2 - Background**

- Consider using tables in some places instead of text to make data more easily accessible
- Consider including predation to livestock issues (such as in Idaho plan), possible in the end of the background section
- Pg. 1 - Line 22-31 – not just Washington numbers (clarify)
- Pg. 12 - Line 37 to Pg. 13 – Line 18 – provide more information about other reasons why wolves went from present to virtually extirpated

The preceding comments were made during the meeting. WWG member we requested to provide additional comment (and/or redline strikeout) to WDFW by Friday, May 25.

## **K. Next Steps**

Madonna Luers, WDFW, informed WWG members that public scoping meetings related to the development of the wolf management plan will happen in late July. She indicated there while there

will likely be publicity regarding the scoping meetings prior to the next WWG meeting, they will not be held until after the July WWG meeting. Data from the scoping meetings will be discussed during the September WWG meetings as appropriate.

## **L. Public Comment**

Jim Davis – Conservation Partnership Center – Mr. Davis indicated he has worked for 5 years on social/economic implication of grizzly bear management which is similar to wolf management. He commended the commission for starting the WWG process and urged participants to not get bogged down dealing with problems but to focus on the broad picture of management that includes positive aspects wolves can bring to the state. He indicated, for example, the reintroduction of wolves in Yellowstone National Park have helped bring elk populations to a more natural, desirable habitat usage in the highlands. He also indicated that a survey of public perception related to grizzly bears revealed 79% of the rural population supported recovery of the bear, and suggested that there was likely a similar high level of support for the wolf. He encouraged undertaking a public perspective survey of the wolf in Washington and reiterated the importance of a broad perspective.

*Mr. Davis did not submit written comment at the meeting.*

Jane Titland – MRNP Associates – Ms. Titland encouraged WWG members to not allow anticipated management costs to deter development of best management practices for grey wolves.

*Ms. Titland submitted written comment at the meeting.*

## **M. Parking Lot – Ideas for Future Consideration**

The following issues were identified during the meeting and will be addressed as the WWG moves forward:

- Consider adding a “definitions” section
  - Definition of malicious
- Implementation – what will be the WWG involvement after plan development? Ongoing “advisory group” role?
- Further discussion of conservation/recovery language
- Development of compensation program
  
- Legal Issues to Address:
  - What “in the act” options do property owners have?
  - Idea of different management areas within the state
  - Critical Habitat Rule – clarification of how SEPA requirements overlay with the Wolf Management Plan especially regarding implications for habitat designations/restrictions
  - Definition of extirpation

**Attachment A**  
**May 9-10 WWG Meeting Attendees**  
(Based on attendance sign-in sheets)

**WWG Members in Attendance:**

- Daryl Asmussen
- John Blankenship
- Duane Cocking
- Jeff Dawson
- Paula J. Del Giudice
- Jack Field
- George Halekas
- Kim Holt
- Derrick Knowles
- Colleen McShane
- Hon. Ken Oliver
- Tommy Petrie, Jr
- Gerry Ring Erickson
- John Stuhlmiller
- Arthur Swannack
- Greta M Wiegand
- Georg Ziegeltrum

**WWG Members Not in Attendance:**

- Bob Tuck

**WDFW Project Staff and RESOLVE Staff in Attendance:**

- Harriet Allen
- Rocky Beach
- Paul De Morgan
- Madonna Luers
- Donny Martorello
- Jerry Nelson
- Nicole Ricketts
- Gary Wiles
- Rob Williams

**Other Individuals in Attendance:**

- Jim Davis
- Jennifer Evans
- Bill Gaines
- Mark Henjum
- Sheila Lynch
- Curt Mack
- Jasmine Minbashian
- Carter Neimeyer
- Anthony Novack
- Mark Neutzmann
- Jim Stephensen
- Jane Titland
- Arlen Washine
- Rick Williamson

**Attachment B**  
**Potential Management Tools – Survey Results**

<b>LIVESTOCK DEPREDAATION TOOL</b>	<i>Phase</i>		
	<b>Endangered</b>	<b>Threatened</b>	<b>Delisted</b>
Provide livestock owners with locations of collared wolves:	100%	100%	100%
Non-contact harassment by livestock owners:	94%	88%	88%
Non-lethal contact harassment by state/fed:	94%	88%	88%
Non-lethal contact harassment by livestock owners:	88%	88%	88%
Relocation:	53%	53%	35%
Provide compensation for confirmed livestock losses:	100%	100%	88%
Provide compensation for unconfirmed livestock losses that are above historic levels:	71%	88%	88%
Identify wolf conservation areas versus wolf management areas:	41%	47%	59%
Lethal take by state/fed:	77%	100%	88%
Lethal take by livestock owner:	53%	77%	94%
Population management/control:	41%	71%	100%

Note: percentages determined by dividing gross number by 17 WWG participants who submitted input.