

Wolf Planning Meeting
January 7, 2019
10 a.m. – 4 p.m.

Attendees: Kim Thorburn, Jay Holzmilller, Barbara Baker, Eric Gardner, Donny Martorello, Julia Smith

10:00: Welcome and logistics

We reviewed the agenda. J. Holzmilller asked for J. Smith to discuss her observation of the WA program since her arrival.

10:15: Check-in; what we hope to accomplish

There was a lot of discussion about what needs to be addressed in future wolf management plans. These were captured as **General Input/Principles:**

- Not just focus on wolf, think full ecosystem and ungulate population connection
- Sustainability
- Hunters need a voice
- Include an Adaptive Management process
- How can Commission be helpful with broad stroke guidance?
- Where can Commission make decisions that lesson the load, simplify the process?

11:00: Delisting timeline

The group discussed the recovery timeline in the existing recovery plan and how that timeline is close but may be slightly behind. The PSR will use WA specific information to reassess the recovery timeline.

Discussed the status of the federal listing and the complexity resulting from that uncertainty.

10:45: Review Previous Commission Engagement (in Recovery Plan development)

Donny provided a review of the process used to develop the current plan.

Desire to avoid last minute changes to work done by others –this requires adequate participation, incite, into content and issues.

Discussion of WAG process and request for Commission sideboards. Uncertain as to Director's expectations for how to engage WAG. Options ranged from separating the two to direct involvement. Regardless, the process needs to ensure that WAG does not get too far out ahead of Commission. There needs to be adequate opportunities for engagement, review, and establishing sideboards if needed.

11:30: Review Ongoing Management Actions

The document describing these activities was reviewed, along with anticipated timelines.

12:00: Lunch

Lunch started at 12:30...

1:00: Develop Commission Engagement Options

The Commissioners focused their discussion on the process options available to them to ensure the appropriate level of engagement in those efforts. The group discussed how a new committee (or sub-committee) could be established that would engage the department and the Commission on wolf-related actions.

Things to determine if a Committee is established:

1. How does the Director wish to engage with the committee?
2. How does the Director want the committee to interact with the WAG?
3. Is it a separate committee or a sub-committee of the WL Committee?
4. Membership assignments.
5. Public engagement expectations for the new committee vs. reporting out through the WL Committee and/or the Commission.
6. Should the Committee have a defined purpose or vision statement?

Additional notes:

Report out in January, but then discussion led to something more detailed being in the Director's report in February.

How many members, who appoints members, open public meetings or report outs? Include non-Commission personnel? Unofficially but not as members?

Discussion was that there are already public processes – the WAG and Commission processes. This committee should focus on Commission engagement and work to ensure diverse public participation on those other processes.

The WAG has asked the Commission for sideboards or guidance, but the Commission should not skip the department in the process – engagement with the WAG should be discussed further.

Should a vision statement be developed and if so, in that Strategic Plan? Some comments captured but not as a draft vision – recovered wolf, healthy ungulates, continued livestock grazing, and ability to address conflict, collaborative, adaptive, local voice.

4:00: Adjourn

Adjourned at approximately 3 p.m.