

I. BACKGROUND

This chapter describes the context for development of the Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan. Contents include the history of wolves in Oregon, their biology and ecology, the legal situation regarding wolves in Oregon, and the process conducted by the Commission to develop the Plan.

A. History of Wolves in Oregon

The history of wolves in Oregon mirrors a familiar scenario played out across the western United States in the first half of the 20th century. Historical accounts point to a relatively wide distribution of wolves, although their abundance varied from place to place. As western immigration continued and wild prey populations were reduced, stock raisers found it necessary to protect their stock from carnivores. They eventually, with the assistance of governments, extirpated wolves entirely.

Early History

Evidence that wolves existed in Oregon can be documented through various means including archeological records, Native American accounts, journals and diaries of early explorers and pioneers, museum specimens, wolf bounty records, and various books and reports. The following written accounts³ offer some interesting observations:

- “...(wolves) are exceedingly numerous in Oregon and Washington Territories, from the Cascades to the Rocky Mountain Divide...”
-George Suckley, expedition Naturalist, 1853-55.
- “...the wolves are very numerous in this country and exceedingly troublesome.”
-Mr. Drayton, Wilkes Expedition, vicinity of Fort Walla Walla, 1841.
- Lewis and Clark noted that seven elk killed by expedition hunters were “...untouched by the wolves, of which indeed there are but a few in this country...”
-Lewis and Clark, winter of 1805-06, Fort Clatsop area, near the mouth of the Columbia River.

Additional wolf location information was reported by biologist Vernon Bailey (1936):

- “...in 1834 Wyeth reported several (wolves) killed along the Deschutes River.”
- “...in 1835 Townsend secured the type of this subspecies near Fort Vancouver just north of the Columbia River.”
- “...in 1854 Suckley collected (wolf) specimens near The Dalles.”
- “...in 1897 Captain Applegate reported them (wolves) formerly common, but at that time extremely rare in the southern Cascade region.”
- “...Jewett reports one large male wolf taken...August 20, 1930, near Balm Mountain on the Umpqua National Forest.”
- “...another old male wolf taken (1930)...on the shore of Crescent Lake in Klamath County.”
- “...two other wolves were killed in Douglas County and one in Lane County during 1930, and one near McKenzie Bridge in Lane County in 1931.”

³ Excerpted from Young and Goldman (1944) and Young (1946).

Ironically, wolves played a pivotal role in the formation of the early Oregon territorial government. Young and Goldman (1944) wrote "...efforts to destroy the wolf in this country were instrumental in formation of the Oregon Territory. The "wolf meetings" of Oregon, officially the formal sessions of the Oregon Wolf Organization, drew pioneer leaders of the northwest together as did no other objective." With wolves and wolf eradication as the drawing card, meeting organizers were successful in assembling significant numbers of settlers to discuss formation of a civil government in the region.

Wolf bounty records provide some indirect data on the distribution and abundance of wolves, although amounts offered by the state and counties may have influenced effort. The first wolf bounty in Oregon was established in 1843 at an Oregon Wolf Association meeting in the Willamette Valley. The bounty for a large wolf was set at \$3 and was paid from "subscriptions" to the association.

The Oregon State Game Commission (OSGC) began offering a \$20 wolf bounty in 1913 in addition to the regular \$5 paid by the state at the time. During the period of October 1, 1913 through May 10, 1914, payments were made on 30 wolves in Oregon: Douglas County, 10; Crook County, 6; Clackamas County, 6; Linn County, 6; and Lane County, 1.⁴

During the period 1913-1946, 393 wolves were presented for payment in Oregon (Olterman and Verts 1972). Many of these wolves were taken prior to the mid -1930s and no more than two wolves per year were bountied after 1937. The last record of a wolf submitted for bounty in Oregon was in 1946 for an animal killed in the Umpqua National Forest in southwest Oregon.⁵

Bailey (1936) authored the first major work on Oregon mammals, titled *The Mammals and Life Zones of Oregon*. He described wolves as present in most timbered areas of Oregon. He considered wolves to be the most common in the western portion of Oregon, from the western foothills of the Cascade Range to the Coast. This observation may have been influenced by the distribution of the human population rather than directly related to abundance of wolves. Information regarding wolves from other locations in Oregon where good habitat existed may not have been available.

Olterman and Verts (1972), in a special report on endangered mammals of Oregon, sought to determine the distribution and abundance of native Oregon mammals which were rare, endangered or recently extirpated from the state. They located 80 wolf specimens in various museums and private collections that were collected from Oregon. They stated that "...most specimens were collected from the western slope of the Cascade Mountains.... This distribution is not representative of the range originally occupied by the wolf in the state because the species probably was eliminated from some areas before 1913 when specimens were first preserved." At the time of their report, they believed the wolf to be extirpated from the state and the absence of populations in neighboring states to preclude natural immigration or re-establishment.

A report compiled by Marshall (1996) stated no authentic gray wolf records were known between 1946 and 1974. During the period 1974-1980, four records of wolves were noted. He considered at least two of these records to be tame wolves or wolf-dog hybrids.

⁴ From the Oregon Sportsman 2 (6):19, 1914, as quoted in Bailey 1936.

⁵ OSGC Annual Game Report 1947.

Human attitudes toward wolves in North American have undergone significant changes during the second half of the 20th century. Strong support for wolf conservation has been documented throughout the United States (Mech and Boitani 2003). Cultural influences such as popular literature, the work of researchers, and the voice of conservationists such as Aldo Leopold have provided information and support for conservation. A 1999 poll of Oregonians showed a 70 percent support rate for the return of wolves to the state.⁶ These changes in wildlife values are embodied in the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 and the Oregon ESA enacted in 1979. However, values and attitudes in the United States are complex and not homogenous. They depend on area of residence (rural-urban), occupation (agriculture/ natural resource-technical/service), and many other factors.

Native American History⁷

Wolves and native tribes coexisted for untold generations, not competing with one another, but complementing one another and adapting to an ever-changing seasonal system of events.

As with other natural resources, tribal people learned the value of the wolves and revered them to a spiritual level. In tribal legends passed down through the generations, wolf, coyote and fox are related to one another and to the tribal peoples. Individual experiences with the wolf more often than not resulted in life-changing lessons. These experiences strengthened the connection between all surrounding events occurring within the natural world and helped maintain an order that everyone understood and respected. This order was circular, involving everyone and everything, with no one part being of greater importance than another.

Following the influence of early Euro-American values in the late 1700s and early 1800s toward natural resources, the order began to change. As one part of the order after another began to fall out of place, it disrupted the whole. Soon there was an imbalance, causing the values and relationships to one another to be weakened. The tribal people as well as others suffer today because of this disorder. To be able to maintain and re-learn the value of one another, the tribal people believe the wolf should have its place without limits or restrictions so that future generations may have a complete circle once again.

Euro-American History

As the first European immigrants arrived in North America they brought with them an aversion for the wolf. This prejudice was founded either by direct contact with wolves in their homelands or was ingrained by their culture or religion. In fact, by the time immigrants departed their homelands, the wolf had been eradicated from some of those areas due to suspicion and dislike for the animal. Once in North America, the immigrants found wolves to be a threat to their domesticated animals. Domesticated animals were a necessary part of Euro-American life, not only to provide the food and the fiber needed for sustenance, but to provide transportation and the energy needed for tilling

⁶ Poll by Davis & Hibbitts, April 1999. The poll was commissioned by the Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA), and paid for by ONDA, Defenders of Wildlife, Oregon Natural Resources Council, and Predator Defense Institute. The poll consisted of 500 five-minute phone interviews with individuals randomly selected from statewide voter registration. Accuracy estimate is +/- 5 percent.

⁷ This section provided by WAC member Ken Hall, member of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

the land. The ability of the wolf to kill the domesticated animals served to create a competition between Euro-Americans and the wolf.

Wolf persecution was intense in Europe to the point that the last wolf was killed on the British Isles in the early sixteenth century under Henry VII. In Scotland, despite intense efforts to kill wolves, the immense Scottish forests offered safe retreats. Scotland's final solution was to burn the forests. At a time where wood was a major fuel source, this event demonstrates the severity of the extermination effort (Boitani 2003).

Folklore of the time was very much a part of propagating the Euro-American cultural attitudes about wolves. "Little Red Riding Hood" and the "Three Little Pigs" were intended to be symbolic or metaphorical, but they had a profound effect on how wolves were viewed (ibid.).

"The Pilgrim Fathers arrived with all the prejudices, beliefs and devices that had been used to eradicate the wolf in their homelands and the war against the wolf in North America began in Jamestown, Virginia, when the first domesticated animals arrived in 1609. Plymouth Colony enacted a wolf bounty in 1630 and bounties were soon established in all the other settlements along the eastern seaboard. By 1700, the wolf had disappeared from New England (ibid.)."

Although the threats to human safety were low, incidents involving attacks on humans furthered the belief in Euro-American culture that the wolves must be exterminated. Lewis and Clark's journals report that on August 8, 1806, Sergeant Nathaniel Pryor had his hand bitten through by a wolf while he slept (Chuinard 1998). The combination of prejudices, religious beliefs, folklore, the need to protect animals which had been domesticated for the benefit of man, and actual human safety concerns led to a continuation of the extermination policy started by the Pilgrims on the eastern seaboard as the Euro-American population expanded westward.

As the western migration began, wolves were systematically killed by the expanding human population. "The removal of the bison from the Great Plains may have fostered an increase in wolf population because of the large numbers of bison carcasses left by hunters....The removal of the bison allowed for the expansion of domesticated animals and for the expansion of cropping, into areas of North America with wolf populations which were unnaturally inflated, at a time when the wolves' natural prey base was exterminated" (Mech and Boitani 2003). This served to create a level of predation on domesticated animals that was unacceptable to citizens throughout the country. In 1915 the responsibility of predator control became a responsibility of the U.S. government with the establishment of the Division of Predator and Rodent Control. Official hunters were paid to kill the last wolves. Stories about the killing of the last remaining wolves were widely published and they had the effect of strengthening the rationale regarding the need for extermination.

Interestingly, the dislike of wolves was a factor in organizing the Euro-Americans. Meetings that were held to discuss the need for extermination of wolves were in many cases the starting points for many of the state and local governments that were formed in the western expansion of North America.

In his chapter on "Wolf Conservation and Recovery" in *Wolves, Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation* (2003), Luigi Boitani writes: By 1930, the wolf had disappeared from almost all the forty-eight contiguous states, including Yellowstone National Park (Jones 2002). The last wolves were killed in Arkansas in 1928, in Oregon in 1946 and in Colorado and Wyoming in 1943 (Busch 1995). Only the

wolves of the Lake Superior region survived a bit longer: the last wolves in Wisconsin were slain between 1950 and 1970, although bounties in Wisconsin and Michigan were repealed in 1956 and 1960 respectively (Thile 1993). A few wolves may have remained in Michigan after 1970 (Henderson et al. 1975). Several hundred wolves did survive in northern Minnesota.

Wolves were granted protection from the long-held Euro-American pursuit to exterminate them by passage of the federal ESA in 1973. As a result of this legislation, the wolf was re-introduced into the contiguous 48 states by the reintroduction of Canadian wolves into central Idaho and Yellowstone National Park. These actions indicate that the cultural beliefs of Euro-Americans may be softening in regard to the historical position of extermination.

B. Biology and Ecology

A discussion on the biology and ecology of wolves includes physical characteristics, pack size, reproduction, food habits, movements and territories, dispersal, mortality, genetics, and population growth. Significant numbers of books and papers have been written on these subjects. Efforts to condense these for the western United States have been undertaken during development of other state management plans. Appendix B, *Wolf Biology and Ecology*, includes a description of this topic that was adapted from the *Montana Gray Wolf Conservation and Management Plan (2002)*. Appendix B also includes citations of books and papers on recent research. Much of the research specific to the western United States has been conducted in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Because portions of this ecosystem contain some non-hunted ungulate populations and have no livestock grazing, the results may not be directly transferable to Oregon in all aspects. Appendix B also provides a summary of wolf diseases.

C. Legal Status

Overview

In Oregon, wolves are subject to both the federal ESA and the Oregon Endangered Species Act (Oregon ESA). These laws are independent but somewhat parallel. As the federal government eases protections for the wolf under the federal ESA, the regulatory spotlight may shift to the Oregon ESA as well as to underlying state wildlife statutes and regulations. But so long as the wolf remains federally listed, it is crucial to consult both federal and state law to understand the protections that pertain to wolves in Oregon.

In January 2004 the USFWS developed an “Interim Response Strategy for Reporting Gray Wolf Activity in Oregon”. In 2007, this document was replaced by the “Federal/State Coordination Strategy for Implementation of Oregon's Wolf Plan” (see Appendix C). The purpose of the document was to guide agency response to specific events that trigger a need for wolf management. Within the document, a common understanding of roles and responsibilities is discussed to ensure close coordination of agencies’ actions to conserve wolves. The strategy was not intended to direct recovery of wolves in Oregon, but to ensure actions by agencies were consistent with the applicable state and federal laws. Now, the Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan is the primary document governing the department’s wolf conservation and management actions.

This Plan is based on an analysis of the federal and state laws that govern the management of the wolf. The federal ESA sets the minimum level for wolf management while the wolf remains listed federally. Oregon's ESA also provides the fundamental legal authority and direction for this Plan and is implemented under the state's legal authority to manage wildlife within the boundaries of Oregon. Local governments express the concerns of their citizens. The Wolf Conservation and Management Plan is a statewide document that integrates state policy across all Oregon to provide a consistent approach for wolf management.

Legal Status – Federal

Wolves gained endangered status in 1974 with their listing under the federal ESA. In 1987, USFWS completed the Northern Rocky Mountain Wolf Recovery Plan. Four years later Congress initiated an administrative process to reintroduce wolves into Yellowstone National Park and central Idaho. Extensive public input showed general support for wolf recovery, and the U.S. Secretary of Interior approved reintroduction. In 1995 and 1996, 66 wolves were captured in Alberta and British Columbia, Canada. Of those, 35 were released in central Idaho and 31 were released into Yellowstone National Park.

Wolves were protected as a “non-essential experimental population” under the federal ESA within a specified zone that included portions of Idaho, Wyoming and Montana. The original 66 wolves had increased to an estimated population of 1706 wolves in the three-state area by the end of 2009.

In April 2003, the USFWS established the Western Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of gray wolves and down-listed their federal ESA classification from “endangered” to “threatened” because of their recovery progress. At the same time, special regulations under section 4(d) of the ESA were adopted. These rules provided livestock producers more options to deal with problem wolves than are available under the endangered status. The 4(d) rules (since vacated by a federal court decision) were very specific and included numerous conditions. As a condition of de-listing the wolf in the Western DPS, the USFWS required state management plans for Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming to ensure the conservation of the species into the future. No such state Plan was required of Oregon. After considering the reality and impacts of wolves moving into the State as well as its legal obligations under the Oregon ESA, Oregon decided to craft its own management Plan.

Gray wolves in Oregon, when the Plan was adopted in 2005, were under the primary jurisdiction of the USFWS and were federally listed as endangered under the federal ESA of 1973. The 2007 Federal/State Coordination Strategy for Implementation of Oregon's Wolf Plan (Strategy) was developed to emphasize close coordination between USFWS and ODFW, and outlined procedures for dealing with wolves while wolves remained federally listed. On May 4, 2009, wolves in the eastern third (east of Hwy. 395/78/95) of Oregon were removed from the federal ESA. Following that delisting, the Strategy was not needed in the federally delisted portion of Oregon other than to track unconfirmed reports of wolf activity. However, on August 5, 2010, federal protections for wolves in Oregon were reinstated, which had the effect of relisting as endangered. Because the federal ESA preempts any less-protective state regulations, the federal ESA sets the minimum level for wolf protection so long as the wolf remains federally listed. Once federally de-listed, the Oregon ESA will apply until wolves are delisted by the Commission.

Legal Status – State of Oregon

Wolves have been classified as endangered in Oregon under the Oregon ESA⁸ since the Oregon ESA was established by the Oregon Legislature in 1987, and continue to be listed as endangered at present. When the Oregon Legislature enacted the Oregon ESA in 1987, it grandfathered onto the Oregon list all species native to Oregon that were then listed under the Federal ESA.⁹ State law generally does not allow “take” (i.e., killing or obtaining possession or control according to the State of Oregon definition¹⁰) of wolves.

The Oregon ESA requires the conservation of listed species, and defines conservation as “the use of methods and procedures necessary to bring a species to the point at which the measures provided under ORS 496.171-496.182 (the Oregon ESA) no longer are necessary. Such methods and procedures include, but are not limited to, activities associated with scientific resource management such as research, census taking, law enforcement, habitat acquisition and maintenance, propagation and transplantation” ORS 496.171(1).¹¹ Thus, so long as the wolf remains listed under the Oregon ESA, the Commission is required to conserve the species in Oregon, according to the Oregon Attorney General (See Appendix D). The law provides an array of management tools from which the Commission may choose when determining how to conserve the species. Those tools include some which may permit regulated take of wolves for particular purposes, if the Commission determines such take is consistent with conservation of the species in Oregon. In other words, successful conservation should lead to delisting and strive to ensure that future “relisting” is unnecessary. Within the context of the conservation mandate, consistent with the federal ESA and to the extent allowed by wolf biology, the Commission has authority under the state ESA and other statutes to develop a conservation and management plan for wolves in Oregon that eventually will lead to delisting.

While much of the focus related to wolves has focused on the state and federal ESA, eventually it will be Oregon’s wildlife policy that will guide long-term management after state delisting. The wildlife policy includes a number of co-equal management goals, one of which is “...that wildlife shall be managed to prevent the serious depletion of any indigenous species...” (ORS 496.012).

⁸ The Oregon ESA appears at Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 496.171-192. The prohibition on taking state-listed species is at ORS 498.026(1).

⁹ ORS 496.004(6) and (17); 171(2); and .176.(1)(a); and OAR 635-100-0100(8).

¹⁰ ORS 496.004(16). Note that, unlike the federal ESA definition of “take,” the Oregon definition does not extend to harming and harassing.

¹¹ Any such habitat protections would only be obligated on public land, however, since “nothing in (the Oregon ESA) is intended, by itself, to require an owner of any private land to take action to protect a threatened species or an endangered species, or to impose additional requirements or restrictions on the use of private land.” ORS 496.192(1). It is important to note that certain conservation and management mechanisms under the Oregon ESA would apply only to state-owned lands or the authorities of state agencies. Others, such as the “take” prohibition, apply anywhere in Oregon ORS 498.026(1).

County Actions

Beginning in 1999, upon learning of the reintroduction of wolves in Idaho, local governments in northeast Oregon took actions to respond to potential wolf migration into Oregon. Wallowa County convened a Wolf Summit in Enterprise in February of 2000. This meeting brought parties of interest together to share information about wolf presence in Oregon.

Several counties passed resolutions calling for wolves to be returned to Idaho by the USFWS. Supporting resolutions were also passed by the state and national county associations. These resolutions call for consultation with local officials before wolves can be permitted to remain in their jurisdiction. Copies of these resolutions can be obtained by contacting the Association of Oregon Counties.

D. Wolf Plan Development

The arrival of three wolves from Idaho into Oregon in 1999 and 2000 spurred a series of events which eventually led the Commission to direct ODFW staff to organize four informational workshops. These workshops, held in 2002, allowed the Commission to examine wolf issues and discuss wolf biology and ecology. Twenty-nine speakers from various states including Oregon addressed the Commission regarding the political, social, economic and biological aspects of wolf management. Members of the public were provided the opportunity to observe and listen to the proceedings but did not interact with the presenters or Commissioners.

The Commission learned from several wolf experts that wolves would continue to disperse into Oregon and eventually establish a permanent population.¹² It was clear from the testimony that wolves would be just as controversial in Oregon as in other states with wolf populations. Concern for the welfare of livestock, big game herds, pets and humans were on the minds of Commissioners and others in attendance.

Following the workshops, the Commission initiated a public process that involved 15 town hall meetings held throughout the state in late 2002 and early 2003. The majority of 2,639 oral statements and questions and 1,502 written comments received during the three-month process fell into 12 “themes” when reviewed and analyzed by ODFW staff:

1. Human and pet safety should/should not be a concern
2. Do/do not write a management plan
3. Educate the public about wolves and wolf issues
4. ESA listing questions and comments
5. Improved ecosystem health
6. Compensation for livestock losses
7. Cost of wolf management
8. Depredation of wolves on livestock
9. Suitable wolf habitat: there is, there is not, is there?
10. Revenue loss to agency and rural communities
11. Predation on wildlife (mostly deer/elk) and/or the loss of hunting opportunities
12. Yes to wolves, no to wolves, with no other concern or recommendation provided

¹² List of wolf experts: Ed Bangs, Curt Mack, and Carter Niemeyer.

It was stated and recognized at the March 2003 Commission meeting that there is a large constituency for delisting the wolf and keeping the species out of Oregon. The Commission was also advised of a 1999 poll showing 70 percent approval for wolves.¹³ By the March 2003 meeting, the Commission decided to initiate a process to develop an Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan based on: science-based information from invited wolf biologists at the Commission sponsored workshops; a review of the oral and written comments received from the public during the wolf town hall meetings; a summary of other states' wolf management plans and how those plans address the concerns and comments heard during Oregon's town hall process; information on strategies to provide livestock owners with flexibility to address wolf depredation; and a legal analysis of the Commission's wolf conservation requirements.

In April 2003, a planning process was approved which included the formation of the Wolf Advisory Committee. At that time, the Commission adopted as a working goal for the Wolf Conservation and Management Plan: "to ensure the long-term survival and conservation of gray wolves as required by Oregon law while minimizing conflicts with humans, primary land uses and other Oregon wildlife." This goal was later modified by the Committee as follows: "to ensure the conservation of gray wolves as required by Oregon law while protecting the social and economic interests of all Oregonians."

The Commission also developed guiding principles to direct the work of the Committee and the planning process:

1. Commission provides direction to write a wolf management Plan based on "conservation" of wolves, as required by state law.
2. Commission will select a "Wolf Advisory Committee" to advise the Commission on wolf issues and draft a wolf management plan.
3. Ideas from wolf management plans produced by other states will be considered.
4. The themes and concerns expressed by the public through town hall meetings and written comments must be considered and incorporated in the final Plan.
5. Active re-introduction of wolves will not be considered. Natural dispersal of wolves from the Idaho population will be accepted.
6. The final Plan will be consistent with the Oregon ESA (ORS 496.171-496.192) and the Oregon Wildlife Policy (ORS 496.012).
7. A final Plan will strive for flexibility in managing wolf populations while providing needed protections for wolves.
8. A final Plan will seek relief for livestock producers from expected wolf depredation.
9. The Committee and the final Wolf Conservation and Management Plan will maintain its focus on wolves and will not address public land grazing or other public land management issues.

A final Plan will address impacts to prey populations, including deer and elk.

Finally, the Commission adopted a draft framework for the Wolf Conservation and Management Plan that incorporated components of other state wolf Plans, Oregon's big game species management Plans, and the concerns of Oregonians. This framework was not intended to suggest a course of action in advance of the advisory committee process, but to initially guide the Committee.

¹³ Poll by Davis & Hibbitts, April 1999.

In June 2003 the Commission appointed 14 members to the Committee after a public nomination process. During the course of Plan development two Committee members were replaced due to other obligations which took precedence over their participation (see Appendix E for a list of Wolf Advisory Committee members). After their first meeting, the Committee members agreed upon a slightly revised framework and the Commission approved the revised version at their January 9, 2004, meeting.

The Committee met 10 times throughout the state, with the assistance of the department and an independent facilitation team, to develop a draft Wolf Conservation and Management Plan for the Commission. The Committee also was assisted by a Wolf Technical Committee composed of wolf experts from many parts of the country. These experts acted as a resource for the Committee and ODFW as the Plan was constructed, and several of them gave presentations at Committee meetings. A “Resource Roster” of technical experts can be found in Appendix F. In addition, the Committee was provided with resource materials from peer-reviewed literature and other state wolf management plans. Information provided to the Committee can be seen in Appendix G. The Committee members also shared articles, literature and information with one another throughout the planning process via e-mail, hard copy and conversation. A list of “Member Suggested Resources” can be found in Appendix H.

The Commission adopted the draft Plan in October 2004 and released it for a full public review process through rulemaking. During the mid-point of the public process, the Wolf Advisory Committee (WAC) reconvened to assess the public comments received to that point and recommended several changes to the Commission (see Appendix I).

The Commission adopted a final Plan and associated administrative rules on February 11, 2005. Legislation was subsequently introduced to the 2005 Legislative Assembly to address the three areas of statutory changes recommended in the Plan. The legislation failed to move out of the House Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee. These legislative recommendations can be found in Appendix P. On October 1, 2005, the Commission re-entered rulemaking to move all references to the recommended changes to an appendix. The changes were adopted by the Commission December 1, 2005.

The adopted Wolf Conservation and Management Plan requires the department to conduct a 5-year review. In March of 2010, the Commission provided direction regarding the process to review the Plan. Specifically the department was to seek out key stakeholders and solicit input and recommended changes to the Plan and Administrative Rules. In May-June 2010, ODFW staff met with the following stakeholder groups:

- Baker County Natural Resource Advisory Committee
- Defenders of Wildlife
- Hells Canyon Preservation Council
- Nez Perce Tribes
- Oregon Cattlemen Association
- Oregon Department of Agriculture
- Oregon Farm Bureau
- Oregon Hunters Association

- Oregon Sheep Growers Association
- Oregon Wild
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Forest Service
- Umatilla Tribes
- USDA Wildlife Services

Comments and recommendations were summarized and an analysis of policy issues raised by stakeholders, which included several alternatives, was presented to the Commission in August 2010. The public had two opportunities to testify before the Commission regarding changes to the Plan and Administrative Rules before the final adoption in October 2010

E. Literature Cited

- Bailey, Vernon. 1936. *The mammals and life zones of Oregon*. North American Fauna 55. 416 pp.
- Boitani, L. 2003. "Wolf Conservation and Recovery." In: *Wolves, Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*. Eds. L. David Mech and Luigi Boitani. University of Chicago Press.
- Busch, R.H. 1995. *The Wolf Almanac*. Lyons & Burford, New York. 226 pp.
- Chuinard, Eldon G. 1998. *Only One Man Died: The Medical Aspects of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*. Ye Galleon Press, Fairfield, WA.
- Davis & Hibbitts. 1999. Poll commissioned by the Oregon Natural Desert Association (ONDA), and paid for by ONDA, Defenders of Wildlife, Oregon Natural Resources Council, and Predator Defense Institute. April 1999.
- Marshall, D.B. 1996. *Species at risk: sensitive, threatened and endangered vertebrates of Oregon*. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, OR, second edition.
- Mech, L. David and Luigi Boitani, eds. 2003. *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*. University of Chicago Press.
- Olterman, J.H. and B.J. Verts. 1972. Endangered Plants and Animals of Oregon; IV. Mammals. Special Report 364. Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State University. Corvallis, 1972. 47 pp.
- Young, S.P. 1946. *The Wolf in North American History*. The Caxton Printers, LTD., Caldwell, Idaho, 1946.
- Young, S.P. and E.A. Goldman. 1944. *The Wolves of North America*. American Wildlife Institute, Washington, D.C.

II. WOLF CONSERVATION

There cannot be a single recipe for wolf conservation that can be applied in all ecological and social contexts. Rather, there are several diverse solutions depending on the needs of both humans and wolves at the local level.
Mech and Boitani, 2003

This chapter focuses on methods and procedures that lead to conservation of wolves in Oregon. The Oregon ESA, under which the gray wolf is listed as endangered, requires the "conservation" of listed species, and defines "conservation" as:

"...the use of methods and procedures necessary to bring a species to the point at which the measures provided under ORS 496.171 to 496.182 are no longer necessary. Such methods and procedures include, but are not limited to, activities associated with scientific resource