



**Meeting Report  
Stakeholder Working Group  
Meeting on Wolves in California  
June 25, 2014**

CDFW Office of Training and Development  
1740 N. Market Blvd  
Sacramento, CA 95834



Photo Courtesy of Gary Kramer

**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
Welcome, Introductions and Logistics.....	4
Review Agenda and Ground Rules/Operating Principles.....	4
Director Bonham Updates.....	4
DFW Staff Updates .....	6
Legal Implications of CESA Listing .....	7
Summary of subgroup SWG meetings/planning/next steps.....	9
Discussion of SWG Mid-Process Check-in and FAQ.....	11
Discussion of Schedule/CWP Outline .....	12
Continued Discussion of CWP Chapters .....	13
Wrap Up and Action Item Review .....	14
APPENDIX A. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS .....	15
APPENDIX B. PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS AND COMMENTS .....	16
APPENDIX C. AGENDA .....	17
APPENDIX D. WOLF PLAN CHAPTER UPDATES.....	20
APPENDIX E. CESA LISTING FAQ.....	21

## **1.0 Introduction**

On June 25, 2014 the California Wolf Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) reconvened to continue their work toward the development of a California wolf management plan. The meeting took place in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW, Department) Office of Training and Development training center in Sacramento, CA. The group's previous meeting took place on May 28, 2014 in the conference room of the Department's Wildlife Branch office. This was the group's 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **2.0 Meeting Objectives and Mechanics**

The purpose of the meeting was to continue to engage the SWG in the wolf planning process and work toward the completion of a California wolf plan (CWP).

The stated objectives were:

- Develop shared understanding of CESA listing implications for CWP, including DFW legal perspective
- Develop shared understanding of CWP timeline, scheduling, and stakeholder commitments moving forward
- Continue SWG input on draft CWP chapters

The meeting was attended in person by the meeting facilitator Sam Magill, 14 stakeholders, five CDFW staff, and one USFWS staff. Three additional stakeholders attended via conference line. Appendix A provides a list of participants, their affiliations, and their contact information. Also in attendance were two legislative representatives, whose names and contact information are captured in Appendix B. The meeting agenda is provided in Appendix C, and all slides presented are captured in Appendix F.

## **3.0 Meeting Outputs**

The SWG's standing ground rules are:

- 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
- Discuss topics together rather than in isolation
- Make every effort to avoid surprises
- Limit sidebars
- Turn off cell phones/switch to non-ring mode

The SWG's goals as presented in the group's operating principles are:

1. If and when wolves establish in California, seek to conserve biologically sustainable populations of wolves in the state
2. Manage the distribution of wolves in the state where there is adequate habitat
3. 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
4. Manage wolf-livestock conflicts to minimize livestock losses
5. Communicate to the public that natural dispersal of wolves into California is reasonably foreseeable given the expanding populations in the Pacific Northwest, inform the public with science-based information of gray wolves and the conservation and management needs of wolves in California, as well as the effects of having wolves in the state

### **Welcome, Introductions and Logistics**

The meeting began with Ms. Kovacs introducing Sam Magill, the facilitator, who then gave the group some information about himself. Many members were familiar with Mr. Magill through his facilitation of the previous week's subgroup meetings. He then asked people in the room and on the phone to identify themselves, provided the access code for the internet, and discussed parking concerns.

### **Review Agenda and Ground Rules/Operating Principles**

Next Mr. Magill read over the agenda and updated members about the status of the stakeholder assessment he is conducting to ascertain people's views on the stakeholder process, especially in the wake of the recent Fish and Game Commission (FGC) listing of wolves as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). One of the questions asked in the assessment is whether members feel the Operating Principles are still valid, and to date everyone interviewed believed that they are. As a result, Mr. Magill wanted to remind everyone that implied in the Operating Principles is the concept that meeting discussions should be open and serve as brainstorming sessions. Department statements should therefore be understood as part of that brainstorming, and not as stated policy.

### **Director Bonham Updates**

Director Bonham began his session by asking if anyone would be opposed to three additional months to draft the wolf plan. Most agreed that it would provide valuable time for the Department to draft the as-yet-unfinished chapters, and for the SWG to review them, as well as to improve the possibility of coming closer to consensus on some of the more contentious issues. Director Bonham acknowledged that the scientific peer

review process alone will be a logistical challenge, and additional time will allow that process and others to happen more smoothly. He also shared that he had received a letter from Senator Ted Gaines asking for additional time for the SWG to develop the plan, to which he had not yet replied because he wanted to confer with the SWG first.

Some SWG members did express concern that an extension would push SWG commitments into the fall which is a very busy time for them. Further, some members expressed that their involvement in wolf planning seems fruitless because of the limitations that listing under CESA imposes on management capacities. For example, if wolves deplete the ungulate herds in California, there are few options to take except to reduce tag quotas, and the thousands of hours and dollars spent trying to help recover deer and elk will have been wasted. Director Bonham asked if the wolf plan could include strategies for improving habitat for ungulates, to which members responded that the Department has little sway with the federal land agencies which hold the majority of ungulate habitat in California. However members did acknowledge that collaborating with Oregon may be of some benefit. Director Bonham acknowledged that California's wolves will likely be part of a continuous population with Oregon, in which case coordination with Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) may be necessary.

The group then described for the Director some of the challenges and ideas that have been discussed in SWG meetings with respect to setting objectives for a wolf population in California. Some of the challenges include how different California's ungulate populations and human densities are from other western states; and the fact that California's wolf population will be connected only to Oregon's population, whereas Oregon's and other western states' populations are broadly connected. Some of the ideas include setting short term (i.e. 15 years) objectives based on Oregon's first 15 years of wolf recolonization in a first phase for California, then using data from that phase to inform objectives for Phase 2; in other words using an adaptive approach to wolf conservation and management. This differs from the approach used by Oregon and Washington, who set longer term objectives at the beginning of their planning.

The next topic of discussion with the Director was regarding the need to improve California's ungulate populations, particularly through improved habitat conditions. While everyone agrees that this is important, there is some disagreement over whether or where the discussion should take place in the wolf plan. Some members feel it belongs within the discussion on wolf-ungulate interactions, or possibly in the wolf conservation discussion, and others feel it is most appropriate within the deer and elk plans. Director Bonham shared the idea that, because all groups agreed on the need to improve habitat for ungulates, they could create a powerful voice by forming an alliance that works with the Department and federal agencies to accomplish that needed habitat

work. He suggested that identifying where issues should be addressed is one part of the SWG's task, and the other task is for the various stakeholder interests to figure out how to incentivize each other to work toward achieving the plan's goals. The plan should therefore contain a finance and implementation component. For example, in federal recovery, the USFWS starts by articulating what it would take to have healthy populations of a species (their goal), then they identify a series of strategies to put in place to achieve that goal, and then list implementation actions tailored to those strategies, including financing.

Next the Director expressed concern over the concept of adaptive management. He feels that the term may be used at times when an agency doesn't know how to proceed with a problem, or they don't want to make difficult decisions, so they say they will manage adaptively. And in the wolf planning situation, because today's participants are not likely to be the same people making the decisions in 15 or 20 years, and because it can be difficult to secure funding without specifics, it might be important to provide actual numbers in a wolf population objective. Asked if he can foresee himself backing increased monitoring of ungulates in order to get better data for the planning effort, the Director stated that he would value a consensus plan that is in sync with the deer and elk plans, and that prescribes substantial monitoring during Phase 1. Further, a consensus plan that members can stand behind and are willing to vocalize support for to the public is compelling enough that he foresees implementation of needed monitoring sooner rather than later (i.e. no need to wait for wolves to arrive in California).

Finally, one stakeholder mentioned the need for sections in the plan to address funding and legislative or regulatory changes to help move the plan forward. To this Director Bonham responded that the Department has limitations on asking for legislative changes. However he did say that with respect to funding, it is best not to present a large document that lists hundreds of proposed actions and their costs. A funding strategy with a 'top ten' list of prioritized actions is preferable, and subsequent actions can be presented later. One stakeholder responded that, although the Department may be limited in their ability to discuss legislative changes, stakeholders can certainly discuss them separate from the SWG process; Director Bonham agreed. He concluded his visit by requesting that the SWG continue working toward consensus on a California Wolf Plan.

## **DFW Staff Updates**

OR7

Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife has collected scats for DNA samples to try to determine the origins of OR7's mate. The results should be available in a few weeks.

### U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Update

The topic of future SWG meeting dates was originally scheduled for this time but was postponed until the end of the meeting. At this time Ms. Lisa Ellis provided the group with updates on the federal delisting process. The USFWS is still going through the 1.6 million comments they received regarding their proposal to delist wolves in their entire range in the U.S. except the Mexican wolf in New Mexico and Arizona. They were given a six month extension, and are moving forward toward meeting their new deadline. Their goal is to have a decision by the end of 2014. The review is being spearheaded by headquarters in Washington, D.C., with help from some regions.

### Status of the Plan by Chapter

A new plan outline was sent to stakeholders recently (Appendix D), which incorporates new chapters the Department decided to develop. As far as completion of the chapters, the Wolf-Ungulate Interactions, Wolf Conservation, and Wolf-Livestock Interactions Subgroups are continuing to discuss the strategies that will be incorporated into those chapters. The Background, Diseases, Wolf-Human Interactions, Wolf-Domestic Dog Interactions, and Wolf Interactions with Other Wildlife chapters are mostly complete, and Ms. Kovacs expects to be sending those to SWG members for review soon. The Introduction and Executive Summary will be done last. Chapters that have yet to be drafted are Land Management Considerations, Plan Implementation, Research and Information Management, Funding Needs/Opportunities, and Wolf Plan Strategy Summaries.

### **Legal Implications of CESA Listing**

After a break, a list of questions was displayed (Appendix E). This list represents questions which had been submitted to the facilitator by stakeholders after wolves were listed as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act by the FGC in June. The Department had requested these questions with the intention of generating a list of frequently asked questions (FAQ), and they were intended to serve as a discussion prompt for this portion of the meeting. Upon questioning by stakeholders, the Department did acknowledge some value in modifying the FAQ for public use, and the Department's wolf website may be where it is disseminated.

Mr. Magill read the compiled questions, which generated comments and suggestions by members. In particular, the question “Does listing obligate the Department to create a recovery plan” prompted members to suggest a more general question that would generate a more complete answer: “What obligations does the Department have for the species as listed?” Another member suggested that what the Department is obligated to do for a listed species may be a different matter than what it takes to actually achieve recovery. At this point Department’s legal counsel provided some information. Ms. Angela Donlan indicated that the Department’s primary obligation is to ensure that we are operating our permitting programs to regulate take and mitigate impacts.

Ms. Donlan then provided information on the estimated timing of upcoming actions by the Department and the FGC with respect to the wolf listing. The actual timing will depend on how many public comments are received, and how long it will take to respond to them. As currently proposed, the Department will produce a draft Initial Statement of Reason for the FGC by mid-August. This document lays out the purpose of the proposed regulation (i.e. wolf listing), articulates what reports the FGC relied on in formulating it, and discusses related economic impacts. The FGC expects that it will then go to notice in the register on August 24<sup>th</sup>. The FGC will likely hold a discussion hearing to receive public comments and adopt the findings on October 8<sup>th</sup>, and they anticipate receiving the draft Final Statement of Reason from the Department on approximately October 22<sup>nd</sup>. The rulemaking package will then be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law, which has 30 days to review the documents for consistency with existing statute. The FGC anticipates the regulation will become embedded in Title 14 some time between January and April, 2015. Ms. Donlan expressed that this is an optimistic schedule, and expects it to take longer due to the likelihood of a large number of comments.

Next, Ms. Donlan explained to the group that the Department’s legal office is working to review some of the proposed wolf management strategies that the SWG have been developing, to determine their legal status under CESA. In particular, they are working to determine if and how non-injurious harassment of wolves to prevent livestock depredation can be implemented legally given that the law prohibits capturing and pursuing. For example the USFWS has been able to permit some aversive measures that are consistent with the federal definition of take. Once Department counsel has determined whether specific actions will result in take under State law, they will then determine which will require an incidental take permit and which will not. They have not yet begun to assess the legitimacy of any non-lethal injurious types of harassment.

At the request of one stakeholder, Ms. Lisa Ellis provided a brief statement about how the USFWS has dealt with federal ESA take restrictions and harassment for preventing

livestock depredation. Ms. Ellis read the ESA definition of harassment to the group: "...the intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to the extent as to significantly impair normal behavior patterns." According to Ms. Ellis, range riders are not problematic, but chasing down a wolf or interfering with a den is definitely problematic. In discussion with staff from other regions, Ms. Ellis concluded that the definition is applied fairly liberally in terms of allowing people to manage their land and livestock, and with respect to requiring Section 7 Incidental Take Permits, they are largely restricted to activities that may impact a den site. She suggested that the Defenders of Wildlife's booklet on non-injurious harassment methods are all acceptable for use under the ESA definition of harassment.

Asked about the implications of the wolf listing on the plan in terms of CEQA, Ms. Donlan explained that a project proponent is required to analyze the impacts of the project on biological resources whether they are listed or not, and are required to mitigate for any significant impacts. A mandatory finding is required under CEQA if the project will significantly impact a listed species. It depends upon the level of impact but the fact that the species is listed doesn't necessarily mean a greater CEQA requirement. When asked about standards for delisting, Ms. Donlan explained that they are the same regulatory considerations as for listing.

## **Summary of Subgroup SWG Meetings/Planning/Next Steps**

### Wolf Conservation Subgroup (WCS)

- Took comments from previous meeting report
- Discussed CESA listing implications and where we currently stand with respect to the listing scenarios table
- Department is developing a strategy for a phase 1 to 2030 utilizing an adaptive approach
- Department requested questions for the FAQ
- The Commission is considering changes to the state's predator management policy
- Discussed whether CEQA comes into play, and discussed thresholds of significance
- Discussed zonal versus statewide adaptive approaches to management as described in the Chapron paper
  - zones as they define them are exclusive areas where wolves are allowed and outside of which they are not allowed

- conducted a sensitivity analysis to detect what effects zonal versus adaptive management would have; found that breeding adults are most important segment of population to keep alive to prevent extirpation
  - in a non-zoned approach connectivity to other populations reduces extinction probability
- Discussing the Chapron paper overlapped with discussion about Minimum Viable Population (MVP) and Population Viability Analysis (PVA)
  - These are approaches that facilitate estimating minimum populations necessary to avoid extinction up to some number of years into the future
- Discussed a set of operating assumptions for wolf conservation to approximately 2030; there were 17 assumptions listed including:
  - no change in wolf management in Oregon
  - roads and road densities are weighted based on how heavily they are used
  - California's population will experience slower growth than other areas due to reduced connectivity to other wolf populations
- Discussed the Wolf Population Dynamics chapter from the 2003 Mech and Boitani book on wolves. We did not have a lot of time for the discussion but it covered things that affect the dynamics including prey densities, territorial defense, road densities, mortalities, and population viability models, among others.
- Discussed a matrix that compared various components of a zoned versus a statewide approach to managing wolves in California. The group will continue to discuss which approach will be durable for the first phase of 15 years.

Ms Kovacs added that the MVP and PVA approaches contain some information that is useful but that they are models containing assumptions which likely do not apply in California.

#### Wolf-Livestock Subgroup (WLS)

- Department provided some information on how they expect the listing will affect the planning process, and that they intend to continue working toward a consensus plan; also displayed the scenarios document, only two of which are currently valid
- Discussed the Wolf-Livestock Interactions chapter
  - became clear that careful wording is important to properly convey meaning
  - reiterated the importance of having scientific literature to support statements
- Discussed aspects of the wolf-livestock depredation strategy matrix

- which agency should confirm depredations
- how best to inform communities and producers about wolf activity in their vicinity
- defining injurious and non-injurious harassment especially under CESA; whether or not to include injurious in the plan given it is not allowed under CESA
- Decided to schedule another meeting since we still have more items to discuss

### Wolf –Ungulate Subgroup (WUIS)

- Also discussed the implications on planning from the CESA listing decision
- Sonke Mastrup joined the group to answer questions about eventual delisting
  - Sonke told the group that the planning effort is even more important now that wolves are listed
  - The goal of listing is to recover and delist and the plan can help identify how to get there and to manage after recovery
- Discussed what it would take to recover wolves
- Discussed the need to coordinate with the deer and elk planning effort and the importance of better data on ungulate populations, especially where wolves are expected to occur
- Discussed the wolf-ungulate chapter and a separate strategy document containing goals, objectives, and strategies and we were asked to submit any comments on it or the chapter by Friday, June 20<sup>th</sup>.
- Discussed incorporating information from the Mexican wolf population
- Reviewed a graph showing estimated ungulate densities in other states as compared to California; how to modify it and provide some additional information for what makes California so different from other states
- Discussed how to resolve uncertainty over what information should go into the wolf-ungulate chapter (the science), and what should go into the wolf conservation chapter (the strategies)
- We ran out of time to discuss strategies in depth; we will revise the strategies document and devote more time to that topic at the next meeting

A brief discussion ensued about the choice of images used on the covers of the meeting report. Some members expressed that those selected may present a bias, and stressed the importance of using a variety of images to convey various aspects of wolves in their natural communities. Others felt that the Department's selection of photos is appropriate, and that the use of only "pretty" images would be biased.

### **Discussion of SWG Mid-Process Check-in and FAQ**

At this point Mr. Magill provided an overview of the status of the stakeholder assessment he is conducting. By the date of this meeting he had spoken with six stakeholders, and will continue the effort in the coming days. The assessment questions fall into one of two basic categories: the stakeholder process in general, and wolf listing implications for members' participation in the process. The majority of members felt that the Department has done a good job remaining unbiased, but also acknowledged that neutral facilitation is more important now that the specifics of the plan are being discussed.

All SWG members interviewed to date expressed a desire to remain engaged until the plan is finalized, even while acknowledging that there may be some areas upon which consensus may not be reached, and that the operating principles developed at the beginning of the process are still valid. Mr. Magill does plan to make some recommendations to the Department for updating some of the operating principles after completing the assessment.

SWG members interviewed understand that under the listing lethal control is no longer a management option at least currently, but can be considered for a future action once the species is delisted. However, members expressed varying opinions on whether the plan will function as a management plan or a recovery plan.

Finally, all members interviewed to date suggested that the plan should focus where it can still have impact, such as a depredation compensation program, and non-injurious harassment measures. Mr. Magill will call additional SWG members, and will summarize the results of the assessment soon. Questions provided by SWG members toward development of the FAQ are contained in Appendix E.

### **Discussion of Schedule/California Wolf Plan (CWP) Outline**

Ms. Kovacs presented the group with some expected dates for various milestones in plan development given the additional three months allowed by the Director. Those include:

- All chapters presented to and reviewed by SWG by October 24
- Preliminary draft plan developed by Department by November 7, with SWG opportunity to view the document in its entirety at that time
- Peer review process and internal CEQA considerations discussed by November 28
- Department writes public review draft to incorporate peer review recommendations and CEQA compliance issues beginning December 1

- Public review period including two public meetings commences approximately January 2, and concludes approximately February 6
- Department compiles and responds to public comments and drafts the final plan for release in early March

Ms. Kovacs stressed that these dates are subject to change, but these are the current projections for completion dates. She will put these items into a spreadsheet and generate a new schedule.

### **Continued Discussion of CWP Chapters**

Dr. Loft began this topic by continuing the earlier discussion about what information should be covered within the Wolf-Ungulate Interactions chapter. He explained that he has been giving considerable thought to that question, and has considered the idea, as suggested by one member, of broadening the scope of the chapter to discuss more on habitat relationships. However he is unsure what such a section would contain, given how wolves are considered habitat generalists whose main requirements are the presence of prey, and linkages connecting them to other populations. Ms. Kovacs added that many researchers suggest that wolves can survive most anywhere, and the most important element for their continuity is improved tolerance by humans. One stakeholder suggested coordination with federal land agencies is very important, that Chapter 9 – Land Management Considerations – would be a natural place to address that topic, and it could include strategies to benefit ungulates.

Further discussion ensued regarding the order of the chapters (see Appendix D), with some suggesting that Diseases may not be best placed right after Background, and others suggesting general topics should go first, followed by more specific topics. Several members suggested that the Background chapter should be renamed Wolf Biology or Wolf Life History. In response to a request for all chapters to be provided as a complete package, Ms. Kovacs explained that for internal policy reasons, she cannot yet provide the document as a draft, but will provide the standalone chapters as soon as they are ready. She requested that members send her any additional thoughts or suggestions.

This section of the meeting concluded with some discussion again about when the various chapters would be sent to the stakeholders, and due dates for comments on others. Ms. Kovacs requested comments by July 11 on the Domestic Dogs chapter. She will resend the most recent versions of the Information and Education and Life History chapters, and requested comments on them by July 18. The Diseases, Wolf-Human Interactions, and Wolf Interactions with Other Wildlife chapters will all be available soon for SWG comments. Members of the Wolf-Ungulate subgroup were reminded to submit high-level (i.e. non-specific) comments on that chapter as soon as possible.

## **Wrap Up and Action Item Review**

The meeting concluded with discussion about dates for upcoming meetings. The next full SWG meeting is scheduled for July 22 in Redding, location to be determined. The Wolf Conservation subgroup is scheduled for the afternoon of July 21, also in Redding, location also to be determined. The Wolf-Ungulate and Wolf-Livestock subgroups have not yet scheduled follow-up meetings. Mr. Magill promised will distribute a Doodle poll to determine these dates.

## APPENDIX A. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Name	Affiliation	Email
<b>Stakeholders</b>		
Mike Ford	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	<a href="mailto:mford@rmef.org">mford@rmef.org</a>
Jeff Davis	The Wildlife Society – Western Section	<a href="mailto:jdavis@colibri-ecology.com">jdavis@colibri-ecology.com</a>
Marilyn Jasper	Sierra Club	<a href="mailto:marilyn.jasper@mlc.sierraclub.org">marilyn.jasper@mlc.sierraclub.org</a>
Pamela Flick	Defenders of Wildlife	<a href="mailto:pflick@defenders.org">pflick@defenders.org</a>
Noelle Cremers	California Farm Bureau	<a href="mailto:ncremers@cfsf.com">ncremers@cfsf.com</a>
Rich Fletcher	Mule Deer Foundation	<a href="mailto:richfletcher@sbcglobal.net">richfletcher@sbcglobal.net</a>
Kimberly Baker	Environmental Protection Information Center	<a href="mailto:kimberly@wildcalifornia.org">kimberly@wildcalifornia.org</a>
Kirk Wilbur	California Cattlemen’s Association	<a href="mailto:kirk@calcattlemen.org">kirk@calcattlemen.org</a>
Bill Gaines	California Houndsmen for Conservation	<a href="mailto:bill@outdoorheritage.org">bill@outdoorheritage.org</a>
Jerry Springer	California Deer Association	<a href="mailto:jerry@westernhunter.com">jerry@westernhunter.com</a>
Mark Rockwell	Endangered Species Coalition	<a href="mailto:mrockwell@stopextinction.org">mrockwell@stopextinction.org</a>
Sean Curtis	Modoc County Resource and UCCE Farm Advisor	<a href="mailto:modoccfb@frontier.net">modoccfb@frontier.net</a>
Damon Nagami	Natural Resources Defense Council	<a href="mailto:dnagami@nrdc.org">dnagami@nrdc.org</a>
Amaroq Weiss	Center for Biological Diversity	<a href="mailto:aweiss@biologicaldiversity.org">aweiss@biologicaldiversity.org</a>
Robert Timm	UC Agriculture and Natural Resources	<a href="mailto:rmtimm@ucanr.edu">rmtimm@ucanr.edu</a>
Karin Vardaman	California Wolf Center	<a href="mailto:karin.vardaman@californiawolfcenter.org">karin.vardaman@californiawolfcenter.org</a>
Pat Griffin	California Agriculture Commission – Siskiyou County	<a href="mailto:pgriffin@co.siskiyou.ca.us">pgriffin@co.siskiyou.ca.us</a>
<b>California Department of Fish and Wildlife Staff</b>		
Karen Kovacs	Wildlife Program Manager – Region 1	<a href="mailto:karen.kovacs@wildlife.ca.gov">karen.kovacs@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
Dr. Eric Loft	Wildlife Branch Chief	<a href="mailto:eric.loft@wildlife.ca.gov">eric.loft@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
Chuck Bonham	Director	<a href="mailto:director@wildlife.ca.gov">director@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
Karen Converse	Environmental Scientist –Wildlife Branch	<a href="mailto:karen.converse@wildlife.ca.gov">karen.converse@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
Angela Donlan	Senior Staff Counsel	<a href="mailto:angela.donlan@wildlife.ca.gov">angela.donlan@wildlife.ca.gov</a>
<b>United States Fish and Wildlife Service Staff</b>		
Lisa Ellis	Fish and Wildlife Biologist	<a href="mailto:lisa_ellis@fws.gov">lisa_ellis@fws.gov</a>

## APPENDIX B. PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS AND COMMENTS

Name	Affiliation	Email
<b>Legislative Representatives</b>		
Terri Worley	Senator Ted Gaines's Office	<a href="mailto:terri.worley@sen.ca.gov">terri.worley@sen.ca.gov</a>
Catherine Bird	Senator Ted Gaines's Office	<a href="mailto:catherine.bird@sen.ca.gov">catherine.bird@sen.ca.gov</a>

- (To Director Bonham) I know the Senator is aware based on our observations that this group has done much hard work so far so the extra time is valuable.

## APPENDIX C. AGENDA

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)  
California Wolf Stakeholders Working Group (SWG) Meeting  
Department of Fish and Wildlife, Office of Training and Development, Sacramento  
June 25, 2014

9am-4pm

CONFERENCE CALL INFORMATION:

Call in number: 1-877-860-3058

Participant code: 758045#

**Objectives:**

- Develop shared understanding of CESA listing implications for CWP, including DFW legal perspective
- Develop shared understanding of California Wolf Plan (CWP) timeline, scheduling, and stakeholder commitments moving forward
- Continue SWG input on draft CWP chapters

**Agenda**

<b>Gather in the meeting room</b>	<b>8:45</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Welcome, Introductions and Logistics <i>Karen Kovacs, DFW</i> <i>Sam Magill, Kearns &amp; West</i></li></ul>	9:05
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review Agenda and Ground Rules/Operating Principles <i>Sam Magill, Kearns &amp; West</i></li></ul>	9:15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Director Bonham Updates <i>Chuck Bonham, Director, DFW</i><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. CWP Timeline and Next Steps</li><li>2. DFW Position on CESA Listing</li></ol></li></ul>	9:30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Updates: <i>DFW Staff</i><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. OR7</li><li>2. Dates for future SWG meetings</li></ol></li></ul>	10:15

### 3. Status of plan by Chapter

<b>BREAK</b>	<b>10:30</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Legal Implications of CESA Listing <i>Angela Donlan, DFW Counsel</i></li></ul>	10:45
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Summary of subgroup SWG meetings/planning/next steps Wolf-Livestock – (Karin Vardaman/Mark Stopher) Wolf-Ungulate – (SWG member TBD/Eric Loft) Wolf Conservation – (Amaroq Weiss/Mark Stopher)</li></ul>	11:45
<b>LUNCH</b>	<b>12:30</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion of SWG Mid-Process Check-in and FAQ <i>Sam Magill, Kearns &amp; West</i></li></ul>	1:30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion of Schedule/CWP Outline <i>DFW Staff</i> <i>All</i></li></ul>	1:45
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continued Discussion of CWP Chapters <i>DFW Staff</i> <i>All</i><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Inclusion of Mexican Wolf data in CWP</li><li>2. SWG Review of Chapters</li></ol></li></ul>	2:15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public Questions <i>All</i></li></ul>	3:30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wrap Up and Action Item Review <i>Sam Magill, Kearns &amp; West</i></li></ul>	3:45
<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>4:00</b>

#### **Attachments:**

**Revised CWP Outline**

**APPENDIX D.**  
**WOLF PLAN CHAPTER UPDATES**

**WOLF PLAN CHAPTER UPDATES – Monday June 16, 2014**

Management Plan Headings:

- Introduction – Purpose and Need
- Ch 1 Background
- Ch 3 Diseases and Wolves
- Ch 6 Wolf-Human Interactions
- Ch 7 Wolf and Domestic Dog Interactions
- Ch 5 Wolf Interactions with other Wildlife Species
- Ch 4 Wolf-Ungulate Interactions
- Ch 8 Wolf-Livestock Conflicts
- Ch 2 Wolf Conservation
- Ch 9 Land Mgt Considerations
- Ch 10 Info and Education
- Ch 11 Plan Implementation, Evaluation, and Reporting
- Ch 12 Research and Information Management
- Ch 13 Funding Needs/Opportunities
- Ch 14 Wolf Plan Strategy Summaries

## **APPENDIX E.**

### **CWP CESA LISTING FAQ**

- 1.) When a species is listed under CESA, does that obligate the State to make an effort to create a plan for recovery?
  
- 2.) Does CESA listing place additional CEQA burdens on the wolf plan itself?
  
- 3.) What are potential “triggers” that could result in delisting?
  
- 4.) Does a listing under CESA create opportunities for generation of funds for habitat of the listed species?
  
- 5.) How does California define "take" related to a listed species? How will this apply to wolves and wolf habitat?
  
- 6.) The burrowing owl is one species that often receives funds for habitat enhancement or mitigation under the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA). Does CEQA create similar opportunities for wolves and wolf habitat?
  
- 7.) CDFW can require permits for some projects. (CESA, Timber harvest, Water Quality, CEQA). These permits can place a mitigation burden on private and public companies that impact habitat for listed species. How will this apply to wolves and wolf habitat?