



**Meeting Report
Wolf-Livestock Stakeholder Subgroup
May 6, 2014**

CDFW Wildlife Branch Conference Room
1812 9th Street,
Sacramento, CA 95811



California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Meeting Objectives and Mechanics	3
3.0 Meeting Outputs	3
Introductions and Housekeeping	3
Comments and Corrections on April 9, 2014 Meeting Report	4
Review/Discuss CDFW Livestock Conflict Concept	4
Summary and Wrap-up.....	4
Action Items	4
APPENDIX A. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS	5
APPENDIX B. PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS	6
APPENDIX C. AGENDA.....	7
APPENDIX D. PROPOSED PHASE 1 WOLF-LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION STRATEGY	8
APPENDIX E. EMAIL FROM MR. STOPHER TO STAKEHOLDERS 5/2/14	12

1.0 Introduction

On May 6, 2014 the Wolf-Livestock Interactions Subgroup (WLIS) of the California Wolf Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) convened in the Conference Room of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Branch Office in Sacramento. This was the eighth meeting of the WLIS, which was established to assist the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW, Department) in developing recommendations on a consensus-driven framework of management strategies for effectively dealing with potential wolf impacts on California's livestock populations.

2.0 Meeting Objectives and Mechanics

The purpose of the meeting was to continue building consensus through discussion of potential topics for inclusion in a Wolf-Livestock Interactions chapter in the California Wolf Plan.

The primary objective of the meeting was to discuss a proposed Phase 1 Wolf-Livestock Depredation Strategy.

The meeting was attended in person by five stakeholders and three CDFW staff, with two additional stakeholders attending via conference line. Appendix A provides a list of participants, their affiliations, and their contact information. In addition, one legislative representative attended in person, and one via conference line. Appendix B provides those individual's names. Finally, also attending via conference line was Mr. Sam Magill, who will be the meeting facilitator once the contract with his company Kearns and West is finalized.

3.0 Meeting Outputs

Introductions and Housekeeping

Attendees introduced themselves for the benefit of the members attending via conference line. Then Ms. Kovacs informed the group that she had an appointment scheduled that afternoon with Director Bonham to convey stakeholders' concerns about the timeframe for plan completion, and would send an email to the SWG with the results of that conversation. Another update was a document she received from U.S.D.A. Wildlife Services having to do with the passage of the Farm Bill, which included compensation for livestock losses from federally listed species. One member asked whether the Department plans to circulate to the SWG the edited version of the Wolf-Livestock Interactions chapter that contains comments as provided by the Wolf-Livestock subgroup, to which Mr. Stopher explained that those comments have been incorporated where

appropriate, and he expects the SWG to have another opportunity to view it once he and Ms. Kovacs have reviewed it again. A draft of a diseases chapter had been produced and it will also be provided to the SWG for review.

Comments and Corrections on April 9, 2014 Meeting Report

No comments were offered.

Review/Discuss CDFW Livestock Conflict Concept

Mr. Stopher led the group in a discussion of the first draft of a proposed Phase 1 Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy (Appendix D), and a related email he drafted to the group (Appendix E). WLIS members made specific suggestions to clarify portions of the document, and also asked clarifying questions about general aspects of the concept. All portions of the document were discussed with the exception of Items M-Q, and Mr. Stopher asked the group to send any additional questions or comments to him by May 13.

Summary and Wrap-up

The next meeting is scheduled for May 20, and it was agreed to schedule a subsequent meeting for two weeks after. It was decided to meet on June 3, from 11am to 2pm in Redding.

Action Items

- Forward the document from Wildlife Services referencing compensation for livestock depredations by federally listed species in the Farm Bill
- Ms. Lauren Richie will send a link to the website of the Mexican Wolf Coexistence Council
- Change “agricultural Extension” to “Cooperative Extension” in Item D-3 of the proposed Phase 1 Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy document
- Stakeholders will provide additional comments or suggestions to Mr. Stopher by May 13, 2014.

**APPENDIX A
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS**

Name	Affiliation	Email
Stakeholders		
Noelle Cremers	California Farm Bureau	ncremers@cfbf.com
Bob Timm	UC Agriculture and Natural Resources	rmtimm@ucanr.edu
Pat Griffin	CA Agriculture Commission – Siskiyou Co.	pgriffin@co.siskiyou.ca.us
Kirk Wilbur	CA Cattlemen’s Association	kirk@calcattlemen.org
Amaroq Weiss	Center for Biological Diversity	aweiss@biologicaldiversity.org
Lauren Richie	CA Wolf Center	lauren.richie@californiawolfcenter.org
Pamela Flick	Defenders of Wildlife	pflick@defenders.org
California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff		
Karen Kovacs	Wildlife Program Manager – Region 1; Wolf Management Planning Program Lead	karen.kovacs@wildlife.ca.gov
Karen Converse	Environmental Scientist – Lands Program	karen.converse@wildlife.ca.gov
Mark Stopher	Senior Policy Advisor	mark.stopher@wildlife.ca.gov

**APPENDIX B
PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS AND COMMENTS**

Legislative Representatives		
Name	Affiliation	Email
Christine Rydell	Senator Jim Nielsen's Office	christine.rydell@sen.ca.gov
Catherine Bird	Senator Ted Gaines's Office	catherine.bird@sen.ca.gov

APPENDIX C – AGENDA

PROPOSED AGENDA

Wolf-Livestock Subgroup
9-12 AM May 6, 2014
1812 Ninth Street, 2nd Floor conference room, Sacramento
Teleconference Line 888.379.9287, PC 476990

*Parking on the street (bring lots of quarters) or parking garages on both 10th and 11th streets between “O” and “P” streets

1. Introductions and Housekeeping
2. Comments and corrections on meeting report for April 9, 2014
3. Review/discuss CDFW livestock conflict concept
 - Review email dated May 2 from Stopher to members
 - Review Version 1.0 Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
4. Discuss next steps
 - Resolution of questions or tasks generated by previous agenda topic
 - Next meeting May 20

Public questions (last ten minutes)

APPENDIX D
PROPOSED PHASE 1 WOLF-LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION STRATEGY

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
Version 1.0 05052014

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION WITH MEMBERS OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

	Element	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife
A	Should the state provide non-lethal deterrent assistance?	Yes
B	If yes, what types	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide technical information (e.g. telephone and email assistance, web access to information, local public meetings). 2. On-site evaluations and meeting with landowners. 3. Focused disclosure of locations for wolves or packs determined previously to have depredated livestock. 4. Technical assistance, funding and approval for Wolf Damage Prevention Cooperative Agreements.
C	OR and WA develop deterrence plans, should CA?	<p>Yes. Titled as a Wolf Damage Prevention Cooperative Agreements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implemented in priority counties with confirmed wolf presence in proximity to livestock depredation 2. Cost share funding up to \$5,000 annually by State for CDFW approved plans¹ 3. Plans are valid for 12 month period from time of approval and may be renewed or amended. 4. CDFW may cap the funds to be allocated by county.
D	Potential cooperating entities for development of Wolf Damage Prevention Cooperative Agreements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USDA Wildlife Services 2. County Agricultural Commissioner 3. Univ. of CA agricultural Extension
E	Should CFDW inform livestock producers of proximity to collared wolves?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Focused disclosure of wolf locations for wolves or wolf packs which have previously depredated livestock.</p>
F	Should non-injurious harassment of wolves be allowed?	Yes.
G	If yes, under what conditions?	When wolves are within 0.25 mile of livestock.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
Version 1.0 05052014

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION WITH MEMBERS OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

H	Should injurious harassment of wolves be allowed (e.g. rubber bullets, bean bag shells, paintballs and cracker shells)?	Yes. Under the following conditions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While a wolf is in the act of pursuing, biting, killing or consuming livestock. 2. All injurious harassment of wolves must be reported to CDFW within 24 hours 3. Landowner must provide access to CDFW to investigate incident.
I	Should there be a state managed compensation program?	Yes
J	If yes, which entity should handle claims and payments?	Options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CA Victim's Compensation and Government Claims Board 2. CA Dept. of Food and Agriculture 3. CDFW
K	If, yes, how should the program operate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Livestock producer must notify CDFW within 24 hours of discovery of dead livestock 2. Protect the carcass(es) and site and provide access to CDFW to investigate 3. File a claim within 14 days of CDFW determination of confirmed or probable wolf depredation 4. 100% of fair market value for confirmedⁱⁱ 5. 50% for probable 6. After two confirmed depredation incidents in any twelve month period, future compensation for the affected producer is available only if that producer has an approved Wolf Damage Prevention Cooperative Agreement with CDFW.
L	Which entity must investigate and confirm livestock depredation?	CDFW
M	Should relocation of depredating wolves to another location in California be an option?	No.
N	Should lethal take be included as part of the strategy?	No ⁱⁱⁱ
O	If yes, under what conditions or standards is lethal take authorized?	Not applicable
P	Should non-lethal deterrents be	Not applicable

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
Version 1.0 05052014
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION WITH MEMBERS OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

	required before lethal take is authorized?	
Q	How should state agency efforts be funded? ^{iv}	Unknown.

ⁱ Fund plans in the chronological order received on a July 1-June 30 fiscal year basis until annual funds are exhausted

ⁱⁱ Process claims in the chronological order received and pay claims on a July 1-June 30 fiscal year basis until annual funds are exhausted.

ⁱⁱⁱ Not during phase I when wolves are first becoming established in California

^{iv} Funding categories for consideration include:

- CDFW personnel costs
- CDFW operating expenses (e.g. office space and equipment, vehicles, field equipment, GPS collars, etc.)
- Compensation fund
- Cost share funding for Wolf Damage Prevention Cooperative Agreements
- Research and Resource Assessment

APPENDIX E
EMAIL FROM MR. STOPHER TO STAKEHOLDERS 5/2/14

Members

I've been considering how to move forward with development of the strategy to include in the Wolf Plan and I have a proposal. Actually, it is not a proposal in the sense that term is usually used. I intend to provide to you a moderately detailed concept for the purpose of generating a dialogue and a proposal that CDFW can put in the first draft of the plan, by the end of May. Consider the following:

First, I suggest that under conditions today, implementation of a wolf plan will require funding, regulations and commitments that do not, or may not, currently exist. And I don't think those current limitations should prevent CDFW, and the SWG, from advocating for a plan that will be successful only with new commitments (again, of funding, authority and effort). I think that is how we have to approach this or we won't be able to say what is needed.

Second, we lack the foreknowledge of when, where and how many wolves will become established in, for example, the next ten years in California. Consequently I suggest we consider a Phase I strategy for the first ten years, or until 4 successful breeding pairs are documented in California. Based on the Oregon and Washington experiences, those two objectives may occur about the same time. Phase I would end when either objective is reached and I am assuming that process will occur at a rate that will allow development of a Phase II informed by experiences in the interim and other new information.

Third, we cannot predict or control status under the Federal ESA or CESA so I suggest that the strategy not be dependent on either.

Fourth, I propose that we consider a strategy for wolf-livestock interactions which does not require defining landscape management units or wolf population objectives. We may do that under the topic of conservation objectives, but I am not, in the moment, convinced that the wolf-livestock management strategy must fold that in.

I will share this concept with you Monday morning (it still needs work) along with an agenda for the Tuesday meeting. However, you can expect that this topic will be the principal suggested agenda item.

To be clear, I am not committed irrevocably to the concept I will share and it represents only an approach which I have generated to facilitate getting to a proposal which has a chance of being supported by the SWG. It has not been vetted through CDFW's wolf team yet. I've considered the elements each caucus provided as part of a strategy, our joint fact finding and conversations I've had with most of you.

Finally, given that this will be provided as the Department's initial formulation of a strategy which will certainly evolve in our dialogue, it will not be helpful to broadcast this indiscriminately or misrepresent this as the Department's position. I will appreciate your discretion in this.

Mark Stopher
Senior Policy Advisor
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
601 Locust Street
Redding, CA 96001
Office 530.225.2275 Cell 530.945.1344
Mark.Stopher@wildlife.ca.gov
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/>