

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Oregon Wolf Conservation and Management Plan (Plan) Wolf Plan Stakeholder Representative (WPSR) Work Group Process

WORK GROUP MEETING #4

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 2018; 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM

**OXFORD SUITES, 2400 SW COURT PLACE, PENDLETON, OR
2400 SW COURT PLACE, PENDLETON, OR**

OVERVIEW

The Oregon Wolf Conservation Management Plan's (Plan) Wolf Plan Stakeholder Representative (WPSR) Work Group met in Pendleton, OR on Tuesday, November 27, 2018. Shannon Hurn, ODFW Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife Programs, Doug Cottam, Wildlife Division Administrator, Kevin Blakely, Wildlife Division Deputy Administrator, and Derek Broman, Carnivore/Furbearer Program Coordinator represented ODFW leadership at the meeting. Amira Streeter, Natural Resources Policy Advisor represented the Governor's Office.

Attendance included eight WPSR Work Group members representing stakeholders from throughout Oregon.

Over the course of the meeting, WPSR Work Group members discussed the following topics with each other, ODFW staff, and the Governor's Office.

- Proposal on Developing Ranch and Farm Specific Gray Wolf Non-Lethal Deterrence Plans
- Funding
- Chronic Depredation
- Controlled Take
- Approach Going Forward, Upcoming Meeting Topics, Next Steps and Summary

This report summarizes the major meeting discussions, action items, and next steps for the WPSR Work Group process.

1. Welcome, Introductions, Context, and Agenda

Shannon Hurn, ODFW Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife Programs and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Shannon Hurn, Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife Programs kicked off the meeting and reminded members that the purpose of the WPSR Work Group is to review the existing Oregon Wolf Plan to determine whether there are issues or concerns that can be addressed in a collaborative process. She noted that progress made at today's meeting will determine how to best structure the scheduled January 8, 2019 WPSR Work Group meeting and will also determine how ODFW provides updates to the Commission at its December, January, and/or February meetings. She explained that the December 7 Commission meeting will include a short update without opportunity for testimony. Public testimony will be provided for when the Commission makes a decision on the Oregon Wolf Plan, likely at the February Commission meeting.

Amira Streeter, Natural Resources Policy Advisor at the Governor's Office, expressed appreciation on behalf of the Governor for the continued participation of Work Group members. She noted that the Governor is hopeful that the group can come to a resolution on outcomes.

WPSR Work Group members and audience participants introduced themselves by name and affiliation.

Deb Nudelman reviewed the agenda, noting that key topics for the day include a discussion on the Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal as well as a discussion on funding, a definition of chronic depredation, controlled take, as well as other topics that members would like to propose for discussion. She explained that the meeting will end with a conversation about next steps, what to report out at the December 7 Commission briefing, and how to move forward with future WPSR Work Group meetings.

Deb Nudelman reviewed the documents in the meeting packet, meeting logistics, audience role, and ground rules.

WPSR Work Group members asked questions about the expectations for upcoming Commission briefings. ODFW representatives noted that a brief update and report will be made on December 7 and will include potential schedule that the Commission will make a decision on the Wolf Plan at its February 8, 2019 meeting. At least forty-nine days in advance of that meeting, a notice of proposed rule-making with the Secretary of State's office will be filed, including the initial Draft rules. That filing opens the public comment on the proposed rulemaking process. The February Commission meeting will include an opportunity for public testimony before the commission makes its decision on the Oregon Wolf Plan.

2. Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal

Kevin Blakely, ODFW Wildlife Division Deputy Administrator Coordinator and Shannon Hurn, Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife Programs

Kevin Blakely reminded members about the process for developing the Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal. Work Group members developed the proposal at their October 9, 2018 meeting. ODFW staff then reflected on that proposal and created a set of questions to understand how the proposal might work on the ground. Then Work Group members reviewed those questions and provided their responses, which were consolidated into one document that was included in the meeting packet.

Kevin reflected on the Work Group member responses to questions, noting that it is clear members see value in the proposal, and a necessity for non-lethal methods in preventing and reducing livestock conflict. All stakeholders placed ODFW in the role of developing the individual plans. Currently, ODFW conducts education and outreach around non-lethal methods, assists landowners with implementing non-lethal methods, and works with County Compensation Committees for information on appropriate tools.

There is concern that the proposal is an unfunded concept. Kevin added that several items that were discussed and supported at the October WPSR Work Group meeting are included in the agency's requested budget as a Policy Option Package (POP), including collaring, monitoring of wolves, and working with producers across the state where wolves are on the landscapes. The Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal, as envisioned in the written document, is entirely separate from and would cost much more to implement than what the POP includes.

Members reflected on the Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal and member responses to questions:

Presentation: Sample Individual Wolf Conflict Deterrence Plan

Deb explained that Cynthia Warnock, an area rancher, worked with ODFW biologists to develop a sample Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan. She invited Cynthia to walk through the experience of developing the Individual Wolf Conflict Deterrence Plan.

Cynthia made the following points:

- She tried to keep the Plan as brief as possible, using a “checkbox” approach that would be easier for other ranchers to implement. Landowners can check off the non-lethal methods that are considered appropriate and potentially effective for their specific circumstance.
- Cynthia reviewed the list of non-lethal methods, and why some would not be effective or appropriate for her particular operation, and situations where the methods might be more appropriate.
- Cynthia reflected on her experience in writing the plan, and noted it was simple and something that ranchers can do if they have the will to do so. In her particular situation, she brought the sample plan to a wildlife biologist at the ODFW office. The biologist reviewed and made comments but did not have to visit her ranch because he knows her operation well. In other cases where the biologist is not familiar with the specific operation, it would

take time and effort for the biologist to travel and visit the site, and to help the landowner understand which non-lethal measures might be effective.

Discussion on Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal

Members asked questions and made the following comments regarding development of individual plans:

- Members discussed concern around the cost and effort required to develop individual plans.
 - Some noted that, due to resource constraints and insufficient staff, ODFW may not be able to take a lead role in developing plans, and some ranchers may not be willing to undertake plan development. We should be realistic, about whether we should even continue talking about this. ODFW staff estimated that it would cost \$4.4 million per year to fund staffing in several districts to help livestock producers develop these plans. If the producers were willing to lead the plan development; then that cost would be somewhat reduced. ODFW is concerned that developing individual plans might not be the best way to address livestock conflicts.
 - Members suggested focusing plan development by prioritizing plans for “high risk” ranchers or those that have had the most depredations. Others noted that hundreds of ranchers are currently implementing non-lethal methods and are impacted by wolves. For example, in Wallowa county there would be 200 operations that need a plan right now; and a plan would take more than a day for each biologist to do. So that would take at least a year for a full-time employee to do. Developing good plans is a large investment.
 - Others noted that the plan does not seem overly burdensome and is worth the cost. They wondered if part of the staff time of the five new positions in the POP could be used to carry out the proposal. ODFW staff responded that the intention of the POP is to fund activities to proactively manage wolves in the future, through conducting surveys, providing non-lethal recommendations to landowners, providing better education, etc.

- Members explained that, from the producers’ perspective, the individual plans do not seem like the best approach to reducing conflicts, and that funding for education around non-lethal methods might be more appropriate.

- A member suggested developing metrics for evaluating the effectiveness of an individual plan, to help understand whether developing such plans is valuable.

- Members stressed the need for building credibility and trust with ODFW regarding data and education on non-lethal methods. ODFW explained that wildlife biologists conduct proactive education around non-lethal methods, though members said they would like to see greater efforts made. Some ranchers have found that they receive inaccurate or non-timely information regarding wolf locations and assistance with issues in the field.

- A member suggested that the conversation around non-lethal methods must be integrated with the conversation around controlled take, including a large-scale look at wolf populations and the positive role that hunting can play.

- Members discussed the relative value of developing individual plans. Some noted that there is value in ensuring that livestock producers use *effective* tools that are tailored to their situation. Meeting with ODFW ensures that the tools being tried are effective. If tools are not effective, then there should be feedback to improve efficacy. The exchange of information is critical; just reading something in a guide book is not effective. Additionally, some ranchers engage in practices that encourage wolves to come in; and they don't realize that their practices have that effect.
- Producers desire recognition by other parties around the changes that have already been made in livestock operations to attempt to reduce conflicts, and the time and money this has cost producers.
- A member suggested that the individual plans should be developed with engagement from the County Wolf Committees. The counties have additional resources, funding, equipment and knowledge that can be pooled with the resources of ODA and ODFW to help resolve conflicts.
- Members expressed concern that a formal individual plan process discounts local knowledge.
- Members noted that ranchers would like to see a guarantee that, if they follow their individual plan and continue to experience depredations, that they are guaranteed to move to lethal control. Others were concerned about ranchers viewing the individual plans as a check box or formality to be given permission to take wolves. Several rancher representatives noted that producers' highest priority is to stop or prevent the killing of livestock; they simply want assurance that if they have done everything they could conceivably think of to try to prevent further depredations, they can move to lethal control. ODFW staff added that the proposal does have the benefit of providing certainty to a rancher: they know what methods they must implement, which is sometimes unclear today. Others commented that, if producers have good individual plans for using non-lethal tools, there should be minimal depredations. If the tools are being followed, and chronic depredation continues, that should trigger re-evaluation to understand what is not working. Other members expressed a preference that there not be a guarantee of lethal control; and that the agency still retain discretion as to whether or not to employ lethal control.
- Members stressed the importance of good data on the location of wolves in the State. Producers want to know whether wolves are in their area, so that they can make adjustments to prevent losses. Concern was expressed that the Proposal seems too conservation focused; as wolf populations increase, conservation standards should decrease, not increase.
- Some members stressed the need for adaptability and flexibility; and that the Proposal seems to add administrative hurdles rather than reducing them. The Oregon Wolf Plan should provide wildlife managers with flexibility to adapt to the situation on the ground, in accordance with the law.
- Members compared the experience of Oregon to that of Idaho, Montana, Washington and California and noted the differences between the states and public values.

During the discussion on the Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal, Kearns & West typed and projected key comments on the portions of the proposal. Key comments are shown in red below:

November 27 meeting. Below are comments from the November 27 meeting, shown in red text.

NON-LETHAL DETERRENCE PLAN PROPOSAL:

1. Funding comes in from the State of the Oregon and Other funders to provide resources to livestock operators to develop operation specific gray wolf nonlethal deterrence plans
 - a. Phase in over time, to allocate funding resources where most needed to address problems
 - b. State provide funding to support producers
 - c. Consider a starting place that focuses on areas where already implementing a non-lethal plan
 - d. Ensure the plan complies with the law

2. ODA/ODFW meets with the Rancher/Farmer to discuss Livestock operations
 - a. Make this a collaborative, proactive process that is flexible and responsive to rancher/farmer needs. Use this proposal as a way to keep livestock and wolves alive. And to have public resources be used to support this premise and to have the value of wolves on the landscape and value of livestock protected.
 - b. Start with ranchers that have a depredation problem.
 - c. Be proactive: ODFW talk with field staff and livestock owners; do workshops, and do meetings to educate on non-lethals
 - i. Share information when wolf packs are around
 - ii. Describe tools that can be used on the ground
 - iii. Strive to reduce or eliminate conflict
 - iv. Build trust and credibility, and a foundation of understanding
 - v. Honor local knowledge on the landscape (get local buy in)
 - d. Engage counties too (not just ODA and ODFW). Share local knowledge within county around practices to reduce depredations.
 - e. Honor what the livestock owner is already doing to prevent conflict/depredations

3. The operator develops a non-lethal conflict deterrence plan specific to their operation, it includes a review of fiscal expenditures to implement their nonlethal deterrence methods
 - a. Focus on non-lethals and be proactive
 - b. Use tools that are effective for the local operation; don't include tools that are not effective. Ensure use of expertise by ODFW and others on tools to be used, if it does not work, get feedback to improve efficacy.
 - c. Make the plan development process light and easy
 - d. Make sure the plan provides for certainty and consistency

- e. Ensure that the plan allows for flexibility and adaptation as needed to address issues as they arise
 - f. Consider the cost of the measures
 4. The plan is approved by ODA and ODFW
 - a. Plan is approved by ODFW (not to include ODA)
 5. All non-lethals (as feasible/reasonable) are deployed as prescribed in the plan
 - a. Make this adaptive and responsive over time
 - b. Producers want to know if wolves are in the area to prevent losses
 - c. With all non-lethals being implemented there should be a reduction in depredation
 6. If chronic depredation occurs (as described in the OR Wolf Conservation and Management Plan) a lethal request is sent to ODFW
 - a. Even if chronic depredation occurs, ensure that the plan allows for flexibility and adaptation as needed to address issues as they arise
 - b. If chronic depredation is occurring, it should also trigger some evaluation of what is not working in addition to the form of authorized lethal control
 7. ODFW confirms the plan has been implemented and authorizes a form of lethal control to address the chronic depredation
 - a. Commitment to quick response to move toward lethal control
 - b. Guarantee move to lethal take if the producer follows the individual plan; others did not support a guaranteed move to lethal take, and that even if the producer follows the individual plan, ODFW still retain discretion of whether to lethally control wolves
- If rancher/farmer does not have a nonlethal deterrence plan or does not follow/implement their plan
 - Then, no lethal request is allowed; not eligible for lethal control
 - Can still apply for compensation

3. Review and Discuss Funding

Derek Broman, ODFW Wildlife Division Carnivore/Furbearer Program Coordinator and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Derek Broman directed members to page 7 of the *Topic Backgrounder* that provides a synopsis of current funding mechanisms for the Wolf Program in Oregon. He explained that as wolf populations rise, current funding is insufficient to implement collaring, investigations, and other priorities. ODFW developed a policy action package (POP) to request five staff to be distributed among current staff to address these workloads. Their work would include: surveys, monitoring, detecting wolf locations, collaring wolves, helping with population counts, implementing new sampling schemes, and implement non-lethal methods. The POP was not originally developed with the intent to fund the nonlethal planning proposal developed by the Work Group. ODFW staff noted that earlier discussions had suggested the potential to fund two additional positions, separate from the POP. This could include an east and west side staff position to help implement non-lethal methods and coordination with producers.

Members asked questions, discussed and made the following comments:

- Members asked clarifying questions around how the POP would change the focus of work and species for district biologists. ODFW noted that if the POP is funded, ideally current district biologists would be focused back on other wildlife, and spend less time on wolf issues, although inevitably some of their time would be spent on wolves. The five staff funded under the POP would be focused on the wolf program.
- Members clarified the use of Pittman–Robertson Federal Aid funds and other sources of revenue, and suggested WPSR Work Group members work together to collaboratively seek additional funding.
- A member asked whether staff funded by the POP would be authorized to conduct lethal takes. ODFW staff responded that the POP does not specifically limit the exact wolf program activities that staff would be authorized to conduct, but it is anticipated that some staff may be authorized to conduct lethal takes in certain parts of the state.

Deb asked participants to indicate their level of support for ODFW's budget and funding proposal POP, as outlined in Page 7 of the *Topic Backgrounder for WPSR October 9, 2018* document. Members provided their reflections in turn:

- Overall, members expressed support for funding for positions to conduct the outlined activities outlined, including performing wolf surveys, monitoring radio-collared wolves, and responding to reports of wolf-livestock conflict.
- Some suggested expanding the activities of the funded positions to include:
 - Implement techniques used in other states beyond radio collaring and tracking that can be more effective.
 - Activities to support research on depredation on livestock and predation on ungulates.
- A member provided support contingent on funding coming from the general fund rather than from hunting tags.

- A member noted that district biologists should still be engaged in wolf issues, since they have the training to respond. ODFW clarified that district biologists would still be engaged in wolf issues to some extent; their work would be supplemented with these five additional positions.
- ***Consensus Point:* Overall, members expressed support for the POP to fund five additional positions to conduct activities to support implementation of the Wolf Plan. Several members had comments and concerns about certain components of the POP, but did not oppose it overall.**

4. Definition of Chronic Depredation

Derek Broman and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Derek directed members to Page 3 of the *Topic Backgrounder* handout that reviews the current and proposed definition of “chronic depredation.” He explained that under the current plan, in Phases 2 and 3, lethal control can be considered after two confirmed depredations or one confirmed depredation with three attempted depredations (in conjunction with numerous other considerations), with no timeframe.

ODFW staff proposes to redefine chronic depredation in in the following way:

- Phase 1: Keep Phase 1 measures intact (no change)
- Phases 2 and 3: consider lethal control after three confirmed depredations within a 12-month period (in conjunction with numerous other requirements)
- Additionally in Phase 3: consider lethal control after two confirmed depredations in two situations: 1) in extreme circumstances where evidence exists of immediate ineffectiveness of non-lethal measures and/or circumstances indicate that non-lethal methods will be ineffective or are impractical; or 2) situations where depredations are occurring on private lands.

Derek clarified that ODFW would consider many factors in determining whether lethal control would be authorized when chronic depredation has occurred. He added that depredation investigations are incredibly rigorous in the process to confirm a depredation.

Members asked questions and discussed the ODFW staff recommendation.

- Members asked for clarification on “extreme circumstances” in the Phase 3 scenario. ODFW clarified that it could include situations in which many heads of sheep are lost and then a second depredation occurs the next night; in this situation, there is likely an individual problematic wolf and it is impractical to wait for a third depredation. Some participants suggested clarifying the Phase 3 language to indicate that “extreme circumstances” apply to situations of high levels of mortality and financial impact.
- A member suggested eliminating the private lands provision, which was added after a lot of process went into generating the “3 depredations in 12 months” figure.

- A member cited reports showing that in areas where there were two depredations, 91% had a third incident. Requiring three depredations to move to lethal take will have little support in the ranching community. The ranching community would be concerned with these stringent criteria before considering lethal control. The member suggested refining the provision so that two probable depredations to equal one confirmed depredation. Phases 2 and 3 represent the management phase, and the regulation should be made less restrictive—not more burdensome. Another member noted that the same series of data from ODFW showed that with each successive predation there was a reduced likelihood of a following predation; therefore, the member suggested letting the predations taper off instead of killing wolves directly after the first one or two predations.
- Some members expressed concern about use of lethal control at a time when wolf populations in Oregon are still low, and around what percentage of the Oregon wolf population might be lethally taken if depredations occur. They noted that if ranchers are effectively using non-lethal methods, this would offset the need for lethal control.
- Members suggested adjusting the timeframe within the definition. The 12-month period captures two depredation seasons, and multiple depredations across seasons cannot be considered “chronic.” Instead, the timeframe should be bound by the season to reflect that “chronic” depredations have a temporal element.
- Members asked for clarity on the kinds of depredations are happening on the ground today. ODFW staff clarified that two-thirds of the state is still in Phase 1 and listed. Northeastern Oregon has a significant number of the wolf packs and a lot of movement among packs. When a lethal request is made, ODFW rarely moves to lethal control before three depredations in a fairly confined time period. ODFW takes a lot of factors into consideration when deciding whether lethal take is the right tool to avoid more depredation.
- Members noted that the Phase 1 definition of chronic depredation (four depredations in six months) was amended in 2010 after a settlement agreement, and there is nothing prescribing that the definition must stay the same in Phases 2 and 3. One member noted that the original stakeholders who developed the plan adopted in 2005 felt there should not be a different definition for “chronic depredation” for each phase but that, rather, “chronic depredation” be defined the same for all three phases, because “chronic” is defined by how many predations occur not by how many wolves there are.
- Members and ODFW discussed the effectiveness of lethal control as a tool to reduce conflict and livestock depredation. ODFW noted that lethal control has been effective, and wolves from packs that are known to be causing problems have been removed; ODFW uses a variety of data/information to determine which wolf to remove, and this has led to fewer livestock deaths. Members suggested updating the definition to authorize use of “targeted” lethal control. Others noted that whole pack removal is preferred by some ranchers, as opposed to individual lethal removal.

Deb asked members for specific proposals to compare to ODFW’s proposed solution. Members provided the following two suggestions:

- Phases 2 and 3: Define “chronic depredation” as three depredations in a grazing season (an approximately 6-to-9-month period)
- Phases 2 and 3: Define “chronic depredation” as two depredations in a 12-month period. Also consider equating two probable depredations to one confirmed depredation.

Members made the following comments on the proposals:

- The livestock community would likely not support three depredations as the bar for chronic depredation. The definition should not become harder to meet as wolf populations increase. Members of the livestock community are also concerned about counting multiple head losses as one loss. The livestock community would prefer to have a guarantee of lethal control after two depredations in a twelve-month period but are comfortable with ODFW using its discretion to consider lethal control after 2 depredations in twelve months in situations where it is clear that the producer has been trying to do non-lethal methods.
- The livestock community may be comfortable with a definition of two depredations in nine months, taking into account the seasonal time period.
- Members noted that data does not suggest that depredations rise as wolf population rises. The data shows that depredations dip up and down. The climb in depredations is not likely to climb at the same rate as wolf increase rate.
- Members of the conservation community commented that two depredations seem insufficient as a threshold for “chronic.”. It is important to balance the definition of chronic depredation with what the state does to assist with non-lethal tools on the front end, and with compensation. They suggested using “three depredations” as the standard but increasing the compensation amount. This extra compensation might encourage the livestock community to try out the three depredations standard, and account for the hardship in waiting for a potential third depredation. There should be time for the non-lethal methods to be in place to see if they can work to stop the predations; two depredations does not allow sufficient time.
- A member added that two *confirmed* depredations is a much higher standard than simply depredations or losses. There are losses in a regular grazing season that go unaccounted for because many producers do not contact ODFW when they find a carcass/bones with very little evidence of a depredation.
- ODFW staff reviewed data on past depredations: out of eleven situations where there were two depredations, ten (91%) depredated a third time. Three depredated more than four times. The average time period between the first and second depredation was 10 days. The average time period between the second and third depredation was 43 days. In situations of four depredations, the four depredations occurred within four months.

ODFW staff encouraged participants to check in with their members to understand what definition of “chronic depredation” would be acceptable. ODFW staff would like members to report out on

the variety of viewpoints or level of agreement at the January WPSR meeting, as well as provide a recommendation on how to define chronic depredation.

5. Controlled Take

Derek Broman and Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Derek directed members to Page 5 of the *Topic Background*er handout that reviews current practices and proposals around controlled take. He explained that the Oregon Wolf Plan defines wolves as a game mammal and uses criteria to separate wolves from other game mammals. Controlled take is specific to addressing wild ungulate issues and chronic depredation issues. It does not consist of a general hunting season and there is maximum enforcement of illegal activities.

Page 5 includes a number of staff proposals. ODFW's proposal is not very different from what is in the current plan, with the addition of the special permit agent concept.

Members discussed controlled take and made the following comments and observations:

- Members of the hunting community suggested using the term “special permit hunter/trapper” rather than “special permit agent.”
- ODFW clarified that it would not sell special agent permits to the public. Instead, the special agent would be a volunteer of ODFW and would be trained to take specific wolves. Members suggested clarifying this in the plan.
- Members asked whether the agent would be entitled to retain the carcass. ODFW staff responded that they would. Members suggested that in order to avoid confusion with cougar agents, the term “hunter/trapper” be used rather than “agent.” Others were surprised that the agent would be entitled to retain the carcass and wanted greater clarity.
- Members asked about the phrasing of the last bullet on page five: stakeholders in the past agreed to the phrase “wolves are a primary cause” as opposed to “wolves are a major cause.” ODFW responded that the language reflects the exact 10j language, which reduces the agency's risk for litigation.
- Representatives of the hunting community noted that their main interest is to discuss controlled take. Their groups are comfortable with the language around controlled take in the Plan at this time; with the caveat that as wolf populations increase, the state should look at expanding the mechanism for controlled take. They expressed hope for spending a significant amount of time on that topic at the next WPSR Work Group Meeting; but if the group does not have the opportunity to talk about the controlled take topic in January, the hunting community is fine with the language as it currently is in the Plan.
- A member commented that the Plan should include wolf management zones and associated management objective numbers: the Plan should clearly state the threshold at which wolf management zones would be brought in. Another member suggested creating a Phase 4 that

would begin when Oregon has a large wolf population, allowing flexibility for greater wolf management and less conservation.

- A member expressed support for updating the language to allow the use of sporting dogs and pets on the East side, as the East side is now in the management phase. Another member was wary of allowing a sporting dog program; in some other states, people who are not responsible hound hunters are putting their animals at risk.

6. Opportunity for Public Input

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb opened the floor for public input. Four members of the public provided public input.

Diane Gallegos, Wolf Haven International, thanked participants for coming together to do this hard work, and hoped that the members together can create a more durable solution than ODFW coming up with a solution on its own. She expressed surprise that the special agent can keep the carcass, which is a different ethic that she would like to hear more about.

Jennifer Jaca suggested defining chronic depredation differently for sheep as opposed to cattle. There may be something different about various kind of livestock that warrant different definitions.

Bill Richardson commented that the group appears to be doing Wolf Plan revision rather than Wolf Plan review. He suggested including hunting in the plan and proposed including trained hunters that pay for a tag to hunt, with funds going towards conservation.

Tim Barbouletos said he is happy he is retired!

7. Upcoming Meeting Topics, Next Steps and Summary

Deb Nudelman, Kearns & West

Deb asked members to reflect on their willingness to continue the conversation at a January WPSR Work Group meeting and consider what should be reported to the Commission. Members responded and made the following final observations:

- Overall, members support continuing the conversation at a January meeting and expressed appreciation for the chance to hear one another's perspectives. They noted that the process is challenging, but desire to see if there can be room for agreed upon path forward. Some noted that the WPSR Work Group seems to have made progress, and others noted that a lot of issues do not seem near agreement and will need to be decided upon by the Commission.
- Members suggested the following in the Report to the Commission:
 - Explain what the group has discussed, where they have come up with new ideas and approaches, and be honest about the divides, and the reasons for disagreement.

- Explain that the process has been rocky, but useful and the group is making slow progress.
- Some suggested providing the various points of view on controlled take and wolf management zones.
- Members made these additional observations:
 - This stakeholder process should be embedded in the wolf conservation work going forward. Collaborative time with diverse stakeholders is useful, even if just a few times per year so that all can be pulling in the right direction and avoid polarization.
 - Members suggested meetings be in person, rather than by phone.

Next WPSR Work Group Meeting and Next Steps

Deb asked members to continue to hold January 8, 2019 as the date of the next WPSR Work Group meeting. If that date does not work for members, they should let Kearns & West know as soon as possible.

Deb thanked members for their participation and complimented them for the impressive amount of work and complicated policy choices they have discussed in a short period of time.

As a next step, ODFW will review the various discussions made around the eight topics introduced at the October 9 meeting (the four “Issues Ready for Resolution,” and the four “Issues for Further Discussion”) as well as the Non-Lethal Deterrence Plan Proposal. The agency will work to summarize and reflect areas of agreement and propose next steps for each. The January 8 meeting will be a final opportunity for Work Group members to attempt to come to agreement on “what they can live with” for all the topics. ODFW staff will incorporate that information into the Wolf Plan for the Commission at the February 8, 2019 meeting.

Members discussed timeframes for public notice and publication of drafts. Shannon Hurn indicated that ODFW will need to provide public notice of rulemaking with the Secretary of State (including current draft rules) by December 24 (at least forty-nine days prior to filing the new rules following the February 8 Commission meeting). The draft rules are required for the initial public notice and can still be revised based on the January 8 WPSR Work Group discussion, before proposed draft rules are completed for the February Commission meeting. It is anticipated that the Commission will consider adopting the Plan at the February meeting. Members had some concern about the short timeframes for public review. ODFW indicated that they would answer additional questions on the public process at the January WPSR meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 pm.

Upcoming Meeting Dates	Location
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● WPSR Work Group Meeting - January 8, 9:00 am – 4:00 pm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Portland, OR

Meeting Participation

WPSR Work Group Representatives

Name	Organization/Entity
Jim Akenson	Oregon Hunters Association
Nick Cady	Cascadia Wildlands
Mary Anne Cooper	Oregon Farm Bureau
Rodger Huffman (<i>alternate</i>)	Oregon Cattlemen's Association
Sean Stevens	Oregon Wild
Suzanne Stone	Defenders of Wildlife
Amaroq Weiss	Center for Biological Diversity
David Wiley	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation

ODFW Team

Name	Title
Kevin Blakely	Wildlife Division Deputy Administrator
Derek Broman	Carnivore/Furbearer Program Coordinator
Roblyn Brown	Wolf Program Field Coordinator
Doug Cottam	Wildlife Division Administrator
Shannon Hurn	Deputy Director for Fish and Wildlife Programs

Governor's Office

Name	Title
Amira Streeter	Natural Resources Policy Advisor

Team Members and Audience

Name	Organization/Entity
Jeanne Barbouletto	
Lane Carrier	
Diane Gallegos	Wolf Haven International
Rusty Inglis	Harney County Farm Bureau
Jennifer Jaca	
Sristi Kamal	Defenders of Wildlife
Robin Kearns	
Danielle Moser	Defenders of Wildlife
Dennis Myhrum	Oregon Farm Bureau
Bill Richardson	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
George Rollins	Oregon Cattlemen's Association
Jerome Rosa (on phone)	Oregon Cattlemen's Association
Haley Stewart	Humane Society of the United States
Fred Walasavage	Oregon Hunters Association
Cynthia Warnock (on phone)	Wallowa County Rancher