

## Proposed CCZ/ERA Language

- Producer concerns
  - Feels like something done “to” producers, not “with” producers
  - Worry this will lengthen an already too slow lethal removal decision-making process
  - Worry that this language further restricts lethal removal as a tool
  - Last paragraph implies this
  - Whether this language is necessary
    - A member’s subsequent question ...  
If part of the intent is to save livestock, what words can make this language useful?
- Subcommittee: Intent is to use non-lethal deterrents at the beginning of the season, before, and not after depredations

## Proposed CCZ/ERA Language

- Staff concern
  - For pre-season meetings with staff and all affected people, what’s the meeting expectation (# people, timing, # of mtgs)?
  - Doable workload?
- Language recommendations
  - Some support for “special focus area” title
  - Move paragraph beginning with, “In these areas ...” before the #’d list instead of after
  - Need to describe the timeframe.
    - e.g. after the 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive year of lethal removal, before the next season
  - Identify these areas as a top funding priority?
  - Remove the last paragraph?
  - Page 14 of the protocol describes the intent for producers to use recommended deterrents before the Dept. considers lethal removal. Adjust that language to include special focus areas?
- Is lethal removal “for two or more consecutive years” the right definition?
- Need to address what if a producer is not willing to support/receive additional help

## Public Comment (Nov 19)

- David
  - With the special focus areas, we're trying to find a way to reduce the conflict.
  - Governor's letter stated our past efforts to do that wasn't acceptable.
  - Concern that accountability for enhanced non-lethal deterrents is not adequately included in the language we worked with.
  - Dept. should look forward, reflect on what happened in the past and anticipate where the special areas might be
  - If killing wolves each year, we should be trying to do things differently ]
    - Guard dogs
    - Electric fencing
    - Etc.
  - Seemed like a past lethal removal decision, it appeared that staff were waiting for a depredation to then recommend lethal removal

- Ilene
  - Appreciative of the staff comments
    - Cogent
    - On the mark
    - Bring the WAG back to reality
    - On all their work
  - Suggestion: Think about taking public input at the beginning.
- Jean
  - Regarding the earlier report on wolf mortalities, fully acknowledge the impact that humans have on wolves
    - Whether wolves killed by agency staff, self defense, or by vehicles
    - All are human-caused mortalities
  - Humans have a very strong impact on all animals

- Wayne
  - Co-founder of Project Wolf USA
  - Momentous time with delisting a couple of weeks ago
  - Learned
    - Producers, hunters, ranchers made their opinions very clear
    - Disappointed there were no strong voices for wolves/wolf advocates
    - Where are their voices against lethality?
  - Thx for the video shilled.
  - Sequel should be how to kill wolves.
  - Asks members that represent wolves to speak out for the wolves
- Tim
  - His experience in remote camera work this past summer showed that range riding didn't happen until the middle parts of the day

- Thanks to staff for their comments
- Problems not being addressed are the environmental impacts of livestock
  - Hear ranchers asking for killing wolves earlier, but doesn't hear about their responsibilities for the livestock
  - Thanks to those people that speak up
- Martha
  - Thx for the great video
  - Glad they're looking at other techniques such as the listening devices
  - On non-lethals, don't hear a lot of talk about using those that are effective for the given situation in relation to the number of livestock
    - Consider the # of livestock being protected by non-lethals.
    - For example, if there are 6 depredations out of 1,000+ livestock, that could trigger lethal removal

- Martha cont.
  - Concerned that range riders aren't working at the right times, while using public money
  - Should be documenting their actions
  - Remind everyone that wolves belong to the public, and the public is paying a lot of the bills
- Lane
  - On the video, "a great video"
  - Appreciates the efforts of WAG members
  - Keep up the good work
  - Especially thanked the staff
- Chris
  - Why is it always about what the producers want?
  - On private lands, we can't tell a producer what to do up until we're using taxpayer \$ to kill wolves

- Steph
  - Echo Tim's comments
  - Echo Martha's comments about range riders
  - Need to better update WAG webpage in a timely manner
  - W/ millions of cattle and 100 + wolves,
    - Ranchers are a small portion of the population
    - The public only gets 30 min. at the end of meetings
  - Disturbed to hear about a wolf-poaching incident was described as self-defense
  - WAG needs to better incorporate the public
  - Quit caving to private cattle interests
- Rachel
  - Troubled talking so much about simple language
  - Producers seem unwilling to budge
  - Seems like a waste of a day
  - Wolves are native, cows are not

- Carol
  - What is the text on all the science?
  - How much does one cow sell for once it's butchered?
  - Multiply by all cattle sold? More important than native wolves?
  - Why is there a compensation program when they graze on public lands?
  - How much is each wolf mortality worth?
  - What monetary compensation does WDFW get from ranching on public lands?
  - Where is the EIS getting their information?
  - Grant funding available to reduce conflict (federal)
  - Enjoyed the film
  - Will public be able to review and interject comments on what we're working on
  - Strongly object to grazing on public lands
  - Ranching enhances private profits while hurting the environment
  - Native wolves are iconic part of our lands and keystone species
  - No ecological justification for hurting wolves on public lands

- Encourage us to phase out cattle ranching
- Rick
  - Commend the WAG's work
  - Balanced approach to management and listening to a lot of different voices
  - A balanced approach to wolf management can be achieved
  - Conservation and production can live in the same space

## Public Comment (Nov 20)

- Harriet
  - Appreciates the time we're investing
  - Disappointed in the process of writing sect. 9
  - Meant to add a section in response to repeated killing of wolves in the same areas
  - Pursue more creative thinking to break the cycle
  - Instead heard protocols to do more killing
  - Should be asking what we can do differently to break the cycle
  - How to address chronic depredations of livestock is covered in the other portions of the protocol
- David
  - Supports what Harriet said
  - Purpose is to stop killing wolves. How did it get off base about killing more wolves?

- Goes against what the Governor said
- Doesn't appear we've made progress in reducing the # of wolves killed
- The environmental community doesn't get enough representation
- Doesn't feel this group is making progress
- Ilene
  - Ranchers and farmers are fearful of potential grazing bans on state/public lands
  - Wolves are animals of opportunity, domestic animals are ultimately at risk. If ranchers, farmers, herders, range riders aren't there, we won't stop depredations.
  - A kill order a couple of days after a depredations, it's worthless - Have to stop depredations before they happen.
  - Don't promise anything that you can't fund or deliver.

- Zoey
  - Agree with Harriet's comments
  - This section is relevant to the protocol because of uncooperative producers
  - Should support cooperative producers, but uncooperative producers shouldn't get benefits
  - Forest Service is a key player in ensuring collaboration
- Chris
  - Thx for everyone's efforts
  - This is a deliberative process, and speed is a bit contrary to that process
- Martha
  - Agree with what Harriet said
  - Discussion surprising worse than previous discussions
  - Dept. should do more collaboration with the Forest Service

- If using public lands, need to be good neighbors
- Must address the "elephant in the room", uncooperative producers
- Consider different lethal criteria for areas with less wolves
- Do we focus on packs or should we focus on areas?
- Don't like the wording for non-lethals, instead more "check the boxes"
- The key is using effective non-lethals
- Think "rolling windows" need to go.
- Public never has gotten adequate documentation before lethal removal
- Chris
  - Supports Harriet's and Zoey's comments
  - Regarding defining time parameters should incorporate using extra mitigation efforts in SFA
  - As far as how long you designate the length of designating an area as an SFA, base it on science
  - Use the term non-compliant producers

- Carol
  - Depressing. She feels wolves are still going to get shot.
  - She sees nature fading away.
  - Wolves are important
- Rachel
  - Appreciates the work
  - Thought the Governor pulled the rug out from us
  - Lethal removal is a tool to use in an efficient and targeted manner. Removing this as a tool isn't the right answer