

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Post-recovery Wolf Conservation and Management Plan – **DRAFT** alternatives matrix

Introduction

This document describes conservation and management elements that would be considered in a post-recovery wolf conservation and management plan in Washington. The elements would help shape alternatives that would be analyzed within the Environment Impact Statement (EIS).

The first matrix in this document represents the initial draft of ideas within major topics that form the elements of a post-recovery plan. At this stage of drafting, these are not stand-alone alternatives that would be found in a draft EIS; rather, these ideas are building blocks that will be used to shape alternatives. Each idea within each element can be blended or swapped with alternatives from other elements. As drafted, each alternative is not considered a “package” and they are intended to evolve and change with public input. The spectrums of ideas included in this draft matrix are conservation and management options that WDFW could support, excluding options that the agency considers out of scope (e.g., eliminating wolves from Washington or maintaining the wolf’s endangered status after they have reached recovery objectives). Many were derived from public feedback received as part of outreach efforts (public scoping) conducted by WDFW in 2019. Although some elements show only one proposed option, we expect to add to and/or expand options that WDFW could support once discussions with our partners and stakeholders begin. As alternatives become more developed, we will also examine funding and budget considerations.

The second matrix in this document is provided as a reference for definitions for species status and classification, and related considerations. Legal status and classification will be guided by the other elements in this matrix rather than predetermined.

For some issues, it may be reasonable to use current cougar and black bear conservation and management activities as points of reference for post-recovery wolf conservation and management. However, there are several elements and ideas in which wolf conservation and management will differ from cougar and black bear, and will likely be controversial and require more conversation. The following are such elements:

Translocation and/or relocation of wolves – WDFW occasionally conducts relocations of cougars and black bears that are not considered a threat to public safety for conflict mitigation reasons, but translocation has not been used to start new populations of cougars or black bears within Washington. Currently, wolves are neither relocated for conflict mitigation nor are they translocated to start new populations in order to meet statewide recovery goals. Both relocation and translocation are contemplated in this matrix.

Hunting of wolves – Black bears and cougars are hunted in Washington, while wolves have long been absent from the state. Where recovered, wolf populations are generally robust, resilient, and can support a moderate level of mortality. Considering a hunting season is appropriate as part of the EIS process for a recovered wolf population. However, wolves differ from cougars and black bears in that wolves have a history of near extermination in the continental United States as a result of government control efforts; as such, hunting will likely be the most contentious issue contemplated in the EIS.

Proactive measures to reduce depredation – Proactive nonlethal deterrents have been heavily emphasized to reduce depredation losses to wolves and will continue to be emphasized beyond recovery. The current level of nonlethal deterrents required for wolves exceeds what WDFW recommends for cougar and black bear conflict management.

Wolf collar data sharing – Different from any other species, wolf collar locations are currently shared on a limited basis with livestock producers and local county government officials who sign a sensitive fish and wildlife data sharing agreement. No other wildlife locations are shared in the same way. Wolf data sharing is dependent upon collaring efforts, which are likely to be reduced over time due to cost and data needs. Data sharing agreements were implemented to help livestock producers understand wolf movements and proximity to livestock to help producers adjust to the novel presence of wolves on the landscape. Data sharing (as applied in Washington) has not been verified as an effective proactive, nonlethal strategy for curbing livestock depredations and it may become less effective as a smaller proportion of the increasing wolf population is collared. However, managing livestock with wolves may still be a novel experience for livestock operators even post-recovery. Data sharing is a current expectation and valued by some livestock operators in occupied wolf habitat. Data sharing may no longer be feasible if wolves become a hunted species.

Payment for indirect losses – Different from any other species, WDFW offers payment for indirect losses to livestock (e.g., decreased birth rates, decreased livestock weights, etc.) attributed to wolves. WDFW contemplates possible changes to these payments in the alternatives matrix.

Wolf-ungulate interactions – The matrix suggests wolf management addressing impacts to at-risk ungulate populations be included in the Game Management Plan because it is updated every six years and allows for adaptive management; this would make it consistent with black bear and cougar management.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife – Post-recovery Wolf Conservation and Management Plan – **DRAFT** alternatives matrix

**For more ideas for discussion, please review the [Scoping Comments Summary](#).*

Elements to consider <i>(pages referenced are from the 2011 Wolf Conservation and Management Plan)</i>	Alternative	Alternative	Alternatives TBD	Status Quo Alternative (No Action – 2011 Wolf Conservation and Management Plan)
Wolf conservation, management, monitoring, and evaluation				
1. Number of regions <i>(pg. 59, 281)</i>	Development of wolf regions based on wolf metapopulations/habitat suitability/permeability, GMU, or ecotype	No divisions or zones of any kind—wolves managed consistently across state	East and West regions	1. Eastern Washington 2. Northern Cascades 3. Southern Cascades/ Northwest Coast
<p><u>Ideas for discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New map based on one or some of the following: wolf metapopulations, breeding habitat, dispersal areas, areas of low and high tolerance - No divisions or zones of any kind—wolves managed consistently across state - Divisions based on the GMU level, number of packs within a GMU (intent to influence individual packs), or ecotypes/prey availability (use divisions used to define ungulate habitat) - East and West Zone (see Oregon’s updated 2019 wolf plan) - Divide southern cascades and NW coast back to two regions (with Olympic Peninsula separate) for a total of four regions, as proposed in one of the alternative in the the 2011 Plan EIS - Maintain status quo (three regions) for consistency with existing public understanding/knowledge - Consider federal designation and federal post-delisting monitoring expectations 				
2. Number and distribution of successful breeding pairs [or packs] <i>(pg. 64, 71, 280)</i>				
Relist as Sensitive				Downlist to Threatened (6 successful breeding pairs, 2 in each recovery region)
Relist as Threatened				Downlist to Sensitive (12 successful breeding pairs – 4 in

				E WA, 3 in N Cas, 5 in S Cas/NW coast)
Relist as Endangered				Delist (15 successful breeding pairs – 4 in each plus 3 anywhere)*** look at old EIS
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
- The modeling exercise currently underway designed to inform the Periodic Status Review of Gray Wolves in Washington will guide these thresholds. This information will be based on the biological status of the population and will not be predetermined.				
3. New → Wolf conservation and monitoring (pg. 136)	Monitoring focused on population level estimates (e.g., occupied area) rather than breeding pairs, den sites, etc.	No formal monitoring/population surveys conducted. Monitoring based on current needs or actions.	Status quo population monitoring (direct minimum count) for a certain time period post-delisting, after which transition to Alt. 1.	Wolf population monitored through a direct minimum count of known individuals, packs, and breeding pairs.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Population monitored based on modeling with inputs that could be kept updated - Monitor to ensure population stays at least above recovery objectives stated in 2011 Wolf Conservation and Management Plan - Movement toward less invasive monitoring as wolves reach recovery objectives? What are benchmarks for moving toward less invasive monitoring? Regionally based? - Disease/health monitoring – not its own element, but should be mentioned in plan. - Emphasize maintenance of integrity of wolf social pack structure - Effects of climate change addressed in plan. - Use size of a wolf pack as a metric for breeding pairs - Wolf density measured in comparison to local ungulate herd (estimated number wolves/estimated herd size) - How frequently, if needed, would an annual wolf report be necessary? 				
4. New → Tribal/cultural aspects of wolf management	WDFW will coordinate and collaborate with individual tribes.	WDFW will coordinate and collaborate with individual tribes.	WDFW will coordinate and collaborate with	WDFW will coordinate and collaborate with individual tribes.

				individual tribes.	
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>					
5. New → Cross-boundary/interagency/government-to-government coordination	If wolves are hunted, incorporate into coordination concerning other game species	Coordinate individually as needed with other agencies and tribes			Status quo – use an Interagency Wolf Committee to coordinate across agencies and tribes and coordinate individually as needed
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>					
6. New → Translocation of wolves from one area of Washington to another (pg. 69, 141, 282)	Translocation of wolves within Washington would be available as a tool if wolves are in danger of relisting (becoming sensitive, threatened, or endangered) or due to unforeseen stochastic events (e.g., disease outbreak).	Translocation not allowed. Allow continued natural expansion of range and establishment of packs in Washington through dispersal from adjacent states and within the state and not through translocation.		If determined necessary by the Director, translocation of wolves within Washington would be available as a tool if wolves do not meet 2011 Plan recovery objectives.	Available as a tool requiring additional SEPA analysis.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wolves will not be translocated to areas where they would be listed as federally endangered. - Introductions of wolves from outside Washington into the state will not be considered unless wolves are in danger of extirpation from the state and robust populations (based on biological data) cannot be maintained by wolves within Washington’s borders. - Opportunistic relocation of individual wolves for mitigating nuisance or conflict is allowed statewide within occupied wolf range in Washington. Relocation does not require a public process and is not used to facilitate dispersal. 					
7. New → Hunting of wolves (pg. 70)	Hunting not allowed (this does not preclude WDFW from managing wolves for conflict or ungulate management).	Use of hunters may be implemented as needed as a tool for a	Specially qualified and permitted hunters may be used for	Implement a regulated hunting season (not a general or open season)	Not allowed.

		specific and dedicated management objective.	a specific and dedicated management objective.	through Game Management Plan and Commission process if/when populations are robust enough to support hunting.	
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>					
- Consider species designation and license requirements (i.e., specialized permits). May require legislation to create separate license/fees for wolf hunting.					
8. New → Reporting and legal status evaluation					WDFW produces an annual report detailing the minimum number of individual wolves, packs, and breeding pairs in the state.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>					
- Dependent on elements above – too early to determine					
Land management					
9. Manage for landscape connectivity (pg. 151)	Support wildlife habitat enhancements, crossing structures, and processes that maintain connectivity between habitat for multiple species				Expand existing efforts to maintain and restore habitat connectivity for wolves.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>					
10. New → Land management (pg. 130)	Status quo - Grazing/wolf management on WDFW lands use Lands Division work. Wolf				Grazing/wolf management on WDFW lands use Lands Division work. Wolf management

	management practices remain the same regardless of land ownership, excluding areas where wolves remain federally listed/NPS lands/tribal lands.			practices remain the same regardless of land ownership, excluding areas where wolves remain federally listed/NPS lands/tribal lands.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What aspects of management are different on public and private lands? By land ownership? - Federal land management is outside the scope of this plan. 				
11. New → Wilderness impacts	Any wolf conservation and management activities in wilderness areas will abide by laws governing wilderness areas or appropriately permitted by USFS.	Any wolf conservation and management activities in wilderness areas will abide by laws governing wilderness areas or appropriately permitted by USFS.	Any wolf conservation and management activities in wilderness areas will abide by laws governing wilderness areas or appropriately permitted by USFS.	Any wolf conservation and management activities in wilderness areas will abide by laws governing wilderness areas or appropriately permitted by USFS.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will WDFW manage wolves differently (e.g., have different approaches to monitoring and conflict) in wilderness areas than other federal lands? 				
Wolf-livestock conflict				
12. Proactive measures to reduce depredation (pg. 89)	Proactive measures consistent with other species (e.g., black bear and cougar). Conflict specialists are in an advisory role (less implementation). Gradual phasing out of DPCA-L and/or contracted range rider programs (or transfer to			WDFW will provide technical assistance to livestock operators to implement proactive measures to reduce conflicts. Assistance with some costs may be paid by non-profit organizations or other entities on a limited

	appropriate state or private entity)—aim for five years after delisting. Chart 5-year phasing out in plan.			basic. Funding provided through DPCA-Ls and contracted range riders.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intermediate option between status quo and black bear and cougar - Original plan says proactive measures will be emphasized beyond recovery - Consider focusing resources on those new to experiencing wolf/livestock conflict versus those who traditionally received support and are well versed in nonlethal deterrents. - Protocol guides the use of these—what do we keep or change? Incorporate or reference protocol in new plan? - Should Washington work to become a national leader in the application of effective non-lethal deterrents? - Given the technology resources available in the Northwest, are we uniquely positioned to explore new solutions? 				
13. Use of non-lethal injurious harassment (i.e. striking wolves with non-lethal projectiles, such as rubber bullets, pg. 87)	Allow without special authorization consistent with any other non-listed species.			Allowed with a permit and training from WDFW during all listed statuses; will be reconsidered during Endangered status if used inappropriately or a mortality occurs under this provision.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
14. New → Wolf collar data sharing	No wolf collar location data sharing consistent with black bears, cougars, elk, etc.	Wolf collar location data sharing with specific government partners (e.g., tribes, USFS, NPS)		Share wolf collar locations with livestock producers and government officials who sign a sensitive fish and wildlife data sharing agreement.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considerations pertaining to data sharing if WDFW opens hunting seasons - Considerations pertaining to data sharing if other entities (such as Tribes) open hunting and trapping seasons - Considerations regarding perceived agency obligations to collar animals to meet any of these alternatives 				
15. New → Depredation response/investigations (pg. 143)	Status quo - responsibility			Responsibility maintained by

	maintained by WDFW consistent with black bear and cougar.			WDFW consistent with black bear and cougar.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider continuing to follow guidance of wolf-livestock interaction protocol - Depredation response applies to lawfully present livestock 				
16. Lethal control by state/federal agents of wolves involved in repeated livestock depredations (pg. 86, 88)	Allowed, consistent with state and federal law. May be conducted by state or federal employees or agents.	Allowed, consistent with state and federal law. Conducted by WDFW consistent with other depredation removal (e.g., black bear and cougar), or federal employees.		Allowed, consistent with state and federal law. WDFW may consider issuing a permit to a livestock owner to conduct lethal control on private land they own or lease if WDFW does not have the resources to address control.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
17. Permitted lethal control by livestock owners (including family members and authorized employees) of wolves involved in repeated livestock depredations (pg. 86, 88)	Allowed by WDFW permit, consistent with black bear and cougar. Permit conditions may include but are not limited to number of animals, area, time limit.			Allowed with an issued permit on private lands and public grazing allotments they own or lease when wolves reach Sensitive status.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
18. Lethal take of wolves in the act of attacking (pursuing, biting, wounding, or killing) livestock (pg. 87, 88)	Keep consistent with WAC 220-440-080.	Revise WAC 220-440-080 to be consistent with black bear and cougar.		Allowed, consistent with WAC 220-440-080. Supercedes 2011 Plan language below: Allowed by livestock owners, (including family members and authorized employees) on private

				land they own or lease at all listed statuses, with an issued permit, after documented depredation (injury or killing) in the area and efforts to resolve the problem have been deemed ineffective. Would trigger a review by WDFW if used inappropriately or if 2 mortalities occur under this provision in a year. WDFW would evaluate the circumstances of the mortalities and determine if it would continue issuing permits.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
19. Lethal take of wolves in the act of attacking (pursuing, biting, wounding, or killing) domestic animals (e.g., dogs)	Keep consistent with WAC 220-440-080.	Consistent with black bear and cougar response on private property.		Allowed, consistent with WAC 220-440-080. Supercedes 2011 Plan language below: Not allowed.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outreach/education needed—outreach materials related to dogs? - What about hunting dogs in wolf territories? Allow for take of wolves in the act of killing a hunting dog on public land? What about hunting dogs engaging in agency-sanctioned work? 				
20. Payment for livestock depredation (pg. 90)	Provide compensation consistent with cougar	Provide compensation for wolf damages (could remain	Five years after delisting, gradually	On grazing sites of 100 or more acres, and where the agency

	(WAC 220-440-170, WAC 220-440-180).	consistent with WAC 220-440-180)	transfer to a different appropriate entity or source. Chart 5-year phasing out in plan.	determines that it would be difficult to survey the entire acreage, full current market value for two animals for each confirmed depredation. It would not include double payment if all other animals are accounted for. On sites of less than 100 acres, full current market value for each confirmed depredation. Losses covered on both private and public lands.
<p><u>Ideas for discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2011 Wolf Plan, pg. 94: “Upon delisting, compensation for livestock depredations may transition to the provisions contained within WAC 232-36 for other predators, and could eventually be phased out depending on the type of management tools that are authorized and the flexibility of control options available to livestock owners. It is assumed that a new management plan will accompany delisting and the need for continued compensation will be evaluated at that time.” - Payments differ by land ownership? - Use existing compensation programs for damage by other species? - Are injured animals sold at market eligible for compensation? - Are landowners eligible for a limited time if wolves have moved into a new area and landowners are still learning about conflict mitigation methods? - Compensation only applies to lawfully present livestock 				
21. New → Payment for indirect losses	Indirect compensation not provided.	Indirect compensation not provided. Combine payment for direct and indirect losses by adding a multiplier on direct losses.	Five years after delisting, gradually transfer to a different appropriate entity or source. Chart	WDFW pays documented claims for indirect losses.

			5-year phasing out in plan.	
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> - “Pay for presence” is another indirect compensation method that could be considered.				
Wolf-ungulate interactions				
22. Ungulate management (pg. 147)	Follow guidance provided in Game Management Plan.			Manage for healthy ungulate populations through habitat improvement, harvest management, and reduction of illegal hunting, consistent with game management plans.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> - Ungulate management guidelines are included and updated in Game Management Plans.				
23. Wolf-ungulate interactions (pg. 148)	Wolf management to address impacts to at-risk ungulate populations will be documented in Game Management Plan (because it is updated every six years and allows for adaptive management).			If the Department determines that wolf predation is a primary limiting factor for at-risk ungulate populations and the wolf population in that recovery region is healthy, it could consider moving of wolves, lethal control, or other control techniques in localized areas. The status of wolves statewide as well as within a specific wolf recovery region where ungulate impacts are occurring would be considered in decision-making

				relative to wolf control. Decisions will be based on scientific principles and evaluated by WDFW.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Redefine at-risk ungulate population and threshold for control of wolves? - The updated wolf plan does not define the specifics, each six-year Game Management Plan does based on current wolf/ungulate population trends. 				
Other elements				
24. Outreach and education (pg. 152)	WDFW will provide ongoing outreach and education efforts regarding wolf conservation and management. WDFW will continue to build upon partnerships and collaboration with NGOs.			Use WDFW staff to conduct outreach and education programs.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecotourism will be discussed within this element. WDFW is supportive of wildlife watching opportunities. - Should outreach be focused to help educate communities as wolves move into areas for the first time? - How frequently, if needed, would an annual wolf report be necessary? 				
25. New → Research (pg. 156)	Research will be based on conservation and management needs and will be assessed periodically to determine where resources for studies are directed.			WDFW collaborates annually on several research projects detailed in each annual report.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue long-term predator/prey interaction studies - Compile/consult latest in- and out-of-state peer-reviewed studies on a regular basis - Work to become a national leader in wolf conflict reduction methods research 				
26. New → Collaborative process	Use a citizen stakeholder advisory			Use a citizen stakeholder advisory

	group to provide guidance to WDFW of implementation of the post-recovery plan.		group to provide guidance to WDFW of implementation on the 2011 Wolf Plan.
<u>Ideas for discussion:</u> - What is role of Wolf Advisory Group post-recovery? Is group maintained or changed to another format (e.g., regional groups)?			

DRAFT

FOR REFERENCE

Legal status/classification paths for wolves post-recovery – DRAFT

Note: Legal status and classification will be guided by the other elements in this matrix rather than predetermined.

Conservation/ management action	Unclassified	Game				Protected wildlife
		Game	Big game	Furbearer	Game without season	
Definition	"Unclassified wildlife" means wildlife existing in Washington in a wild state that have not been classified as big game, game animals, game birds, predatory birds, protected wildlife, endangered wildlife, or deleterious exotic wildlife (RCW 77.08.010).	"Game animals" means wild animals that shall not be hunted except as authorized by the commission (RCW 77.08.010 , WAC 220-400-020).	Same definition as game, species designated in RCW 77.08.030	“Fur-bearing animals” means game animals that shall not be trapped except as authorized by the commission (RCW 77.08.010 , WAC 220-400-020).	Same as other game designations without authorized season	"Protected wildlife" means wildlife designated by the commission that shall not be hunted or fished (RCW 77.08.010).
Example species	Coyote, skunks, opossum, mice, moles, rats, porcupine, nutria	Rabbits, fox, raccoon, bobcat, bullfrog	Elk, deer, moose, cougar, bear	Bobcat, beaver, river otter, fox, badger, raccoon	Sage grouse, sharp-tailed grouse, pronghorn	Pika, marmot, squirrel spp., wolverine, all cetaceans/pinnipeds not otherwise classified
Recreational take provisions	Year-round take, no bag limit	Place, time, and manner determined by Commission, described in Game Management Plan				None - “wildlife designated by the commission that shall not be hunted or fished”
Penalty for illegal take	N/A	RCW 77.15.430	RCW 77.15.420 (penalties range from \$2,000-\$12,000 depending on species)	RCW 77.15.190	Same as other game designations without authorized season	RCW 77.15.130 (penalties currently \$2,000 for designated species)

Allow for lethal removal for depredation (by agency)	Yes	Yes, at agency/Commission discretion				Yes, at agency/Commission discretion
Allow for lethal removal for depredation (by public)	Yes	Yes, at agency/Commission discretion				Yes, at agency/Commission discretion
Allow for lethal removal for human safety (by agency)	Yes	Yes, at agency/Commission discretion				Yes, at agency/Commission discretion
Allow for lethal removal for human safety (by public)	Yes	Yes, at agency/Commission discretion				Yes, at agency/Commission discretion
Allow for lethal removal based on at-risk ungulate populations (by agency)	Yes	Yes, at agency/Commission discretion				Yes, at agency/Commission discretion
Allow for lethal removal based on at-risk ungulate populations (by public)	Yes	Yes, at agency/Commission discretion				Yes, at agency/Commission discretion
Allow for hunting	Yes	Yes				No
Funding source	General Fund, Wildlife - State	General Fund, Wildlife – State, federal Pittman-Robertson, federal Tester (NOTE: Tester is not a broadly applicable fund and may not need to be on this list)				General Fund, Wildlife – State, PLP, WLP, Federal grants
List of RCWS and WACS to be amended to move to this status	- WAC 220-610-010 (wildlife classified as endangered species)	- WAC 220-610-010 (wildlife classified as endangered species) - WAC 220-400-020 (classification of wild animals)	- WAC 220-610-010 (wildlife classified as endangered species) - RCW 77.08.030 “Big game defined”	- WAC 220-610-010 (wildlife classified as endangered species) - WAC 220-400-020 (classification of wild animals)	- WAC 220-610-010 (wildlife classified as endangered species) - WAC 220-400-020 (classification of wild animals)	- WAC 220.610.010 (wildlife classified as endangered species) - WAC 220-200-100 (wildlife classified as protected shall not be hunted or fished)

Classification definitions

Recreational hunting allowed

Defined in [RCW 77.08.010](#):

- **Game animal** – Wild animals that shall not be hunted except as authorized by the commission. They can only be hunted under rules created by the Commission and they could be killed if causing property damage.
- **Furbearer** – A species whose hide has a commercial value in the fur industry, may be trapped or hunted depending on species.
- **Unclassified** – A species that can be trapped or hunted year-round, no bag limit set.

No recreational hunting allowed

Defined in [WAC 220-610-110](#):

- **Endangered** – Any wildlife species native to the state of Washington that is seriously threatened with extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range within the state.
- **Threatened** – Any wildlife species native to the state of Washington that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout a significant portion of its range within the state without cooperative management or removal of threats.
- **Sensitive** – Any wildlife species native to the state of Washington that is vulnerable or declining and is likely to become endangered or threatened in a significant portion of its range within the state without cooperative management or removal of threats.
- **“Significant portion of its range”** means that portion of a species’s range likely to be essential to the long-term survival of the population in Washington.

Defined in [RCW 77.12.020](#) and [RCW 77.08.010](#):

- **Protected** – Wildlife designated by the commission that shall not be hunted or fished. They are not subject to hunting, but could be killed if causing property damage issues. Subject to criminal wildlife penalty as assessed in [RCW 77.15.130](#).