

Exhibit I

Draft Wolf Plan Review

April 21, 2017

1. Background and Need for Review
2. Review Process
3. Draft Plan



Russ Morgan

Wolf Program Coordinator

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife

Background & Need for Review

- **The current Plan contains specific direction for evaluation and reporting on wolf management in the state**
 - Annual reporting to the Commission
 - Commission evaluates the effectiveness of implementation every five years

Review Process

- **March 2016 Commission meeting**
 - Invited panel and discussion
- **Stakeholder group discussions**
 - Three meetings
 - Development of policy issues
- **Agency and tribal coordination**
- **October 2016 Commission meeting**
- **Internal agency evaluation**
- **Development of initial review draft**

Draft Plan – General Approach to Revisions

- **Previous agreements or understandings important**
 - Conservation focus in all phases
 - Increasing flexibility as population increases
 - Delisting analysis factors still valid
- **Use adaptive approach as originally intended**
- **Proposed revisions consider agency limitations**

Draft Plan – Overall

- **General structure and flow is similar to current Plan**
- **Maintains overall conservation focus**
- **Reflects current situation in Oregon**
 - Uses Oregon-specific information where applicable
- **Increased use of science to support draft Plan**
- **Reduced appendices**
- **Earlier versions of the Plan will continue to be made available for historical reference**

Chapter 1 – Introduction

- **Combined the Introduction and Chapter 1 of current Plan**
 - Reduced overall content of chapter
 - Historical and background information is well documented and easily referenced

Chapter 2 – Conservation, Monitoring, and Game Mammal Status

- **Maintains current zones and population objectives associated with phases**
 - Development of a spatial population model
 - Requires an analysis of the population when moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2 in the Western Zone
 - Clarified the minimum number of wolves necessary to reduce risk of dropping below the Phase 3 objective

Chapter 2 (Continued)

- **Added “Potential Conservation Threats” section**
 - Human-caused mortality
 - Genetic health
 - Habitat and connectivity
 - Diseases
 - Human attitudes toward wolves
- **Changed the collar requirement for monitoring**
 - Phase 1&2 – 1 collar per pack
 - Phase 3 – collaring in select situations
 - Increased use of VHF collars in all phases
- **Implement a citizen advisory group process**

Chapter 2 (Continued)

- **Wolves as Special Status Game Mammals**
 - Establishment of game mammal status was called for in 2005 Plan – formalized by the 2009 Legislature
 - The current Plan states that the use of hunters and trappers in very specific situations will be an available tool in Phase 3
 - Not intended to manage or limit the wolf population
 - No general hunting seasons allowed
 - Does not replace non-lethal efforts to minimize depredation

Chapter 2 (Continued)

- **Draft Plan maintains the Department's ability to use hunters and trappers for certain management situations, and adds specificity for when take would be allowed**
 - Must not reduce overall population health factors
 - Department must establish that that wolves are a significant factor in the population not meeting established ungulate objectives and the controlled take action is expected to improve the situation
 - Requires the Department to monitor results and impacts
 - Adds certification requirements and procedures before hunters and trappers could be utilized
 - General season hunts are not permitted (no change from current)

Chapter 3 – Wolf-Livestock Conflicts

- Added Oregon-specific wolf depredation data
- Increased scientific literature related to wolf-livestock conflict
- Added new section covering considerations and scientific background for tools to minimize depredation
 - Non-lethal measures
 - Lethal control
 - Compensation

Chapter 3 (Continued)

- **Strategies to address livestock conflict**
 - Continue to use Phase 1 standards
 - Injurious harassment (Phases 2&3) – requires that livestock must be present for injurious harassment to be allowed
 - Raised the minimum level of depredation (Phase 2&3) for consideration of lethal control to:
 - Three confirmed depredations within 12 month period, or
 - One confirmed depredation and at least 4 probable depredations
- **Requires that any take permits must be within an area of depredating wolves**

Chapter 3 (Continued)

- Adds clarification that non-lethal measures must be reasonable for the situation before lethal control may be employed (Phase 2&3)
- Reduced reporting time for any take of wolves to 24 hrs.
- Requires that investigations of depredation are conducted objectively using a consistently applied standard of evidence, regardless of which agency conducts

Chapter 4 – Wolf-ungulate Interactions, and Interactions with Other Carnivores

- **Combines Chapters 4 & 5 of the current Plan**
 - Eliminates Ch. 5 section on hybrids (now in Ch. 2)
 - Eliminates Ch. 5 section on ESA species and ecosystem responses
- **Adds scientific literature related to wolf interactions with ungulate prey species**
- **Adds a section summarizing big game population status in units with wolves**

Chapter 4 (Continued)

- Adds new section – “Wolf Interactions with other Carnivores”
- Updated strategies to reflect Chapter 2 game mammal standards

Chapter 5 – Wolf-Human Interactions

- Updated and reorganized
- Reaffirm that reported wolf-human interactions will remain a high priority

Chapter 6 – Information and Education

- Chapter reorganized and shortened
- Implementation of the communications plan as the only strategy within the chapter
- Reaffirms that Department will continue with wolf web page

Chapter 7 – Reporting and Evaluation

- Chapter condensed, but general approach unchanged
- Adds strategy to integrate the citizen advisory group process (Chapter 2) into evaluation of the Plan

Chapter 8 – Research and Information Management

- Updated and expanded chapter
- All strategies are new
 - Research should be responsive to management and conservation needs
 - Science-based monitoring important
 - Importance of effective collaborations
 - Use research conducted elsewhere
 - Effectively disseminate research derived information

Chapter 9 – Budget for Implementation

- Completely revised and condensed
- Reflects only current funding options and costs of wolf management

Chapter 10 – Literature Cited

- Significantly increased use of referenced literature in this draft Plan

Chapter 11 – Economic Considerations (removed)

- Focused on economic values and tradeoffs of having wolves
- Oregon has clearly made a decision to have wolves
- Some information within the chapter are incorporated into other portions of draft Plan

Next Steps

- **May 19th Commission meeting**
- **Coordination with agencies and Tribes**
- **Review public input**
- **External review opportunity by agencies, wolf managers, and other experts**
- **Develop revised draft based on Commission guidance**
- **Present revised draft Plan and Oregon Administrative Rule to Commission**

Questions?

