



**Meeting Report
Wolf-Livestock Stakeholder Subgroup
June 19, 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 Logistics	3
Updates/Housekeeping	3
Discuss CESA Listing Implications	4
Comments on Draft Wolf-Livestock Chapter	4
Review/Discuss Recommendations from Caucuses on CDFW Livestock Conflict Concept	5
Discuss Action Items and Next Steps	5
APPENDIX A. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS	7
APPENDIX B. AGENDA	8
APPENDIX C. PHASE I WOLF-LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION STRATEGY – ENVIRONMENTAL CAUCUS COMMENTS	9
APPENDIX D. PHASE I WOLF-LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION STRATEGY – AGRICULTURE CAUCUS COMMENTS	13

1.0 Introduction

On June 19, 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 tenth 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.

Objectives of the meeting as initially planned were:

- Discuss CESA listing implication for the SWG and Wolf Plan
- Continue development of Wolf-Livestock chapter with focus on CDFW Livestock Conflict Concept

The meeting was attended in person by the meeting facilitator Sam Magill, seven stakeholders and five CDFW staff. Appendix A provides a list of participants, their affiliations, and their contact information. Appendix B contains the meeting agenda.

3.0 Meeting Outputs

Introductions and Logistics

After the group members introduced themselves, Mr. Sam Magill read over the agenda and asked for any questions.

Updates/Housekeeping

- Ms. Karin Vardaman will present this group's update at the next full SWG meeting
- Members asked for additional time to review the May 20 meeting report, so the group was asked to provide their comments by end of day on Friday, June 20th.
- The discussion to schedule another meeting was postponed until the end of today's meeting

Discuss CESA Listing Implications

The California Fish and Game Commission decided at their June 4, 2014 meeting in Fortuna, to list the gray wolf as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act. Department staff explained that the goal is to continue with completion of the plan. The primary implication of the listing decision is that lethal take for management of wolves will no longer be an option. Further, the Department may have to comply with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions for plan development, and Department legal staff will attend the next SWG to provide further information about that. If the group can come to consensus with the management plan there may be an opportunity for legislative changes that would restore some management options, however lethal take remains unauthorized as long as the species is federally listed. The plan may therefore contain proposed actions that the Department does not have statutory authority to implement at this time. Mr. Magill requested that members send him any questions they would like added to a list of frequently asked questions by the end of the day on Friday, June 20th.

Comments on Draft Wolf-Livestock Chapter

This portion of the meeting consisted of a discussion of comments of the draft wolf-livestock interactions chapter. The draft chapter containing comments from each of the agriculture and environmental caucuses were projected, and commenters provided further explanation as needed.

In general, comments from the agriculture caucus consisted of: 1) correct errors in citing literature; 2) clarify information on the results of studies on direct and indirect effects of wolf depredation on cattle; 3) stress the impact on individual producers from depredation on cattle; 4) cite additional authors, several of which were provided by this caucus, of studies on indirect impacts of wolves on cattle; 5) include results of Collinge et al. (2008) that demonstrates a greater likelihood by wolves to depredate cattle over other predators; 6) mention the possibility that some wolves may prefer livestock over native ungulates and other natural prey; 7) include a statement about the variable effectiveness of non-lethal techniques; and 8) clarify that targeted removal of problem predators may reduce livestock loss more than sport hunting of wolves.

General comments from the environmental caucus consisted of: 1) include mention in the first paragraph on the use of deterrents as affecting the occurrence of depredations; 2) include overreporting of livestock losses as a potential cause for differences between NASS reports and confirmed losses; 3) provide context for the statement that cattle depredations increased during the period of wolf recolonization (pg. 3); 4) provide additional detail – including other studies – on the use of fladry as a non-lethal technique

(pg. 7); 5) include citations (provided) that demonstrate the effectiveness of livestock protection dogs; 6) include a note of caution in interpreting the results of the Ramler et al. (2014) paper; and 7) mention the much greater incidence of livestock losses to digestive problems and weather which can be mitigated by producers.

Review/Discuss Recommendations from Caucuses on CDFW Livestock Conflict Concept

Mr. Stopher opened the discussion of this topic by reminding the group of the concept of a phased approach to wolf conservation/management in California that involves identifying temporal and demographic parameters that define the phase and its limits, as opposed to an objective for specific wolf numbers. The proposed parameters were established by considering the experience in Oregon, in that after 15 years of natural wolf recolonization, the state counted six breeding pairs. Should California's experience follow a similar path, the realization of 15 years or six breeding pairs could mark the beginning of the second phase. This approach would allow the Department sufficient time to monitor the wolf population, and establish parameters for Phase 2 based on direct observations of wolf behavior in California; in other words, to manage adaptively. The group then commenced to discuss their comments on the Phase 1 Depredation Strategy document.

General comments (see Appendix C) from the agriculture caucus included: 1) the Department should be allowed to use lethal control methods, contingent on federal listing status, to control wolves that are chronically depredating livestock, and develop guidelines for such take.

General comments (see Appendix D) from the environmental caucus included: 1) disclosure of wolf locations to potentially affected producers in the area should consist of providing a polygon of the wolf pack's territory; 2) any non-injurious harassment allowed should follow CESA guidance and buffer zones around known dens and rendezvous sites should be established, within which harassment cannot be used; 3) this caucus is researching whether or not there is any demonstrable effect of teaching wolves to avoid an area prior to livestock presence – if not then wolves should only be chased from areas with livestock already present; 4) Item K6 needs clarification, and should only include one confirmed depredation incident per 12 month period; 5) CDFW should have ultimate authority for investigating and confirming livestock depredations; 6) this caucus needs additional information before forming an opinion on relocating depredating wolves to another part of California; 7) lethal take is not allowed under CESA.

Discuss Action Items and Next Steps

At this point the topic of another meeting was discussed. Mr. Stopher noted that the Department has enough feedback from the group to develop the wolf-livestock interactions strategies. He asked the group if they felt there was need for another

meeting, and if so, to discuss what topics. The group decided that, although there are one or two items upon which they will likely not reach consensus, there are some items that, with further discussion, the caucuses could come closer to agreement on. They decided therefore, to schedule another meeting. Mr. Magill will poll the group for possible dates and times. Further, he requested that any CESA-related questions for the FAQ be sent to him by the end of the day on Friday, June 20th, and any comments on the May 20th meeting report be sent to Karen Converse, also by the end of the day on Friday, June 20th. Lastly, Mr. Stopher will send the group the three sets of comments generated on the draft chapter.

**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
Lesa Eidman	California Woolgrowers Association	lesa@woolgrowers.org
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
Karin Vardaman	CA Wolf Center	karin.vardaman@californiawolfcenter.org
California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff		
Karen Kovacs	Wildlife Program Manager – Region 1	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
Pete Figura	Environmental Scientist – Region 1	pete.figura@wildlife.ca.gov
Erin Reddy	Scientific Aid – Lands Program	erin.reddy@wildlife.ca.gov

APPENDIX B – AGENDA

PROPOSED AGENDA

Wolf-Livestock Subgroup

10-1 PM June 19, 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

Objectives:

- Discuss CESA listing implication for the SWG and Wolf Plan
 - Continue development of Wolf-Livestock chapter with focus on CDFW Livestock Conflict Concept
1. Introductions and Logistics (5 minutes)
 2. Updates/Housekeeping (10 minutes)
 - a. Identify Stakeholder member for update at next SWG meeting
 - b. Review, discuss, and revise May 20 meeting report
 - c. Discuss Wolf-Livestock Subgroup Scheduling
 3. Discuss CESA listing implications (15 minutes)
 - a. DFW perspective on listing
 - b. Implications of listing on Plan development
 4. Comments on draft wolf-livestock chapter (45 minutes)
 5. BREAK (15 minutes)
 6. Review/discuss recommendations from caucuses on CDFW livestock conflict concept (70 minutes)
 - Version 1.0 edited May 19, 2014 Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
 7. Public questions (10 minutes)
 8. Discuss Action Items and Next Steps (10 minutes)
 - Resolution of questions or tasks generated by previous agenda topic
 - Action Item Review

APPENDIX C
PHASE I WOLF-LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION STRATEGY
ENVIRONMENTAL CAUCUS COMMENTS

	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 4. Loan of equipment 5. 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 sympatric distributions of wolves and livestock. List of priority counties to be updated annually by CDFW. 2. Cost share funding up to \$5,000 annually by State for CDFW approved plansⁱ 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. 5. On-site evaluation by CDFW required. 6. Livestock producer must report on implementation and effectiveness of the actions. 7. An evaluation by CDFW is required prior to amending or renewing an Agreement.

Formatted

Comment [MS1]: Unresolved issues and extent of disclosure. Possible elements include requirement to enroll for notification, determine geographic precision, and wolf proximity to area of interest, follow-up when wolves are not proximate

Comment [a2]: Provide polygon info of pack range to potentially affected producers in that area.

Comment [MS3]: Possible multi-year agreements tied to what they are doing on the ground

Comment [MS4]: How would this be determined? Wolf population, depredation experience, proportional to risk. Is there a role for County AG Commissioners in priority counties in making this determination?

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
Version 2.0 05292014
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION WITH MEMBERS OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

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 Cooperative Extension 4. CDFA 5. USFWS 6. NRCS 7. USDA Farm Services
E	Should CDFW inform livestock producers of proximity to collared wolves?	Yes. Focused disclosure of locations for wolves or packs
F	Should non-injurious harassment of wolves be allowed?	<p>Yes. Non-injurious harassment includes noise (e.g. shouting, airhorns, cracker shells, and discharging firearms into the ground), chasing wolves on foot, horseback or motorized vehicle for no more than 0.24 mile, RAG boxes, and other methods yet to be determined.</p> <p>No harassment within known den or rendezvous sites/ CDFW to advise affected livestock producers.</p>
G	If yes, under what conditions?	When wolves are within 0.25 mile of livestock or pasture where livestock will be placed within two weeks.
H	Should non-lethal injurious harassment of wolves be allowed (e.g. rubber bullets, bean bag shells, and paintballs)?	<p>Yes. Under the following conditions:</p> <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 biologist to investigate incident.
I	Should there be a state managed compensation program?	Yes
J	If yes, which entity should handle claims and payments?	<p>Options:</p> <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

Comment [a5]: Provide polygon info of pack range to potentially affected producers in that area.

Comment [a6]: Some of this may not be applicable under CESA.

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [a7]: If we find out that some of the above is allowable under CESA, buffer zones should be established by the agency within which harassment cannot be used.

Comment [a8]: Conservation caucus researching whether chasing wolves from areas before livestock present has verified demonstrable effect in teaching wolves not to come near livestock; if no scientific basis for this, then should only be chased if livestock present.

Comment [a10]: May not be applicable under CESA.

Comment [MS9]: For rubber bullets we may want to require pre-authorization, ammunition limitations and guidance.

Comment [MS11]: CA has a government claims process which, with some adaptations could be used. May require regulations.

		<p>provide access to CDFW to investigate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> File a claim within 6 months <u>days</u> of CDFW determination of confirmed or probable wolf depredation 100% of fair market value for confirmedⁱⁱ 50% for probable After <u>two</u> confirmed depredation incidents in any twelve month <u>period</u>, 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 <u>has ultimate authority for investigation and confirmation of all livestock depredations. with assistance from</u> USDA Wildlife Services <u>assistance may be sought</u> where available.
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 . <u>Not applicable under CESA.</u>
O	If yes, under what conditions or standards is lethal take authorized?	Not applicable. <u>See above (N.).</u>
P	Should non-lethal deterrents be required before lethal take is authorized?	Not applicable. <u>See above (N.).</u>
Q	How should state agency efforts be funded? ^{iv}	Unknown.

Comment [MS12]: Current guidelines for claims against State of CA must be filed within 6 months. This is intended to be consistent with that standard.

Comment [a13]: Should be one, not two.

Comment [a14]: This needs to be word-smithed; as written, it looks like it starts over every year and there is a "free" depredation (or two, as currently written) every 12 months.

Comment [a15]: Conservation caucus doing additional investigation on this topic before arriving at firm conclusion.

Comment [MS16]: AG caucus comment. DFW or its agents or contractors should be able to lethally control wolves that are depredating livestock regardless of what stage of the plan we're in. WA's plan allows lethal control (contingent on federal listing status) during all stages for wolves involved in repeated livestock depredations. OR plan also allows lethal control during all stages.

Comment [MS17]: AG caucus comment. Develop guidelines for lethal take of wolves involved in livestock depredations.

Comment [MS18]: AG caucus comment. Develop guidelines for lethal take of wolves involved in livestock depredations.

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 B
PHASE I WOLF-LIVESTOCK DEPREDATION STRATEGY
AGRICULTURE CAUCUS COMMENTS

	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. 3-4. <u>Loan of equipment</u> 4-5. 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 <u>Agreements</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implemented in priority counties with confirmed sympatric distributions of wolves and presence in proximity to livestock <u>depredation</u> 2. Cost share funding up to \$5,000 annually by State for CDFW approved plansⁱ 3. Plans are valid for 12 month period from time of approval and may be renewed or <u>amended</u>. 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-Cooperative Extension 4. <u>C DFA</u> 5. <u>USFWS</u> 6. <u>NRCS</u> 7. <u>USDA Farm Services</u> 3-

Formatted

Comment [MS1]: Unresolved issues and extent of disclosure. C Bird – public safety, poss criteria of enrolling for notification, determine geographic precision, and wolf proximity to area of interest

Comment [MS2]: Agreements should include reporting, tied to an on-site evaluation, protect proprietary information

Comment [MS3]: Create and maintain a list of eligible counties or portions of counties

Comment [MS4]: Possible multi-year agreements tied to what they are doing on the ground

Formatted: Font: +Body (Calibri), 12 pt

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

E	Should CDFW inform livestock producers of proximity to collared wolves?	Yes. Focused disclosure of wolf locations for wolves or wolf packs which have previously depredated in proximity to <u>livestock.</u>
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 <u>or locations where livestock will be located within a two week period.</u>
H	Should <u>non-lethal</u> injurious harassment of wolves be allowed (e.g. rubber bullets, bean bag shells, <u>and</u> paintballs <u>and cracker shells</u>)?	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 <u>program</u> ?	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 <u>3014</u> 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.

Comment [MS5]: Keep consistent with above revisions

Comment [MS6]: Need to assess feasibility and risks

Comment [MS7]: Consider a permit and training

Comment [n8]: What would there be to investigate? Why is this necessary?

Comment [MS9]: Research existing statutes about compensation

Comment [MS10]: AG 30 days is what's required for eligibility under FSA's livestock indemnity payments.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Phase I Wolf-livestock Depredation Strategy
Version 1.0 0519052014

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION WITH MEMBERS OF THE STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

L	Which entity must investigate and confirm livestock depredation?	<u>USDA Wildlife Services or CDFW. Whichever agency has a qualified person available first and is acceptable to livestock owner.</u>
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 <u>Yes</u>
O	If yes, under what conditions or standards is lethal take authorized?	Not applicable <u><2 Breeding Pairs, no take, unless there are three documented depredations by a pack in a six month period. >2 Breeding Pairs, follow Washington Model (page 85-89 of Washington Wolf Conservation and Management Plan)</u>
P	Should non-lethal deterrents be required before lethal take is authorized?	Not applicable <u>See above, DFW would be allowed to waive the requirement if local conditions prevent the feasible implementation of non-lethal deterrents.</u>
Q	How should state agency efforts be funded? ^{iv}	Unknown.

Comment [MS11]: AG DFW or its agents or contractors should be able to lethally control wolves that are depredating livestock regardless of what stage of the plan we're in. WA's plan allows lethal control (contingent on federal listing status) during all stages for wolves involved in repeated livestock depredations. OR plan also allows lethal control during all stages.

Comment [MS12]: AG Develop guidelines for lethal take of wolves involved in livestock depredations.

Comment [n13]: In Oregon there were 8 documented depredations of cattle once they reached two breeding pairs.

Comment [MS14]: AG Develop guidelines for lethal take of wolves involved in livestock depredations.

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