

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wolf Working Group Members (WWG) and WDFW Staff
FROM: Paul De Morgan, RESOLVE
SUBJECT: Action Items from the December 6-7 Meeting #6 – FINAL
DATE: February 22, 2008

This memo includes action items agreed to during the December 6-7 meeting, a list of future meeting dates, a brief summary, and flipchart notes 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 #7	March 26-27, 2008 <i>Ellensburg, WA</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization of recommendations and review of full draft plan
WWG Meeting #8	TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of public review process results

I. ACTION ITEMS

Action Items Memo	Who	Completed by
1. Distribute draft Action Items memo for review	RESOLVE	Thursday, Dec. 27
2. Provide edits/comments on Action Items Memo to RESOLVE	WWG members	Thursday, Jan. 11
3. Finalize and distribute final memo to WWG and WDFW	RESOLVE	Thursday, Jan. 25

Miscellaneous	Who	Completed by
4. Schedule 7 th meeting of WWG	RESOLVE	Completed

5. Provide WWG members with information on upcoming (January 2008) briefing for the Commission on the WWG process and consider taping briefing and discussion for WWG review	WDFW	Completed – Dec. 20
--	------	---------------------

Chapters 3 and 4	Who	Completed by
6. Hold Pool Hall caucus conference call	Pool Hall Caucus	Completed – Dec. 17
7. Share results of Pool Hall caucus conference call with WDFW and others as appropriate	Pool Hall Caucus	Monday, Jan. 7
8. Discuss revisions to regions map	Daryl, Derrick, and George	Thursday, Jan. 31
9. Develop draft compensation plan for review by the full WWG	Derrick, Greta, Jack, and John S.	Friday, Feb. 22
10. Prepare and distribute next draft of Chapters 3 & 4 incorporating and fleshing out elements outlined in chart	WDFW	Friday, Feb. 22

Other Chapters in Plan	Who	Completed by
11. Provide WWG members with updated drafts of other chapters, as needed	WDFW	Intermittent, between Jan 28- Mar 1
12. Finalize all chapters in the plan and distribute for review	WDFW	At least by March 12 <i>(two weeks prior to Meeting #7)</i>

Ongoing	Who	Completed by
13. Update website as necessary	WDFW	Ongoing
14. <u>Hard Copy Packet Distribution</u> – Mail information to Daryl Asmussen and Jeff Dawson	WDFW and RESOLVE	Ongoing

15. <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

[This list was originally developed at the September 13-14, 2007 meeting; it was not updated at the October 29-30 or December 6-7 meetings.]

- 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
- Provide information related to ungulates (Chapter 5)
 - Elk herds – reasons for not achieving population objectives
 - Recent data on ungulate mortality due to vehicles
- Contact agencies to assess impacts on multi-use mandates of Wolf Plan
- Provide written clarification of land use restrictions/implications of denning sites in Ch. 8
- Provide information from Integrated Agriculture Task Force on what other land management agencies might require regarding denning sites in Ch. 8

III. OVERVIEW OF DISCUSSIONS

Day 1 – December 6, 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.

B. WDFW Perspectives on the Wolf Management Plan

Dave Brittell, WDFW Assistant Director, provided the group with a copy of the Department’s memo clarifying the wolf conservation and management planning process including:

- the extension of the planning timeline:

- the change in the plan's format (to show consensus opinions, minority opinions, options considered, and the range of public input);
- the inclusion of an economic analysis and the option to prepare a more extensive analysis with additional funding from the 2009 legislative session;
- information about an upcoming Commission briefing on the WWG process (in January 2008); and
- a brief overview of the Wolf Working Group process.

It was pointed out that while the Commission will be briefed and provide comments on the plan, the WDFW director will make the final decisions about the plan. In response to questions from the group, the department noted that changes to the document could be made in response to comments (public or Commission) and that the timeline/process is not set in stone, but there is no indication from the Commission that they think anything is missing or awry with the process so far. Public comments will be evaluated individually and there will likely be a response to all comments submitted. WWG members wanted confirmation that the WWG could provide additional input after peer review and comment, if needed.

There was also some discussion about how the Department would capture the essence of options considered by the group but not adopted considering that the group is not specifically tracking this information. The Department responded that such information would be included at only the highest/most general level.

The Department also noted that in addition to the economic considerations discussion to be provided in Chapter 13, there was the option to seek additional funding in the 2009 legislative session to support a more detailed economic study. Some WWG members noted that their industries were preparing their own economic assessments, but in some cases, it would take many months to develop complete information.

Regarding the upcoming January 2008 Commission briefing, WWG members had a number of suggestions for potential speakers/invitees, including the following:

- Ron Shirts (Idaho sheep producer)
- Pete Zager (Idaho Department of Fish and Game)
- Jim Peek (University of Idaho – retired)
- Other ranchers and elk hunters who have been impacted by wolves

(Contact information for the individuals listed above was provided to Dave Brittell.)

WWG members expressed the interest in getting input for the Commission from people with real-life experience about what works and what does not in terms of wolf management and in looking at what happens in the long run when wolves have become established and successful. WWG members were interested in being kept up to date on preparations for the Commission briefing, including seeing the agenda in advance of the meeting and they inquired about the possibility of taping the meeting for later WWG review.

C. Update on Activities Since the Last Meeting

The facilitator provided the group with an update on activities since the last meeting including the following:

- Caucus Calls. The two caucuses established during the last meeting each held separate conference calls to discuss issues related to the Plan Chapters 3 and 4 (wolf conservation and wolf/livestock conflicts). ***The two caucuses will be referenced herein as the conservation caucus (which includes conservation, environmental, and related interests from within the WWG) and the producers caucus (which includes livestock producer, ranching, forestry, hunting, and related interests from within the WWG)***
- Group of Four Calls. The caucuses then each appointed approximately two members to meet by conference call with the other caucus. This group had two conference calls to discuss the issues.

The facilitator noted that in the Group of Four calls and in subsequent conversation with the parties, he had observed that each group underwent an evolution of thinking and was making an effort to address the interests of those in the group with different perspectives. He encouraged the group to continue to make the effort to hear and understand the interests and needs of others at the table and to try to address those interests when proposing a course of action for the Plan with the confidence that other WWG members will be doing the same.

D. Presentation of Proposed Package Language and Key Outstanding Issues Discussion of Key Outstanding Issues

At this point, the group began a lengthy discussion of a potential package of proposals addressing a number of key issues related to wolf conservation and wolf/livestock conflicts. Each of the two caucuses presented (in PowerPoint slides) a proposed package reflecting that group's internal discussions and its efforts through the Group of Four to find mutually acceptable approaches addressing all interests. Each of the packages included proposals with respect to several different elements related to wolf conservation and wolf/livestock conflict management. These elements evolved from the Factors and Options matrix developed following meeting #5. The presentations each addressed some of the elements listed below, and the discussion that followed fleshed out common ground and differences among working group members on all of the elements.

Package elements discussed by the WWG related to conservation goals, the nature of various management tools, the timing of management tool availability, and compensation issues. Elements included the following:

Conservation Goals:

- Status and Breeding Pairs. The number of breeding pairs (BPs) required to trigger a downlisting of wolf status in Washington, i.e., the number of BPs required to move:
 - from Endangered (Phase I) to Threatened (Phase II)
 - from Threatened (Phase II) to Sensitive (Phase III)
 - to delist from Sensitive (Phase III) to the next status level (Phase IV – TBD)
 - to transition from Phase IV to Phase V

- Population Limits. Whether there should be a population at which Phase V is “finished” and a “limit” on target wolf population levels is reached
- Distribution Goals. Whether there should be regional distribution goals/triggers, what those numbers should be and the size and shape of the regions
- Duration. The number of years during which BP numbers must meet or exceed the relevant target levels in order to establish that the recovery objective/trigger has been met and management can go to the next phase.

Management Tools:

- Translocation. Whether and when the in-state translocation of wolves should be used to achieve conservation or distribution goals or to alleviate wolf/livestock conflicts
- Wolf Location Information. The availability of information on the known location of wolf packs and breeding pairs (potentially helpful to producers to help them avoid conflicts, but if publicly available, could also encourage excessive tourist visitation that could disturb wolves and producers, or could lead to illegal hunting)
- Non-Injurious Harassment. Actions intended to deter wolf /livestock interactions, e.g., noises, lights, etc.
- Non-Lethal Injurious Harassment. E.g., rubber bullets, beanbag projectiles, etc.
- Lethal Take.
 - Take when wolf is in the act of attacking/depredating
 - Take when wolf is in act of harassing
 - Take of wolves involved in chronic depredation (2 or more attacks in 12 months)
- Homestead Protection. Lethal take of wolves in the act of attacking allowed within a defined distance of a residence (which could potentially include associated outbuildings)
- Hunting.
- Proactive development of non-lethal management tools.
- Compensation.
 - Confirmed kills
 - Probable kills
 - Undocumented kills
 - Reduced production (lower weight gain from grazing, etc.)
 - Miscellaneous – (e.g., grazing permits rendered all or partially unusable due to wolf activity)
 - No compensation

The discussion of the proposed packages, elements and related issues continued through the rest of the day. The group had discussions both in plenary and in separate caucuses. As noted below, the discussion of these elements and issues continued into Day 2 of the meeting. For convenience and clarity, the paragraphs below combine points of discussion raised during both Day 1 and Day 2.

As the discussion of these factors proceeded, the following issues were raised:

Package Negotiations. In general, WWG members noted that their proposals or support for various compromises on conservation goals and other elements were tied to satisfactory resolution of all the elements and should not be seen as stand-alone firm proposals.

Conservation Goals and Downlisting/Delisting Recovery Objectives/Triggers. There was a lot of discussion on the numbers of BPs for the recovery objectives/triggers, the number of years that those numbers would have to be maintained, and the extent of geographic distribution before formal downlisting or delisting could occur. In the end, there was general agreement on the number of BPs that needed to be confirmed for downlisting from Endangered to Threatened (6 BPs), from Threatened to Sensitive (12 BPs), and from Sensitive to the next level of management (15 BPs). Some members wanted to set numbers for later phases of recovery while others were not comfortable setting numbers that far out in time and preferred to leave those numbers to the discretion of the Department.

In general members agreed that the reproductive and geographic requirements associated with each level must be confirmed for 3 years before going to the next management phase. However, upon questioning, WDFW stated that if wolf populations were to increase rapidly, then timelines for more restrictive conservation statuses would be reduced or eliminated – e.g., if in the fourth year of wolf management there were already 12 or more BPs in the state and these numbers together with the geographic requirements had been maintained for three years, then the Department would skip efforts to downlist to Threatened status and would move ahead with downlisting to Sensitive status. (It was noted that the requirement of 15 BPs to delist from Sensitive status would have to be met for the required time period and that time period could not be shortened based on reaching the next threshold number if that number were expressed as total number of wolves rather than as breeding pairs.)

In addition, some WWG members were concerned that the public process for downlisting would add unnecessary time (1 to 2 years) before new management tools could be employed, so members agreed the Plan should specify that the appropriate management tools take effect as soon as the appropriate recovery objectives/triggers have been met without waiting for the formal downlisting or delisting process.

Total Numbers of Wolves. Some members of the WWG felt it was important, especially in the later phases of wolf recovery, that the Department manage for total number of wolves, not just breeding pairs. They suggested this was less costly than tracking BPs and consistent with how other established wildlife populations are monitored and managed. Some members of the producers caucus also suggested that there be a ceiling population level to which the Department would strive to manage wolf population numbers. WDFW indicated they did not manage other species this way and would attempt to describe how they can address these concerns in the next version of the document.

Counting Interstate Wolves. There was discussion about how to count wolves that move back and forth across state lines. Some wanted them to be counted as part of the recovery objective/trigger numbers for Washington even if they spent the majority of their time in Idaho, Oregon, or British Columbia. Others suggested wolves should be counted only in the state where the den was located. The agency noted that there was a standardized protocol that all the other states are using to address this situation.

Distribution Goals and Redrawing Regions. There was discussion about lumping of ecoregions and re-drawing the lines used for regional distribution targets. The conservation caucus proposed a new set of regions (combining some of the Department's proposed

“ecoregions”) and indicated a willingness to work with the producers to draw lines that worked for both management goals and conservation goals. In general, members of the conservation caucus were very committed to developing appropriate distribution goals. Alternatively, some members of the producers caucus suggested leaving distributional goals out of the Plan and up the discretion of the Department, but in the end, WWG members generally agreed to the use of distributional goals in the early phases of recovery. There was a commitment by members of both caucuses to re-examine the boundaries (map) of the regions. Of particular interest to some members was whether to include all or part of the Columbia Plateau region in the overall Eastern Washington region.

Post Delisting Status. There was discussion about what status wolves should have after they are delisted (*after* having been downlisted from Endangered to Threatened to Sensitive species status). Some suggested they be given “Big Game” status and that hunts be allowed as appropriate. The agency noted that a SEPA process would be required to consider hunting of wolves. It was suggested that auctions, raffles, or “Governor’s Tags” were ways to raise significant revenues through wolf hunting. It was noted however, that wolf populations could not likely be controlled just through hunting, no matter what sort of options were offered. Some suggested that ultimately, if wolf populations grew substantially, the wolf should be treated as a “predator” species, but that is no longer an official status that exists under Washington Law.

Partial Federal Delisting in Washington. There was discussion about the existing federal government proposal to draw a line through Washington and delist wolves only in the eastern portion of the state. WWG members wanted to know what that would mean for state management standards and approaches. The department indicated that the federal agencies would likely seek to reach agreement on a state lead role in wolf management throughout the state.

Management Tools. There was significant discussion about when certain management tools (e.g., the homestead provision or other lethal take options) should become available to livestock producers. Producers favored moving more quickly to the full range of management options. It was also suggested that the Plan include provisions to deal with special cases – cases that present unusual circumstances (severe burdens). The question was raised whether, once wolf populations grew to target levels and all management tools were available, wolf populations should be allowed to grow without limit or whether wolf populations should be managed to a ceiling population.

Translocation. The group discussed various translocation issues and recognized the need for additional description with respect to the number of potential translocations, the number of target sites/areas, and other factors. It was noted that aggressive translocation efforts could help accelerate reaching target or trigger conservation goals and therefore accelerate downlisting or delisting. It was also noted that certain areas were not suitable for wolves (e.g., the Puget Trough) and some members suggested that all wolves appearing in those areas should be translocated. For example, the Columbia Plateau (CP) region was one area suggested for 100% translocation, but others suggested that there is a lot of open terrain in the region and that unless they become a problem, it might be fine to allow some wolves in that area. It was also suggested that only non-alpha wolves should be translocated. Members noted that translocation might be a slow way to deal with problem wolves or areas with

spiking populations because of the lengthy SEPA process that would be required to support translocation. However, it was suggested that the SEPA process could be undertaken in advance of the need for a specific translocation – i.e., immediately after Plan approval – based on a set of areas and options for potential translocation.

Lethal Take. There was discussion of issues related to lethal take of problem wolves, including the Homestead Protection provisions discussed below. Some conversation revolved around the circumstances and approaches for dealing with wolves and packs that engage in chronic depredation of livestock (i.e., 2 depredations within 12 months). Some members noted the flexible approach adopted by Montana that looks at pack history and other relevant factors. It was noted as part of this discussion that lethal take is always allowed in defense of one's self or others (humans) from actual attack.

Homestead Protection Provisions. Discussion about the homestead protection provision touched on a number of issues including the appropriate distance from the residence, the nature of associated structures or facilities that could be included as part of the residence, the timing of when the tool could be used (with respect to the phase or status of conservation, including the number of BPs), and whether the provision should include the protection of pets or hunting hounds even when not within the residential perimeter. Eventually, the idea of a homestead protection provision was incorporated into the discussion of lethal take in general (i.e., proximity to the homestead became one factor in deciding whether lethal take would be allowable).

Compensation. Some WWG participants, from both sides of the issue, suggested that once the full range of management options were available to producers, compensation programs would not be necessary and could terminate. This translated into the idea suggested by some members, that compensation should be on a sliding scale according to the degree to which management tools were available to producers. On the other hand, it was noted that statistics from current compensation programs in other states indicate that depredation by wolves will become more significant as wolf numbers increase over time. At least one WWG member opposed using state funds to provide compensation, although private foundation money was acceptable. There was also discussion about what types of losses might be compensable. It was agreed that a subgroup should be formed to deal with the issues surrounding compensation (e.g., what level of compensation for what types of losses).

Denning Sites. There was discussion among the group and with the department about what restrictions to an owner's use of land (e.g., forestry or agriculture) would be required by the presence of wolf den sites. After much discussion, the group seemed to conclude that the impact on landowners would be minimal. The group requested clarification of the issue from the department in writing. There was also a request that the Integrated Agriculture Task Force provide information regarding what other land management agencies might require in terms of restrictions

Ungulate Management. Noting that prior information presented to the group suggested that elk and other ungulates had much more significant challenges to their population success than predation (currently, and perhaps also when wolves become predators), the group has since focused on making positive impact in other areas of ungulate management as a way to offset for wolf predation (thereby maintaining the herds and maintaining or improving

hunter opportunity). Discussion focused also on what it means to “encourage” ungulate populations and what actions might be relevant or appropriate to include in a wolf management plan.

State Monitoring of Wolves. The Department clarified that it has some resources and is already gearing up to detect and monitor incoming wolves. It noted trainings for field biologists were in the works and that the Department is already out looking for wolves. They indicated they had confirmed individual wolves in the state but no confirmed packs.

At the close of Day 1, the facilitator went around the room and asked each WWG member to assess where they felt the group was in terms of progress toward consensus on a package. Almost unanimously, group members agreed that they felt like the group was close to consensus on a number of important issues. After the formal meeting adjourned for the day, the facilitator worked with some interested WWG members to collect and organize the range of agreed-upon elements and the range of still undecided elements of the package and present them in a single document with which the group could work the following day in an effort to reach consensus.

Day 2 – December 7, 2007

On the second day, the WWG continued its discussions of key issues and the proposed package. At this point, the group began working off of a single document – a chart listing the various conservation parameters and management options down the left side with the proposed phases of wolf recovery listed across the top (a time based axis). Thus, the chart presented how the applicability of each management tool would change over time as wolf populations increase and conservation thresholds/triggers are reached. Over the course of the day, the group discussed again many of the elements included in the chart. The essence of those issue discussions is captured in the paragraphs above.

At the end of the day, the group had produced a chart that included a number of potentially agreed-upon elements (with the caveat that final agreement was dependent on a satisfactory resolution of all outstanding issues) as well as a number of elements with 2 or 3 different options listed. On the chart, areas of current agreement were shown in simple white. Areas where some issues remain to be resolved appear highlighted/shaded, and the different proposals for each are shown in different colors. The last version of that worksheet, with a few formatting changes, is attached. ***It must be noted that this document is a work in progress and the final consensus of the group on any or all elements included therein may be quite different from that presented here.***

E. Public Comment and Adjournment

At the opportunity for public comments, several members of the audience expressed appreciation for the work the group was doing. There were no other comments. The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 PM.

IV. FLIPCHART NOTES

Day 1 – December 6, 2007

Notes, Issues, and Concerns:

- Cross boundary wolves
 - Where's the den
 - What's the management regime
- Homestead Protection
 - Distance
 - Timing (pre/post delisting)
 - Definition of "residence"
- Build in ways to address special cases
 - e.g., x number of losses
- Ecoregion by ecoregion management?
- Recovery objectives/triggers defined by
 - Number of BPs for
 - Number of years
 - With distribution? (i.e., Number of geographic regions)
- What if recovery objectives/triggers are met more quickly than downlisting to threatened
 - E.g.,
 - 6 in 1st year
 - 12 in 2nd year
 - 18 in 3rd year (still "threatened" status?)
 - 19 in 4th year (still "sensitive species" status?)
- Recovery Objectives/Triggers
 - 6 (3 years with sufficient geographic distribution)downlist to Threatened
 - 12 (3 years with sufficient geographic distribution)delist to Sensitive
 - 15 (3 years with sufficient geographic distribution).....designate as something else (e.g., Big Game)
 - x.....general hunt, impact hunt
 - y

Day 2 – December 7, 2007

Notes, Issues, and Concerns:

- Tools becoming available when recovery objectives/triggers are met (not when "official" designation is made)
- Chronic depredation – the pack not the individual is targeted (doesn't mean all pack taken out necessarily)
- What to do when get to bigger numbers?
 - "Predator" (cost/benefit?)
- Land use
 - Protection of wolf denning sites - ?
 - Administrative relief

- Definition of denning sites
 - Clarify the current rules (*action item*) – denning site times, protections
- Provisions related to endangered species on private land during denning season
 - Clarify in writing (*action item*)
 - What is the buffer
 - What is harassment
 - Case by case basis
 - Experience from other states
- What to do vis a vis management of Eastern 1/3 if delisted fed but not other 2/3
 - State approved plan
 - Use 10j
- Homestead Protection
 - Interest: safe haven for animals
 - Remember – applies for all, not just producers

Action Items:

- Commission related information
- Restrictions on denning sites – on fed/other land management lands
- March 26-27 (new meeting dates for next meeting)
- Map revision
 - Derrick, Daryl, George
- Caucus Calls
 - Pool room – next two weeks
- Compensation Group
 - John S, Jack, +2

Attachment A
December 6-7, 2007 WWG Meeting Attendees
(Based on attendance sign-in sheets)

WWG Members in Attendance:

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

WWG Members Not in Attendance:

- Paula Del Giudice

WDFW Project Staff and RESOLVE Staff in Attendance:

- Harriet Allen
- Rocky Beach
- Paul De Morgan
- Madonna Luers
- Turner Odell
- Kevin Robinette
- Gary Wiles

Other Individuals in Attendance:

- Michele Beal-Erwin
- Tom Buckley
- William E. Liggett
- Bobbie Thorniley
- Jane K. Titland
- Dan Trochta