



**Meeting Report**  
**California Wolf Stakeholder Working Group**  
**Operating Principles Subgroup**  
**July 24, 2013**

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Mid-Pacific Region Office  
1140 West Wood St.  
Willows, CA 95988



California Wolf Stakeholder Working Group – Operating Principles Subgroup

**California Department of Fish and Wildlife**

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Meeting Objectives and Mechanics.....	3
Meeting Outputs.....	3
Revisions to the draft Operating Principles.....	3
Rules of Attendance .....	4
Sideboards Discussion .....	4
Sideboard #1 .....	5
Sideboard #2 .....	5
Sideboard #3 .....	6
Goals Discussion.....	6
Goal #1 .....	6
Goal #2 .....	8
Goal #3 .....	9
Goal #4 .....	10
Goal #5 .....	10
Accommodating Public Opinion.....	12
Appendix A – Meeting Participants .....	13
Appendix B – Agenda.....	14
Appendix C – Original Draft Operating Principles .....	15
Appendix D – Revised Draft Operating Principles .....	20

Cover Photo from left: Mark Rockwell, Randy Morrison, Amaroq Weiss, Mike Ford, Pamela Flick, Noelle Cremers, Pat Griffin, Lesa Eidman, Lauren Richie, Jerry Springer, Margo Parks

## **1.0 Introduction**

On July 24, 2013, the Operating Principles Subgroup (OPS) of the California Wolf Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) convened to finalize the sideboards and goals portions of the SWG Operating Principles. The OPS was formed during the March 28, 2013 SWG meeting specifically for this purpose. A significant portion of that meeting was spent in discussion of the sideboards and goals as originally drafted by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and it was decided that a subgroup should convene to further discuss and finalize the language within the document that provides a purpose for the SWG process, and the procedures by which the group will govern its discussion, deliberations, and decision-making.

## **2.0 Meeting Objectives and Mechanics**

The meeting was conducted at the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Mid-Pacific Region Office in Willows, California. The stated goal of the meeting was to review and reach consensus on the language within the draft Stakeholder Working Group Operating Principles, the final version of which will be presented at the August 29, 2013 SWG meeting in Davis, California. The OPS meeting was attended by 11 stakeholders, and three CDFW staff. Appendix A provides a list of attendees and their contact information.

The meeting agenda is provided in Appendix B. The meeting began with introductions and passing out of the agenda, the original draft and revised draft Operating Principles, and a sign-in sheet, followed by opening comments by the CDFW Wolf Planning lead, Karen Kovacs. Ms. Kovacs then opened the discussion of the SWG Operating Principles sideboards and goals by explaining the methods used to revise the original Draft Operating Principles. The majority of the meeting involved discussing and finalizing the language within each goal and sideboard.

Additional discussion that occurred involved CDFW announcing that they have issued a Request for Proposals toward a contract for a facilitator of the stakeholder process, rules of attendance in the stakeholder process, and how best to accommodate public opinion during the wolf management planning process.

## **3.0 Meeting Outputs**

### **Revisions to the draft Operating Principles**

Ms. Kovacs began by explaining the differences between the original and revised drafts of the SWG Operating Principles. In the revision she placed the sideboards ahead of the goals in the document and attempted to modify language in both sections to best incorporate what stakeholders had advocated for during the March discussion. For each goal, a number of proposed versions were presented for possible agreement by the

group. As explained by Ms. Kovacs, the only other modifications from the original draft included a paragraph that provides background on the California wolf planning and stakeholder input processes.

## **Rules of Attendance**

Members of the OPS reminded CDFW staff of the discussion that had taken place previously regarding the rules around meeting attendance and continued membership in the SWG. Members were concerned about two provisions in the Meeting Attendance section of the Operating Principles which state that 1) if a member misses two meetings they will no longer be considered an active SWG member, and 2) sending an alternate does not substitute for meeting attendance. Many members expressed concern that during this stakeholder process, which may last more than two years, it is likely that some of them may have occasional conflicts that prevent them from attending. They requested that those provisions be stricken from the Operating Principles.

Ms. Kovacs explained the thinking that went into those provisions, which was that an absent member may attempt in subsequent meetings to engage in discussion over topics that were resolved during the meeting from which they were absent, thereby delaying progress. She stressed that the stakeholder process is one of collaboration, and if an entity is not present it is extremely difficult to incorporate their concerns. But she conceded that as long as members who miss a meeting agree that we continue to move forward in subsequent meetings, and it is incumbent upon them to either send an alternate who can fully engage on their behalf, or express their concerns to another member in advance of the missed meeting, she is willing to modify the language to reflect that.

## **Sideboards Discussion**

Ms. Kovacs explained that CDFW views the sideboards as non-negotiable principles under which the SWG will operate during their participation in the wolf planning process. As such, the sideboards provide the backdrop and basis for their work. To preface the Operating Principles document, the following preamble reads:

For any collaborative process to operate smoothly, it is helpful for those involved to agree at the outset on the purpose for the process and on the procedures by which the group will govern its discussions, deliberations, and decision-making.

To preface the sideboards specifically, the following background information was added to the revised Operating Principles and read to the group by Ms. Kovacs:

With the arrival into the state of a naturally dispersing, radio-collared gray wolf from Oregon in 2011, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) embarked on an effort to provide outreach to the public including information on the history of gray wolves in California, basic wolf biology, legal status, etc., and of particular interest to the public, the general whereabouts of the wolf while it remained in the state. CDFW also sought out those stakeholders who would be most closely affected by the potential return of gray wolves to California and began a collaborative effort to receive input on future direction of wolf management in the state.

As a result of these efforts the need to develop a plan to address wolves in California became apparent. In 2013, the CDFW initiated a process to develop a California Wolf Plan (Plan). The scope of the plan will be constrained by the following sideboards:

The conversation over the language within each sideboard then ensued. Ms. Kovacs read each sideboard as presented in the revised draft Operating Principles and discussion about the wording followed.

**Sideboard #1** (CDFW revised): As populations of gray wolves continue to expand within Oregon, the potential for additional gray wolves to enter California will increase. This planning effort will include a number of alternatives that address gray wolves within the state. However, the option of planning for a future with no wolves in California is not an alternative for this plan.

OPS suggestions for finalizing Sideboard #1 included:

- change “Oregon” to “Oregon and Washington” or “Pacific Northwest” to better reflect the geographic range in which wolves are expanding (e.g. through the Cascade Range)
- remove the language that states planning for no wolves is not an option because that possibility does exist if wolves do not enter California
- change the final sentence to read “Because of this potential the option of planning for no wolves is not an alternative.”

**Sideboard #2** (CDFW revised): The CDFW will not translocate wolves from another state or country into California, or introduce wolves in any way (e.g. from a captively bred California population).

OPS suggestions for finalizing Sideboard #2 included:

- change the word “translocate” to “introduce” or “reintroduce” to reflect the common terminology of moving animals in from another state
- “translocate” refers to moving animals around within a state; does the parenthetical (from a captively bred California population) mean you may move animals around within California that are not part of a captively bred population?

**Sideboard #3** (CDFW revised): As a result of human influences and the subsequent changes in the California landscape, there is not sufficient habitat for wolves to be restored to their entire historic range. Consequently, the option of planning for a future with wolves distributed throughout the species’ historic range or abundance in California is not an alternative to this plan.

OPS suggestions for finalizing Sideboard #3 included:

- change “not an alternative to the Plan” to read “not an alternative in (or for) the Plan”

Ms. Kovacs concluded this section by acknowledging everyone’s comments and suggestions, and that she would incorporate them into the final version of the Operating Principles, which will be available for presentation to the larger SWG at our August meeting.

## **Goals Discussion**

As revised, the Goals section of the Operating Principles begins with the following preamble:

The Wolf Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) has been assembled to develop recommendations for CDFW to consider toward the first draft of the California Wolf Plan. These recommendations will help CDFW to achieve the following goals:

Each of the goals as originally drafted was read to the group, followed by suggested revisions as drafted by CDFW in response to the group’s input during the March SWG meeting. The OPS discussed each goal and its suggested revision(s) before finalizing language and moving on to discuss the next goal. Language for all goals was finalized before the conclusion of the meeting. The following summarizes those discussions.

### **Goal #1**

Original version: Facilitate the conservation of self-sustaining populations of wolves in California.

CDFW draft revisions:

- Manage California ecosystems in a manner that will support a self-sustaining population of wolves in California.
- If and when wolves (or If wolves become established) establish in California, facilitate the conservation of self-sustaining populations of wolves in California
- If and when wolves establish in California, shall seek to conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California
- If and when wolves establish in California, shall seek to conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California where there is adequate habitat to support sufficient populations of prey species. (Blend of 1 and 2)

OPS suggestions for finalizing Goal #1 included:

- Make Goal #1 an overarching vision for managing wolves
- Clarify what we mean by “establish;” is it when one wolf enters the state, or when there is a mating pair, or something else? We need to be able to manage dispersers for their own protection and regarding conflicts with livestock, etc.
- Clarify what we mean by “self-sustaining.”
- Move “if and when” to the preamble so that it encompasses all of the goals
- Drop “if and when”, drop “seek to”, and just say “conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California”

CDFW responses to suggestions:

- Having an overarching vision is a good idea, something we will likely incorporate in a preface in the management plan, as well as statement letters from the stakeholders
- We will develop a glossary of terms in the management plan that will define the terms we use; establish and self-sustaining will be based on science and will be spelled out in the plan
- This goal is specific to conservation of established packs; we address conservation and management related to dispersing animals through our non-game regulations and protections and through other goals in the management plan; some of this will be dependent upon its federal and state status in California; “establish” is a middle ground in the spectrum of one or a few dispersing individuals on one end, and a fully self-sustaining metapopulation of wolves on the other end.

Final version: If and when wolves establish in California, seek to conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California.

## Goal #2

Original version: Manage the distribution of wolves within the state where there is adequate habitat to support sufficient populations of prey species.

No CDFW revisions drafted

OPS suggestions for finalizing Goal #2 included:

- Can we say “wild” prey species?
- Can we couch it using ecological language such as that we will balance the predator prey relationship?
- Since wolves will manage their own distribution, can we drop that part and just say “Ensure that there is adequate habitat to support sufficient populations of native prey species?”
- I found language that I like that reads: “Manage wolf populations and the range and distribution of wolves in California such that the species is no longer in danger of extinction now and in the foreseeable future.”
- What about “Manage adequate habitat?”
- Consider combining Goals 1 and 2 so it would read “...seek to conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California and ensure there is adequate habitat to support sufficient prey species,” or adding some language about managing wolf distribution in Goal 1.
- Remove any mention about the prey species in Goal #2
- We must realize that managing distribution means allowing for translocation so they can get to areas with adequate habitat, and not just keeping them out of areas where they cause trouble

CDFW responses to suggestions:

- Consider “native” prey species?
- CDFW doesn’t manage habitat, other agencies do that; we can affect the distribution of wolves because we have the authority to manage them
- The phrase “manage the distribution” means allowing wolves to occur where there is adequate habitat and sufficient prey, and not where they are near urban centers or where they will conflict with livestock
- We want to keep the conservation of self-sustaining populations and the management of their distributions separate; we need the flexibility to do both

Final version: Manage the distribution of wolves within the state where there is adequate habitat.



### **Goal #3**

Original version: Manage ungulate populations in the state to provide abundant prey for wolves and other predators, intrinsic enjoyment by the public, and harvest opportunities for hunters.

#### CDFW draft revisions:

- Manage wild ungulate populations in the state to provide abundant prey for wolves and other predators, intrinsic enjoyment by the public, and harvest opportunities for hunters.

#### OPS suggestions for finalizing Goal #3 included:

- Because there are private ungulate populations, and the Department doesn't have the authority to manage them, "native" instead of "wild" makes sense
- It's fine the way it is; you don't need "native" because the Department is not going to manage a rancher's ungulates
- Change "abundant" to "adequate"
- Many don't feel the deer and elk populations are adequate now; maybe use "improve" instead of "manage"
- I'd like to see it worded to convey that all of these interests are equal, that none weighs more than another

#### CDFW responses to suggestions:

- "wild" was included because it was suggested at the last meeting; it's meant to distinguish between domestic livestock and wild ungulates like deer and elk
- We had "improve" in our existing deer plan and we found that we can't do it; we don't have the ability to affect the land management agencies to provide what the deer need; having language in our wolf plan regarding better managing ungulates gives us some leverage with the land management agencies
- We have the deer and elk programs involved in writing chapters for the wolf plan; they will help us to decide what actions we should take toward ungulate population management in the state

Final version: Manage native ungulate populations in the state to provide abundant prey for wolves and other predators, intrinsic enjoyment by the public, and harvest opportunities for hunters.

## **Goal #4**

Original version: Manage wolf-livestock conflicts to minimize livestock losses and also minimize the number of wolves potentially subject to lethal control actions.

CDFW draft revisions:

- Manage wolf-livestock conflicts to minimize livestock losses through proactive, nonlethal techniques, and also minimize the number of wolves potentially subject to lethal control actions when nonlethal measures have been unsuccessful.

OPS suggestions for finalizing Goal #4 included:

- I prefer the original #4; as with the other goals, we can add details within the plan
- The suggestion goes too far in limiting our ability to use lethal controls; several experts say that packs that habituate to livestock must have their alphas taken out; this allows you to overall take fewer wolves
- Do we need to say that wolves are potentially subject to lethal control?

CDFW responses to suggestions:

- It sounds like you think that including “potentially subject to lethal control” leaves out everything in between? So we should just leave out those specifics and include them in the plan?

Final version: Manage wolf-livestock conflict to minimize livestock losses.

## **Goal #5**

Original version: Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is inevitable given the expanding numbers in other western states and educate the public on the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California.

CDFW draft revisions:

- Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is inevitable given the expanding numbers in other western states. Educate and inform the public with science-based information on gray wolves and the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California
- Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is highly likely (or reasonably foreseeable) given the expanding numbers (or populations) in other western states and educate the public on the conservation

and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California

- Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is highly likely given the expanding numbers in other western states. Educate and inform the public with science-based information on gray wolves and the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California.

OPS suggestions for finalizing Goal #5 included:

- Instead of “highly likely” just say “possible”
- We said “potential” in the first sidebar; just stay consistent with that language
- “Reasonably foreseeable” takes away the hyperbole and link to the fact that we’ve got these expanding populations and that why there’s a potential for them to come here
- Go with “reasonably foreseeable” and change “expanding numbers” to “expanding populations”
- instead of both “educate and inform”, since they are synonyms, drop “educate” and just use “inform”
- I don’t know that “the value of wolves” is necessary; use “management needs of wolves in California.” Period.
- Making a value statement about wolves is in balance with the value we’ve placed on livestock; balances the other two goals that view wolves as a problem
- The general perception is that “value” means “good”;
- Is “consequences” a negative or positive perception?
- What about instead stating something about the role of wolves in the environment? That will remove a good or bad spin to the statement.
- What at “the role of wolves in California?”
- How about “the effects of wolves on the landscape?”
- “social and ecological effects?” I think that “effects” can go either which way; it covers everybody when you talk about ecological effects or effects on livestock or effects on ungulates but I don’t think it covers that social value that people may have
- when we change in the sideboards Oregon to Pacific Northwest we should either say Pacific Northwest here or western states the other place; they should be the same
- we could say “... science-based information on gray wolves, their effects, and conservation and management needs...”

CDFW responses to suggestions:

- “Reasonably foreseeable” seems more scientifically and legally justified
- Value doesn’t necessarily mean good; it’s what people take from it
- The ecological role is still problematic for some; we envisioned this to point out what wolves bring to California, like it or not; we have to consider that the Department’s role is to manage the fish and wildlife for the intrinsic enjoyment and use by the public; that includes those who like to know there are deer on the landscape and those who like to go out and hunt them; how do we capture that and not get into the political issues that wolves bring to the dialogue?

Final version: Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is reasonably foreseeable given the expanding populations in other western states. Inform the public with science-based information on gray wolves and the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the effects of having wolves in California.

### **Accommodating Public Opinion**

The final discussion of the OPS meeting related to public participation in the stakeholder process. Ms. Kovacs conveyed the opinions of several members that open-ended public input during the last meeting created delays in making progress, and that we should define what public opportunity should be within these meetings.

It was suggested that 15 minutes at the end of each meeting could be allowed for the public to ask questions or make comments. Others felt that 15 minutes at the end was insufficient for fully addressing public concerns, and that opening the meeting before lunch, or providing cards for them to write their questions and concerns on would alleviate some of the time constraint.

Several members expressed a preference to having one meeting or two to three hours of one meeting dedicated to a public forum. During this forum the Department and stakeholders could update the public on relevant issues, and the public could ask questions and voice opinions. This would offer greater opportunity for public participation before the public comment period of a draft plan, which many view as a token opportunity that has little impact on the final plan.

Department staff were hesitant to accede to this suggestion, due to the volume of work that needs to be done by the SWG, and the limited time in which they have to accomplish this work. Further, it is outside the scope of the contract for facilitation that has been drafted, which includes a series of full stakeholder meetings, some potential subgroup meetings, the expert peer-review meetings that are planned, and two public meetings that will be scheduled after the draft plan is released. However they did concede that it is a good suggestion, and will consult legal counsel for their recommendations.

## APPENDIX A. Meeting Participants

<b>Stakeholders in Attendance</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Pam Flick	Defenders of Wildlife	<a href="mailto:pflick@defenders.org">pflick@defenders.org</a>
Amaroq Weiss	Center for Biological Diversity	<a href="mailto:aweiss@biologicaldiversity.org">aweiss@biologicaldiversity.org</a>
Randy Morrison	Mule Deer Foundation	<a href="mailto:randy@muledeer.org">randy@muledeer.org</a>
Mark Rockwell	Endangered Species Coalition	<a href="mailto:mrockwell@stopextinction.org">mrockwell@stopextinction.org</a>
Margo Parks	California Cattlemen's Association	<a href="mailto:margo@cattlemen.org">margo@cattlemen.org</a>
Mike Ford	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	<a href="mailto:mford@rmef.org">mford@rmef.org</a>
Pat Griffin	California Agricultural Commission, Siskiyou County	<a href="mailto:pgriffin@co.siskiyou.ca.us">pgriffin@co.siskiyou.ca.us</a>
Lesia Eidman	California Wool Growers Association	<a href="mailto:lesia@woolgrowers.com">lesia@woolgrowers.com</a>
Noelle Cremers	California Farm Bureau	<a href="mailto:ncremers@cbbf.com">ncremers@cbbf.com</a>
Jerry Springer	California Deer Association	<a href="mailto:jerry@esternhunter.com">jerry@esternhunter.com</a>
Lauren Richie	California Wolf Center	<a href="mailto:lauren.richie@californiawolfcenter.org">lauren.richie@californiawolfcenter.org</a>
<b>California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff Present</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Karen Kovacs	Wildlife Program Manager	<a href="mailto:karen.kovacs@wildlife.ca.gov">karen.kovacs@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
Deana Clifford	Associate Wildlife Veterinarian	<a href="mailto:deana.clifford@wildlife.ca.gov">deana.clifford@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
Karen Converse	Environmental Scientist	<a href="mailto:karen.converse@wildlife.ca.gov">karen.converse@wildlife.ca.gov</a>

## **APPENDIX B. Agenda**

CA Wolf Plan – Stakeholder Working Group (Subgroup) Meeting

July 24, 2013, Bureau of Reclamation Office, Willows (1000-1600 hrs.)

**Goal** – To review and reach consensus on the language within the draft SWG Operating Principles. The final version will be presented at the August SWG meeting in Davis, CA.

### **Agenda**

Review of SWG comments on the draft Operating Principles from March 28, 2013 meeting

Clarification/discussion on proposed changes by DFW

Review of revised draft Operating Principles (v2)

## **APPENDIX C. Original Draft Operating Principles**

# California Wolf Stakeholder Working Group Operating Principles

For any collaborative process to operate smoothly, it is helpful for those involved to agree at the outset on the purpose for the process and on the procedures by which the group will govern its discussions, deliberations, and decision-making.

## I. Purpose of the Wolf Stakeholder Working Group

In 2013, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) initiated a process to develop a California Wolf Plan (Plan). This Plan is intended to provide a framework for CDFW to accomplish the following **GOALS** in the future:

1. Facilitate the conservation of self-sustaining populations of wolves in California
2. Manage the distribution of wolves within the State where there is adequate habitat to support sufficient populations of prey species
3. Manage ungulate populations in the State to provide abundant prey for wolves and other predators, intrinsic enjoyment by the public and harvest opportunities for hunters
4. Manage wolf-livestock conflicts to minimize livestock losses and also minimize the number of wolves potentially subject to lethal control actions
5. Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is inevitable given the expanding numbers in other Western States and educate the public on the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California.

There are several non-negotiable **SIDEBOARDS** for this effort which constrain the scope of the Plan. These are:

1. The option of planning for a future with no wolves in California is not an alternative for this plan.
2. The CDFW will not translocate wolves from another State or country into California, or introduce wolves in any way (e.g. from a captive bred California population.)
3. The option of planning for a future with wolves distributed throughout the species historic range or abundance in California is not an acceptable alternative.

The Plan will address the various opportunities and limitations on authority, for CDFW to accomplish the above purposes while accounting for uncertain future listing status under the Federal Endangered Species Act and potential listing under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).

The Director of the CDFW has authorized staff to develop this Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) to guide the CDFW in developing a plan for gray wolves, which are expected to make their way to California from growing populations in neighboring states, particularly Oregon. The SWG will develop recommendations for the CDFW to consider as the draft Plan is developed. All SWG products will be conveyed to the CDFW; however, this does not mean that all recommendations will necessarily be incorporated in the draft or final Plan. Members of the SWG represent livestock ranching and agriculture, conservation groups, biologists, hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts. The composition of the SWG may change further as this process to develop a California Wolf Plan proceeds.

## II. Participation

**Interests Represented.** SWG members represent interests that may be substantially affected by the conservation of wolves in California. The members have a variety of interests, experience with wolf or related natural resource issues, and willingness to work together in a collaborative, consensus process. In order to foster creative problem solving, members are encouraged to voice their individual viewpoints and ideas. In order to broaden and strengthen the chances of successful collaboration for the anticipated final recommendations, members are expected to bring the perspectives of their constituent groups, as well as others with similar interests, to the SWG process.

**Meeting Attendance.** Members are expected to make a good faith effort to attend all full meetings. It is expected that the group will only meet several times prior to release of a draft Plan. As such, if a member misses two meetings (unless unforeseen circumstances arise) they will no longer be considered an active SWG member and will not be asked to participate in future meetings.



If a member cannot attend, he or she may designate an individual to attend in their place to represent their interests (an alternate). The alternate should be knowledgeable about wolf issues and the topics to be discussed at the meeting. The alternate's primary responsibility is to inform the member about the deliberations at the conclusion of the meeting. It is the responsibility of the member to prepare the alternate for the meeting by sharing background information and an overview of the deliberations leading up to the meeting. Sending an alternate does not substitute for meeting attendance.

The member will strive to provide the name and background of the alternate as soon as possible, and no later than five days, in advance of the meeting. All individuals attending for members are bound by these Operating Principles. The facilitator will work with alternates to assist as needed in making their participation as constructive as possible.

**Withdrawal from the SWG.** Any member may withdraw from the SWG at any time without prejudice. Communication about the reasons for withdrawing, if related to the SWG process, will be appreciated. Good faith provisions apply to those who withdraw.

The decision to replace a member will depend on factors such as how far along the group is in the process, whether addition of a new member would be disruptive, and whether the loss of the interests represented by the withdrawing member creates a serious deficiency for on the SWG in terms of expertise and/or interests. Authority for decisions about replacing members rests with the CDFW Director. Any replacement member, or alternate, is expected to accept the process "as it stands" at the point in time when they first participate.

### III. Organizational Structure

**SWG Members.** The members are working together to achieve a mutually acceptable outcome that satisfies, to the greatest degree possible, the interests of all participants. In order for the Plan to be acceptable and implementable, those involved in developing the plan agree to work together to produce recommendations that integrate the mandates, concerns, and ideas of all those significantly affected by the plan. All SWG members agree to:

- Attend meetings and follow through on promises and commitments;
- Bring concerns from their interest group or organization up for discussion at the earliest feasible point in the process;
- Share all relevant information that will assist the group in achieving its goals;
- Keep its organization's representatives informed of potential decisions and actions, in order to expedite approval for the final product;
- Support the eventual product if they have concurred in it; and
- Concur in decisions about the Stakeholder SWG process, including overseeing the implementation of the operating principles.

SWG members recognize that final decision-making authority to develop a California Wolf Plan rests with the CDFW. The CDFW is committed to developing a plan that has achieved concurrence and support from the range of stakeholders, to the extent possible.

The SWG will have assistance from CDFW staff who will attend all meetings. While CDFW staff may sit at the table and participate in the SWG deliberations as needed, they are not SWG members. Karen Kovacs, Northern Region Wildlife Program Manager is the CDFW team leader for this effort. Eric Loft, Wildlife Branch Chief; Angela Donlan, Senior Staff Counsel; Mark Stopher, Senior Policy Advisor; and other CDFW staff will support the SWG.

**Facilitation.** CDFW prefers to use professional facilitators and is exploring the possibility of doing so for the SWG. Until that possibility is resolved, CDFW will utilize trained facilitators when possible from within CDFW. The facilitator will not take positions on the issues before the SWG. The facilitator will work to ensure that the process runs smoothly. The facilitator's role usually includes developing draft agendas, distributing meeting materials, facilitating meetings, working to resolve any impasse that may arise, preparing meeting summaries, and other tasks as requested.

**Sub-Groups.** As necessary, the SWG may choose to form sub-groups. The SWG will designate sub-group members as needed for any anticipated tasks and outcomes. At the direction of the SWG, sub-group members may develop

draft products and make recommendations to the SWG. Sub-groups will not make decisions on behalf of the SWG. Any SWG member can be a member of a sub-group.

#### **IV. Meetings**

**Open to the Public.** All SWG meetings will be open to the public. However, the CDFW expects that the range of public perspectives will be included in the SWG process primarily through the involvement of the SWG members. As such, there will only be a 15 minute period for public comment at the end of each SWG meeting. Members of the public are encouraged to submit written comments on the work of the SWG which will then be distributed to all members for consideration.

**Agendas.** Proposed meeting agendas will be drafted by the facilitator in consultation with SWG members, circulated in advance of meetings, and approved or revised at the beginning of each meeting.

**Action Item Memos.** In order to assist the SWG in documenting its progress and activities, within ten business days of each meeting the Facilitator will prepare and distribute an action items memo. These memos will convey major decisions and ensure that timelines for completing agreed upon actions are clear to all participants. These will be distributed to CDFW staff and all SWG members for review prior to preparing a final memo.

**Breaks and Caucuses.** Meetings may be suspended at any time at the request of any member to allow consultation among SWG members. Requests should be respectful of all members' time. If the use of caucuses becomes disruptive, the SWG will revisit the process.

#### **V. Decision-Making and Commitments**

**Consensus.** The SWG will strive to operate by consensus. Consensus is defined as all SWG members can live with the recommendation or decision. All recommendations and materials will be reviewed and discussed by the SWG before being forwarded to the CDFW for their consideration.

**Decision Making.** Decisions will be made by consensus of those SWG members present at a meeting. If the members present at a meeting reach consensus on a major product, the facilitator will convey the results to those absent from the meeting and assess their ability to agree. Full consensus will not be achieved until all members have confirmed agreement.

**Absence of Consensus.** If full consensus cannot be reached the SWG may choose to articulate areas of agreement and disagreement and the reasons why differences continue to exist, or communicate separate sets of recommendations (i.e. majority and minority reports).

If the SWG chooses to articulate areas of agreement and disagreement, members representing the different perspectives on specific issues will be asked to prepare language reflecting their views. The language should clearly identify the issues and information needs and uncertainties. In addition, those members that support each perspective will be identified.

If separate sets of recommendations (i.e., majority and minority reports) are conveyed to the CDFW, members representing the minority point of view will be asked to prepare a communication reflecting their views.

#### **VI. Safeguards for the Members**

**Good Faith.** All members agree to act in good faith in all aspects of the collaborative effort. As such, members will consider the input and viewpoint of other participants and conduct themselves in a manner that promotes joint problem solving and collaboration.

Acting in good faith also requires that: specific proposals made in open and frank problem solving conversations not be used against any other member in the future; personal attacks and prejudiced statements are not acceptable; negative generalizations are not productive and have the potential to impede the ability of the SWG to reach

consensus; individuals not represent their personal or organization's views as views of the SWG, and members express consistent views and opinions in the SWG and in other forums, including in press contacts.

Should a SWG member be found to be acting in bad faith the facilitator will be asked to talk with the individual(s) about the situation. A variety of approaches will be explored, accordingly, to redress the concerns. The authority to replace and/or remove a member from the SWG rests with the CDFW Director.

**Rights in Other Forums.** Participation in the SWG process does not limit the rights of any member. Members will make a good faith effort to notify one another in advance, if another action outside the process will be initiated or pursued, which will affect the terms of proposals, recommendations, or agreements being discussed.

**Public Communications.** All SWG members agree to refrain from making negative comments about or characterizing the views of other SWG members in contacts with the press, or on internet web postings, in newsletters, or in email or letter communications to members of respective stakeholder groups. They also agree not to knowingly mischaracterize the positions and views of any other party, nor their own, in public forums.

## **VII. Process Suggestions/Ground Rules**

SWG members agree to consider and apply the following process suggestions and ground rules:

- Seek to learn and understand each other's perspective.
- Encourage respectful, candid, and constructive discussions.
- Provide balance of speaking time.
- Seek to resolve differences and reach consensus.
- As appropriate, discuss topics together rather than in isolation.
- Make every effort to avoid surprises.
- Limit sidebars.
- Turn off cell phones or put them in the non-ring mode during formal meeting sessions.

## **VIII. Schedule**

In developing its initial recommendations, the SWG will meet approximately every other month, beginning in late February 2013 and ending in June 2014. Exact dates will be determined by CDFW in consultation with SWG members. CDFW staff may also be holding public meetings during preparation of the draft plan. The CDFW is scheduled to complete its initial draft Plan by August 31, 2013. The draft will then be available for 45 days to the SWG for their review, and a panel of peer reviewers. Comments from peer reviewers and consensus comments by the SWG will be addressed by CDFW as appropriate and proposed plan revisions will be shared with the SWG. Upon completion of the draft plan, CDFW will release the plan for a 90-day public review process.

Final approval of a Wolf Plan, by the CDFW, is anticipated by June 30, 2014.

## **APPENDIX D. Revised Draft Operating Principles (version 2)**

# California Wolf Stakeholder Working Group Operating Principles

For any collaborative process to operate smoothly, it is helpful for those involved to agree at the outset on the purpose for the process and on the procedures by which the group will govern its discussions, deliberations, and decision-making.

## Background

With the arrival into the state of a naturally dispersing, radio-collared gray wolf from Oregon in 2011, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) embarked on an effort to provide outreach to the public including information on the history of gray wolves in California, basic wolf biology, legal status, etc., and of particular interest to the public the general whereabouts of the wolf while it remained in the State. CDFW also sought out those stakeholders who would be most closely affected by the potential return of gray wolves to California and began a collaborative effort to receive input on future direction of wolf management in the state.

As a result of these efforts the need to develop a plan to address wolves in California became apparent. In 2013, the CDFW initiated a process to develop a California Wolf Plan (Plan). The scope of the Plan will be constrained by the following **SIDEBOARDS**:

1. As populations of gray wolves continue to expand within Oregon, the potential for additional gray wolves to enter California will increase. This planning effort will include a number of alternatives that address gray wolves within the State. However, the option of planning for a future with no wolves in California is not an alternative for this plan.
2. The CDFW will not translocate wolves from another State or country into California, or introduce wolves in any way (e.g. from a captive bred California population.)
3. As a result of human influences and the subsequent changes in the California landscape, there is not sufficient habitat for wolves to be restored to their entire historic range. Consequently, the option of planning for a future with wolves distributed throughout the species historic range or abundance in California is not an alternative to this Plan.

## I. Purpose of the Wolf Stakeholder Working Group

The Wolf Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) has been assembled to develop recommendations for CDFW to consider toward the first draft of the California Wolf Plan. These recommendations will help CDFW to achieve the following **GOALS**:

### 1. Facilitate the conservation of self-sustaining populations of wolves in California

Suggestions:

*a) Manage California ecosystems in a manner that will support a self-sustaining population of wolves in California.*

*b) If and when wolves (or If wolves become established) establish in California, facilitate the conservation of self-sustaining populations of wolves in California*

*c) If and when wolves establish in California, shall seek to conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California*

*d) If and when wolves establish in California, shall seek to conserve self-sustaining populations of wolves in California where there is adequate habitat to support sufficient populations of prey species. (Blend of 1 and 2)*

### 2. Manage the distribution of wolves within the State where there is adequate habitat to support sufficient populations of prey species

**3. Manage ungulate populations in the State to provide abundant prey for wolves and other predators, intrinsic enjoyment by the public and harvest opportunities for hunters**

Suggestion:

a) Manage *wild* ungulate populations in the State to provide abundant prey for wolves and other predators, intrinsic enjoyment by the public and harvest opportunities for hunters

**4. Manage wolf-livestock conflicts to minimize livestock losses and also minimize the number of wolves potentially subject to lethal control actions**

Suggestion:

a) Manage wolf-livestock conflicts to minimize livestock losses *through proactive, nonlethal techniques*, and also minimize the number of wolves potentially subject to lethal control actions *when nonlethal measures have been unsuccessful*

**5. Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is inevitable given the expanding numbers in other Western States and educate the public on the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California.**

Suggestions:

a) Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is inevitable given the expanding numbers in other Western States. Educate *and inform* the public with *science-based information on gray wolves and the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California.*

b) Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is *highly likely (or reasonably foreseeable)* given the expanding numbers (*or populations*) in other Western States and educate the public on the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California

c) Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is *highly likely* given the expanding numbers in other Western States. Educate *and inform* the public with *science-based information on gray wolves and the conservation and management needs for wolves in California, as well as the value of having wolves in California.*

The Plan will address the various opportunities and limitations on authority, for CDFW to accomplish the above purposes while accounting for uncertain future listing status under the Federal Endangered Species Act and potential listing under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA).

The Director of CDFW has authorized staff to develop this Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) to guide the CDFW in developing a plan (consistent with the above **GOALS**) for gray wolves, which are expected to make their way to California from growing populations in neighboring states, particularly Oregon. The SWG will develop recommendations for the CDFW to consider as the draft Plan is developed. All SWG products will be conveyed to the CDFW; however, this does not mean that all recommendations will necessarily be incorporated in the draft or final plan. Members of the SWG represent livestock ranching and agriculture, conservation groups, biologists, hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts. The composition of the SWG may change further as this process to develop a California Wolf Plan (Plan) proceeds.

## **II. Participation**

**Interests Represented.** SWG members represent interests that may be substantially affected by the recovery of wolves in California. The members have a variety of interests, experience with wolf or related natural resource issues, and willingness to work together in a collaborative, consensus process. In order to foster creative problem solving, members are encouraged to voice their individual viewpoints and ideas. In order to broaden and strengthen the chances of successful collaboration for the anticipated final recommendations, members are expected to bring the perspectives of their constituent groups, as well as others with similar interests, to the SWG process.

**Meeting Attendance.** Members are expected to make a good faith effort to attend all full meetings. It is expected that the group will only meet several times prior to release of a draft Plan. As such, if a member misses two meetings (unless unforeseen circumstances arise) they will no longer be considered an active SWG member and will not be asked to participate in future meetings.

If a member cannot attend, he or she may designate an individual to attend in their place to represent their interests (an alternate). The alternate should be knowledgeable about wolf issues and the topics to be discussed at the meeting. The alternate's primary responsibility is to inform the member about the deliberations at the conclusion of the meeting. It is the responsibility of the member to prepare the alternate for the meeting by sharing background information and an overview of the deliberations leading up to the meeting. Sending an alternate does not substitute for meeting attendance.

The member will strive to provide the name and background of the alternate as soon as possible, and no later than five days, in advance of the meeting. All individuals attending for members are bound by these Operating Principles. The facilitator will work with alternates to assist as needed in making their participation as constructive as possible.

**Withdrawal from the SWG.** Any member may withdraw from the SWG at any time without prejudice. Communication about the reasons for withdrawing, if related to the SWG process, will be appreciated. Good faith provisions apply to those who withdraw.

The decision to replace a member will depend on factors such as how far along the group is in the process, whether addition of a new member would be disruptive, and whether the loss of the interests represented by the withdrawing member creates a serious deficiency for on the SWG in terms of expertise and/or interests. Authority for decisions about replacing members rests with the CDFW Director. Any replacement member, or alternate, is expected to accept the process "as it stands" at the point in time when they first participate.

### III. Organizational Structure

**SWG Members.** The members are working together to achieve a mutually acceptable outcome that satisfies, to the greatest degree possible, the interests of all participants. In order for the Plan to be acceptable and implementable, those involved in developing the plan agree to work together to produce recommendations that integrate the mandates, concerns, and ideas of all those significantly affected by the plan. All SWG members agree to:

- Attend meetings and follow through on promises and commitments;
- Bring concerns from their interest group or organization up for discussion at the earliest feasible point in the process;
- Share all relevant information that will assist the group in achieving its goals;
- Keep its organization's representatives informed of potential decisions and actions, in order to expedite approval for the final product;
- Support the eventual product if they have concurred in it; and
- Concur in decisions about the Stakeholder SWG process, including overseeing the implementation of the operating principles.

SWG members recognize that final decision-making authority to develop a California Wolf Plan rests with the CDFW. The CDFW is committed to developing a plan that has achieved concurrence and support from the range of stakeholders, to the extent possible.

The SWG will have assistance from CDFW staff who will attend all meetings.. While CDFW staff may sit at the table and participate in the SWG deliberations as needed, they are not SWG members. Karen Kovacs, Northern Region

Wildlife Program Manager is the CDFW team leader for this effort. Eric Loft, Wildlife Program Branch Chief; Angela Donlan, Senior Staff Counsel; Mark Stopher, Senior Policy Advisor; and other CDFW staff will support the SWG.

**Facilitation.** CDFW prefers to use professional facilitators and is exploring the possibility of doing so for the SWG. Until that possibility is resolved, CDFW will utilize trained facilitators when possible from within CDFW. The facilitator will not take positions on the issues before the SWG. The facilitator will work to ensure that the process runs smoothly. The facilitator's role usually includes developing draft agendas, distributing meeting materials, facilitating meetings, working to resolve any impasse that may arise, preparing meeting summaries, and other tasks as requested.

**Sub-Groups.** As necessary, the SWG may choose to form sub-groups. The SWG will designate sub-group members as needed for any anticipated tasks and outcomes. At the direction of the SWG, sub-group members may develop draft products and make recommendations to the SWG. Sub-groups will not make decisions on behalf of the SWG. Any SWG member can be a member of a sub-group.

#### **IV. Meetings**

**Open to the Public.** All SWG meetings will be open to the public. However, the CDFW expects that the range of public perspectives will be included in the SWG process primarily through the involvement of the SWG members. As such, there will only be a 15 minute period for public comment at the end of each SWG meeting. Members of the public are encouraged to submit written comments on the work of the SWG which will then be distributed to all members for consideration.

**Agendas.** Proposed meeting agendas will be drafted by the facilitator in consultation with SWG members, circulated in advance of meetings, and approved or revised at the beginning of each meeting.

**Action Item Memos.** In order to assist the SWG in documenting its progress and activities, within ten business days of each meeting the Facilitator will prepare and distribute an action items memo. These memos will convey major decisions and ensure that timelines for completing agreed upon actions are clear to all participants. These will be distributed to CDFW staff and all SWG members for review prior to preparing a final memo.

**Breaks and Caucuses.** Meetings may be suspended at any time at the request of any member to allow consultation among SWG members. Requests should be respectful of all members' time. If the use of caucuses becomes disruptive, the SWG will revisit the process.

#### **V. Decision-Making and Commitments**

**Consensus.** The SWG will strive to operate by consensus. Consensus is defined as all SWG members can live with the recommendation or decision. All recommendations and materials will be reviewed and discussed by the SWG before being forwarded to the CDFW for their consideration.

**Decision Making.** Decisions will be made by consensus of those SWG members present at a meeting. If the members present at a meeting reach consensus on a major product, the facilitator will convey the results to those absent from the meeting and assess their ability to agree. Full consensus will not be achieved until all members have confirmed agreement.

**Absence of Consensus.** If full consensus cannot be reached the SWG may choose to articulate areas of agreement and disagreement and the reasons why differences continue to exist, or communicate separate sets of recommendations (i.e., majority and minority reports).

If the SWG chooses to articulate areas of agreement and disagreement, members representing the different perspectives on specific issues will be asked to prepare language reflecting their views. The language should clearly identify the issues and information needs and uncertainties. In addition, those members that support each perspective will be identified.



If separate sets of recommendations (i.e., majority and minority reports) are conveyed to the CDFW, members representing the minority point of view will be asked to prepare a communication reflecting their views.

## **VI. Safeguards for the Members**

**Good Faith.** All members agree to act in good faith in all aspects of the collaborative effort. As such, members will consider the input and viewpoint of other participants and conduct themselves in a manner that promotes joint problem solving and collaboration.

Acting in good faith also requires that: specific proposals made in open and frank problem solving conversations not be used against any other member in the future; personal attacks and prejudiced statements are not acceptable; negative generalizations are not productive and have the potential to impede the ability of the SWG to reach consensus; individuals not represent their personal or organization's views as views of the SWG, and members express consistent views and opinions in the SWG and in other forums, including in press contacts.

Should a SWG member be found to be acting in bad faith the facilitator will be asked to talk with the individual(s) about the situation. A variety of approaches will be explored, accordingly, to redress the concerns. The authority to replace and/or remove a member from the SWG rests with the CDFW Director.

**Rights in Other Forums.** Participation in the SWG process does not limit the rights of any member. Members will make a good faith effort to notify one another in advance, if another action outside the process will be initiated or pursued, which will affect the terms of proposals, recommendations, or agreements being discussed.

**Public Communications.** All SWG members agree to refrain from making negative comments about or characterizing the views of other SWG members in contacts with the press, or on internet web postings, in newsletters or in email or letter communications to members of respective stakeholder groups. They also agree not to knowingly mischaracterize the positions and views of any other party, nor their own, in public forums.

## **VII. Process Suggestions/Ground Rules**

SWG members agree to consider and apply the following process suggestions and ground rules:

- Seek to learn and understand each other's perspective.
- Encourage respectful, candid, and constructive discussions.
- Provide balance of speaking time.
- Seek to resolve differences and reach consensus.
- As appropriate, discuss topics together rather than in isolation.
- Make every effort to avoid surprises.
- Limit sidebars.
- Turn off cell phones or put them in the non-ring mode during formal meeting sessions.

## **VIII. Schedule**

In developing its initial recommendations, the SWG will meet approximately every other month, beginning in late February 2013 and ending in June 2014. Exact dates will be determined by CDFW in consultation with SWG members. CDFW staff may also be holding public meetings during preparation of the draft plan. The CDFW is scheduled to complete its initial draft Plan by August 31, 2013. The draft will then be available for 45 days to the SWG for their review, and a panel of peer reviewers. Comments from peer reviewers and consensus comments by the SWG will be addressed by CDFW as appropriate and proposed plan revisions will be shared with the SWG. Upon completion of the draft plan, CDFW will release the plan for a 90-day public review process.

Final approval of a Wolf Plan, by the CDFW, is anticipated by June 30, 2014.