

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wolf Working Group Members (WWG) and WDFW Staff
FROM: Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
SUBJECT: Action Items from the October 29-30 Meeting #5 – FINAL
DATE: November 28, 2007

This memo includes action items agreed to during the October 29-30 meeting, a list of future meeting dates, and flipchart notes of WWG discussions for your information.

Please review the action item list for tasks assigned to you and/or the Working Group in general (highlighted in yellow). After reviewing the memo, please let us know if we missed any action items and/or if you identify any omissions or changes to more accurately capture the conversations.

Upcoming Meetings	When and Where	Suggested Agenda Items
WWG Meeting #6	Thu-Fri, Dec 6-7 <i>Ellensburg, WA</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 3 and 4 package components Other chapters as time permits WDFW direction to the WWG
WWG Meeting #7	Dates, TBD <i>Location, TBD</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization of recommendations

I. ACTION ITEMS

Action Items Memo	Who	Completed by
1. Distribute draft Action Items memo for review	RESOLVE	Monday, Nov. 12
2. Provide edits/comments on Action Items Memo to RESOLVE	WWG members	Monday, Nov. 26
3. Finalize and distribute final memo to WWG and WDFW	RESOLVE	Friday, Nov. 30

Chapters 3 & 4 – Caucuses and <i>Group of Four</i> Meetings	Who	Completed by
4. Read the subgroup revised drafts!	WWG members	ASAP
5. Provide Factors and Options Matrix to WWG members for use in caucus discussions	RESOLVE	Completed
6. Attempt to contact George Z. regarding participation in caucus	RESOLVE	Completed
7. Schedule conference call of the conservation and producers caucuses	RESOLVE	Completed
8. Schedule call/meeting of the cross-caucus <i>Group of Four</i>	RESOLVE	ASAP
9. Caucus conference calls	Big Room caucus and Dance Hall caucus	On or before Wednesday, Nov. 14
10. <i>Group of Four</i> conference call	Derrick, Duane, George H., and Jack	On or before Tuesday, Nov. 20

Chapter 5 – Comments	Who	Completed by
11. Submit additional comments on Chapter 5	WWG Members	Friday, November 30
12. Consider subgroup to increase specificity	John Blankenship	Wednesday, Dec. 5
13. Provide information related to ungulates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elk herds – reasons for not achieving population objectives • Recent data on ungulate mortality due to vehicles 	WDFW	Prior to Meeting #7
14. Incorporate changes to Chapter 5	WDFW	Meeting #7

Miscellaneous	Who	Completed by
15. Invite Director to attend next WWG meeting	WDFW	Completed

16. Share Director's letter to Commission with WWG members	WDFW	Wednesday, Dec. 6
17. Schedule 7 th meeting of WWG	RESOLVE	ASAP
18. Contact agencies to assess impacts on multi-use mandates of Wolf Plan	Harriet Allen	2 weeks in advance of Meeting #7 (date TBD)
19. Talk to Bob, Paula, John (regarding attendance)	RESOLVE	Wednesday, Dec. 5
20. Consider revisions to Operating Principles to propose to WWG	RESOLVE	Before next WWG meeting

Ongoing	Who	Completed by
21. Update website as necessary	WDFW	Wednesday, Dec. 5
22. <u>Hard Copy Packet Distribution</u> – Mail information to Daryl Asmussen and Jeff Dawson	WDFW and RESOLVE	Ongoing
23. <u>Map of Washington</u> – Bring large map of Washington for reference in future WWG meetings	WDFW	All future meetings

II. PARKING LOT FOR ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE DRAFT PLAN

[Originally developed at September 13-14, 2007 meeting; not updated at October 29-30 meeting]

- Provide general data of location of grazing permits or locations where there are no allocations
- State Sensitive/Managed Big Game – Provide clarification on the distinction between state sensitive and managed big game (management implications)
- Forest Practices Act Clarification – Provide further clarification on rule for protection of denning sites (Class IV Special designation) including reference to appropriate legislation and review periods
- Clarifications on Conflict Issues – Provide clarification on the following:
 - What is 'chronic' wolf depredation (pg. 6)
 - Will the Department support a statutory change for wolf take when 'caught in the act?'
 - What are the implications of a guard dog killing a wolf
- Hybrid Issues – assess feasibility of new saliva sample technology determining depredation by wolf or hybrid

III. OVERVIEW OF DISCUSSIONS

Day 1 – October 29, 2007

A. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Harriet Allen, WDFW, welcomed the members to the Wolf Working Group (WWG) meeting and thanked participants on behalf of WDFW for their involvement. The facilitator reviewed the meeting objectives, agenda, and materials.

WDFW had several updates for the group, including:

- WDFW informed the group that the final deadline for the plan had been extended from June 2008 to December 2008. The purpose of the extension was to allow a more reasonable time for peer review, public review, and response to comments received during review.
- WDFW noted that while efforts so far had been focused on plan drafting, the group had also been asked to provide clarification if consensus could not be reached. The Department also would have to identify alternatives and develop a NEPA-like analysis.
- The WDFW Director will be sending an update letter to the Commission describing these two issues (and the WWG will be copied on the letter).

B. Addressing Tribal Issues Associated with the Wolf Management Plan

Nate Pamplin, WDFW Tribal Liaison, provided an overview of Tribal issues related to the Plan. He described the source and nature of tribal fish and wildlife rights including on- and off-reservation hunting rights reserved by treaty and noted that the tribes were nevertheless subject to ESA restrictions. He explained that the Department was working with the tribes as part of the inter-agency wolf committee. The group emphasized that it will be important to work with the tribes to ensure effective implementation of the wolf plan, and the Department indicated its commitment to doing so. In response to questions from the group the Department noted that it would expect that the tribes would participate in any compensation program established by the plan (although current deer/elk damage program do not include tribal lands).

C. Introduction to Conservation/Recovery Objectives Subgroup Results Introduction to Management Options Subgroup Results Introduction to Compensation Subgroup Results

At the outset of the discussion of these subgroups results, the group heard a presentation on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) from Teresa Eturaspe, WDFW SEPA Coordinator. She explained how the SEPA process would apply to the Wolf Plan including:

- The need to identify a clear statement of purpose and need
- The need to identify several alternatives including the preferred alternative, a no action alternative, and other non-preferred alternatives
- The required public process including scoping meetings (already held), a draft EIS, comment period, and a final EIS

In response to questions from the group, the Department noted that a socio-economic impact analysis is not required by SEPA. WDFW noted that any consensus reached by this group would

likely constitute the selected “preferred alternative” for SEPA purposes. The department would be responsible for developing the other elements required by SEPA. The SEPA documents would cover the Wolf Plan at the policy level – more specific future actions with independent significance taken pursuant to the Plan (e.g., a specific translocation proposal) would likely require a supplemental EIS.

With respect to the role of the Commission and the Director of WDFW, the Department noted that for the Wolf Plan, the Director is the final decision maker, not the Commission, although the Department will work with the Commission and the Commission will have the opportunity to review the Plan.

The group expressed its interest in having the Director attend the next WWG meeting to clarify in person the respective roles of the Department and the Commission and to reaffirm his expectations of this group (beyond noting that neither historic populations nor zero wolves were acceptable alternatives). There was some discussion about having the next meeting in Olympia to facilitate the Director’s participation, but that was problematic for some members. The group also emphasized the need to share the Director’s upcoming letter to the Commission with WWG members. It was noted also that there may be a need to revise the WWG operating principles to accurately reflect group mission.

Following the SEPA discussion, the group heard a presentation on the work of the recovery/conservation subgroup. There was not complete consensus among the group but the majority of the group did move toward a compromise. For those that agreed, it appeared that conservation interests accepted reduced recovery goals while producer interests accepted translocation as a management tool. From this point on, the group engaged in a wide ranging discussion of interests and concerns related to recovery goals and management options, including compensation. The discussion included brief introductions to the work of the Management Options and Compensation subgroups as well, but the discussion of these interrelated issues continued. The discussion included the following observations:

- Recovery targets specified in breeding pairs (BPs) does not clearly reflect the much larger number of wolves associated with one BP
- Some members would prefer a delisting goal of 7-8 BPs rather than the compromise suggested (12 BPs) or the original proposal (15 BPs), while other members suggested a willingness to accept higher numbers if post listing status and management options will enable effective control of wolves that impact livestock producers
- Some members noted that the point is to get the wolf delisted and keep it delisted (so that more management options can be used) and that adequate numbers will be needed to achieve that outcome
- Members discussed striking a balance between protection against depredation (an expanded management toolbox while progressing toward delisting) and ensuring recovery (adequate recovery goals for down- and de-listing) – including the tradeoffs between management options and translocation
- Management options could include non-lethal injurious deterrence in some circumstances (e.g., stalking animals)
- Management options could also include a homestead protection provision allowing the take of wolves attacking homestead animals (pets, and maybe other close-in livestock) within a

- certain perimeter (e.g., 100 yards) – although some members preferred that the provision allow take of wolves attacking any domestic animal anywhere on private property
- Translocation was recognized as a tool to help get wolves away from areas of conflict (e.g., Eastern Washington) and into desired habitat areas (e.g., Cascades)
 - Members noted the cost of monitoring for more BPs and that monitoring costs might decrease after delisting because the Department could then monitor packs instead of BPs
 - Ungulates
 - There are concerns about wolf impacts on deer/elk herds and hunter opportunity
 - Compensation
 - Bailey Find compensation is only available while wolves are federally listed
 - Need to address post de-listing compensation
 - Various sources of funding for compensation (general funds, special taxes or fees, or third party funding) each raise various issues
 - Some members expressed the concern that funding not be solely the burden of the sporting community through taxes, license fees, and tags and that the cost of wolf recovery should be shared by all members of the public, while other members questioned the use of public dollars
 - Compensation could be provided for all or part of several different types of loss:
 - Confirmed or probable losses – least controversial
 - Undocumented losses – more problematic
 - Measured decrease in productivity even without mortality (e.g., lack of weight gain during grazing periods) – more difficult to measure
 - Unusable forage (areas leased for grazing but unusable due to wolf activity)
 - Some members discussed phasing out compensation (or certain types of compensation) over a period of time
 - One proposal suggested seeking legislative funding to be split between compensation and research on tools to further peaceful coexistence with wolves
 - Some members had concerns with ensuring the adequacy of compensation over time

Day 2 – October 30, 2007

D. Chapter 5 – Wolf-Ungulate Interactions

Jerry Nelson, WDFW, gave the group an overview of wolf/ungulate issues and the draft of Chapter 5. After fielding questions about herd status and the maps provided, the Department was asked if it could state or determine how many wolves that state could support on an ungulates-only basis without doing damage to the herds. The Department could not provide a specific answer, but acknowledged that wolves will have a cost in terms of deer and elk. The Department highlighted the relative significance of different elements of the annual elk harvest (e.g., 59% to hunters, 15% to poachers, 2% to predators). It was noted that any potential increase in predation loss by wolves perhaps could be more than offset by improving management to reduce other unwanted sources of harvest (e.g., poaching). (It was noted that anecdotal evidence suggested that road mortality might be higher than currently reported, and the Department noted that an updated study was being completed.) There was additional discussion about the economic importance of elk/deer hunting and the potential impact of wolves, especially in areas where the herds are already challenged and potentially more susceptible to a negative impact by incoming wolves. Again there were concerns

about the Department's ability (resources) to undertake new management activities related to ungulates (for the benefit of wolves).

E. Chapter 9 – Information and Education

Although all the members of the public at the scoping meetings were supportive of increasing public information on returning wolves, many participants recognized that finding adequate resources for the task would be a significant challenge. Some members felt that the information shared with the public needed to be “balanced” and were interested in a suggestion that there be a multi-stakeholder subgroup that would look at the content of Department public information and develop more specifics. Members also had suggestions for getting materials into the hands of rangers in potentially affected areas including information on what to do (how to act) if someone crosses paths with a wolf. Other members indicated field education programs have been very successful for other issues

**F. Chapter 10 – Evaluation and Reporting
Chapter 11 – Research and Information Management**

There was very brief discussion on these two draft chapters. Members did note that an effort should be made now to look for incoming wolves before the plan is complete. The Border Patrol was mentioned as a possible source of information.

G. Chapters 8, 12 and 13 – Introduction and Discussion

The group received a very brief orientation to these chapters – still in the very early stage of development.

Chapter 8 – Land Management. The group discussed the potential impact of the Wolf Plan on other state agencies. The Department was requested to provide information on how each agency with a multi-use mandate would be impacted by wolves and the Plan.

Chapter 12 – Timeline and Budget Estimates for Implementation. It was suggested that the Department break out those tasks that it must do regardless of whether additional resources are provided by the legislature. Other actions should be prioritized for funding purposes – perhaps grouped in tiers depending on the funding received. It was suggested (but without the belief that it would be likely to happen) that the tribes be asked to support the efforts outlined in the Plan. Some members were concerned that the Department would have to use all its available resources to support mandated management/recovery activities and that producers would come up short when compensation was needed for depredation losses. An alternative suggestion was to tie the number of BPs sought to the available funding – less funding would mean a lower number for delisting – but the Department suggested that there was no way to calculate the cost per BP and that their mandate was to ensure “recovery.” The Department acknowledged that it would have to communicate to the legislature that resources would be needed for (1) recovery, (2) monitoring, and (3) conflict management – that all three elements were essential. That message will be more strongly heard if it is coming from all of those involved in the WWG.

Chapter 13 – Economic Considerations. Members noted the importance of this chapter and made various suggestions including looking at the potential economic benefits of wolves (from wildlife watching, eventual hunting, etc.) as well as assessing the costs such as loss of livestock, pets or

working animals, adverse impacts on hunting, and impacts on land values. Outfitters were suggested as a possible additional source of data.

H. Revisit Key Elements of Chapters 3 and 4

At this time the group resumed its discussion of the tradeoffs among recovery efforts and management options. Members tried to exchange information about their most essential interests.

They discussed what tools could be provided to livestock producers to make them comfortable with returning wolves including the ability to defend against wolves like they can with coyotes – the ability to defend their property and security in a timely manner. (The Department noted that an expedited permit decision for a take could be processed in as little as 2-3 days.) Some members recognized a goal of trying to get producer impacts as close to zero as possible with a combination of tools and compensation.

Similarly, other members noted that they wanted assurance of a sustainable population to return a significant predator/carnivore to its very important role in the ecosystem. Ecosystems need wolves to resume proper function and balance.

There was a concern that lawsuits would delay the process when it was time for the state to delist – thereby allowing wolf numbers (and impacts on livestock) to increase before more management tools can be employed. But others noted that the purpose of this group was to find an agreement that would not be subject to litigation because it was supported by all the interests as represented in the WWG. WWG can help make the ultimate Plan more resilient or resistant to attack.

There was a strong sense that no one wanted the hunter/sportsmen community to bear the costs of wolf management alone (as with the license fees that support most of WDFW's other wildlife management activities). There was also an interest by some members in clumping some of the ecoregions together to create a simplified and more understandable set of regions.

Translocation was again identified as a tool to assist in reducing conflict (by moving wolves to desirable areas as quickly as possible until delisting is possible) and in achieving recovery. For example, the Department could limit wolves in the eastern part of the state (e.g., Blue Mountains) until translocation of eastern wolves fills up the Cascade region up to the desired de-listing level. An even quicker path to recovery would be to import wolves from Idaho, but that is not salable to everyone's constituencies and it is not within the Department's sideboards for this process.

At this point there was a break while representatives of the various interests around the table took some time to caucus. After the caucus it was decided that two separate caucuses (conservation interests and livestock/hunting interests) would meet individually (by phone) to think through the various tradeoffs and options. Then a group of four individuals (two from each caucus) would meet (along with the facilitator) to try to come up with a package of recovery goals and conflict management tools that everyone could live with as a unified plan.

I. Public Comment and Adjournment

After an opportunity for public comments, the meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 PM.

IV. FLIPCHART NOTES

Issues

- Tribal involvement
 - Acknowledge
 - Recognize will need to consult and may require adjustments
 - Peer review process
 - Highlight need
- Director's "Vision" – (re: process, Commission role, etc.)
 - Attend next meeting
 - In Olympia? (Tommy, Jeff, Daryl have concerns about traveling that far)
 - Letter – share with WWG
 - Operating Principles – consider revisions to propose to WWG

Recovery Objectives

- Option: 8/15
- Option: 6/12 – tied to translocation and ecoregions
- Issue: Post de-listing category
 - Managed big game
 - Predator
- Issue: Impacts on ungulates in future
- Interest: Sufficient funding to monitor wolves so don't have lots more wolves on the ground
- Issue: Dealing with "top" numbers
- Issue: How many wolves per breeding pair
- Issue: What about wolves in "non-included" regions (e.g., Columbia Plateau)

Management Options

- Issue: 4.5 – should allow landowner to take on private land
- Issue: 4.6 – 100 yards? – might be too small
- Interest: Buy in – maybe make it an animal specific option (i.e., family pets) on private lands
- Issue: TWO interests – sustainable population and buy-in to get there

Compensation

- Issue: Funding source
 - Justification for public \$
- Issue: "Phase out" provision
- Issue: Undocumented loss
 - Define/identify "wolf activity areas" and allow producers to document (verified) normal loss and actual loss
- Issue: Documented changes in livestock use/production on range
 - Producers through range plans establish baselines and assess at end of year
- Possible funding for undocumented losses – conservation groups
- Funding – Bailey – yes, but need public funding
 - Significant concerns with any public funding

- Proposal: Go to legislature, get \$ and split between compensation (once fed delisted and with a sunset provision TBD) and development of sustainable methods for living with wolves

Information and Education

- Short term:
 - On-the-ground conversations with landowners
 - Public meetings in affected communities before plan comes out (publicize well)
 - More specificity now
- Long Term:
 - Balance
 - Multi-stakeholder involvement
- Consider subgroup to increase specificity

Moving Pieces

- Recovery Objectives
- Distribution Goals (Ecoregions)
- Management Options
- Translocation
- Compensation
- Future Status
- Management by Ecoregion
- Other

Interests and Ideas

- Interest: Long-term, sustainable population of wolves able to withstand disease, etc.
- Idea: Consider managing eastern 1/3 (one fed. Delisted) differently – changes to sub-region approach
- Question: What management tool package would make the livestock industry able to live with wolves in state
- Idea/Interest: Manage ungulates for hunters
- Interest/Package: Hunting/take of wolves opportunity
- Interest: translocation in place
- Interest: Low hassle to get access to tools
- Package: In the act
- Interest: Sense of Security, flexibility
- Interest: Not getting one area “hit” too hard
- Concern: Transient wolves
- Interest: [blank]
- Issue: Hunting not way to manage wolves
- Interest: Stay in business
- Rationale: in general for wolves – predator/carnivore in the ecosystem again – has significant ecological benefits
- Interest: Burden on State as a whole

- Implies don't put compensation on hunting tags
- Interest: Dealing with unconfirmed loss and/or insufficient weight gain
- Package: Compensation funded-by/supported-by State
- Concern: Litigation requiring lots of time to get to delisting (numbers increase in the meantime)
- Package: Agreement to support the plan – help withstand litigation
- Package: Limit numbers in east areas in short term until established in central Cascades – then when all management options on the table, more in the east
- Package: Compensation, with at very least review, and \$ for strategies to live with wolves
- Interest: Maintain/increase hunting opportunities

Attachment A
October 29-30, 2007 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
- Adrian Miller (alternate for Georg Z.)
- Hon. Ken Oliver
- Tommy Petrie, Jr
- Gerry Ring Erickson
- John Stuhlmiller
- Arthur Swannack
- Bob Tuck
- Greta M Wiegand

WWG Members Not in Attendance:

- Georg Ziegltrum

WDFW Project Staff and RESOLVE Staff in Attendance:

- Harriet Allen
- Rocky Beach
- Paul De Morgan
- Teresa Eturaspe
- Madonna Luers
- Donny Martorello
- Jerry Nelson
- Anthony Novack
- Turner Odell
- Nathan Pamplin
- Kevin Robinette
- Gary Wiles

Other Individuals in Attendance:

- Julie Callahan
- Bill Gaines
- Chuck Perry
- Bobbie Thormoleg
- Dan Trochta