

# **WOLF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

8/27/2014 Wausau Howard Johnson Hotel

**Introductions** - Deb Beyer provided a summary of discussion topics. An opportunity to amend the agenda was provided. A review of committee discussion procedures was provided. Committee member introductions were made: Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission, Timber Wolf Alliance, Wis. Conservation Congress, Wis. Trappers Association, Wis. Wildlife Federation, Wis. Bear Hunters Association, Safari Club Int'l, Wis. Bowhunters Association, Wis. Trappers Association, Wis. County Forest Association, USDA APHIS-Wildlife Services, U.S. Forest Service, DNR Customer Service, DNR West-central District, DNR Northern District, DNR Southern District, DNR Northeast District, DNR Law Enforcement, DNR Science Services, DNR Wildlife Damage Specialist, DNR Forest Wildlife Specialist, and DNR Large Carnivore Specialist.

**Member Matters** - Discussion directed by Laurie Groskopf, committee member, with comments provided by committee members.

- Statements on the internet reportedly stated by Laurie about the committee were inaccurate and not stated by Laurie. These statements are not factual and she does not support those statements.
- There was science behind the harvest and experts from the DNR that provided data. It is not entirely clear why Jen Stenglein's population model has become ineffective for use.
- There are portions of the wolf count that are outstanding and there are many experienced trackers involved. The tracking effort should be more complete and requires additional trackers.
- There are some inconsistencies in the 2013 tracking report. When the public reports observations, the observations are classified as non-wolf, probable, or confirmed wolf observation. To be listed as confirmed, hard evidence is needed.
- 2014 wolf tracker training classes are being finalized currently and will occur primarily in November and December. Working to identify venues.
- The post delisting monitoring report developed for the USFWS is currently available. However, some components of the tracking survey are not public record; specific location data of game species is not public record. A summary of tracking effort is not available in the current report but the data is available. Dave MacFarland will provide the data that is public record to the committee; data availability is determined by law as legal protections are in place regarding the specific locations of game species. This is similar to deer location data (buck mortality study).
  - Hound hunters would find location data useful for avoiding wolf locations although cautionary maps are provided on the DNR web page following dog depredations.
  - Increased use of hunter-provided information is needed. Observation reports are used to identify wolf locations and all members of the public may participate in wolf track surveys if desired. Additional research is being developed and these efforts take time. The tracking program is about teaching people how to collect data usable by the program; required training is not an indictment on a person's ability to identify tracks.

## **Proposed Voluntary Registration Guidelines for Wolves Harvested with the Aid of Dogs** -

Discussion directed by Dave MacFarland, committee Chair, with comments provided by committee members.

- A background of what was discussed at the previous meeting regarding this topic was provided.
- “Taxidermist” must be added to the list of persons skinning wolf carcasses in proposal.
- DNR Law Enforcement
  - Effort to investigate wolf carcasses would be a high work load for DNR law enforcement staff; LE are short-staffed and limitations currently exist with public access to LE staff.
  - There are limitations with this procedure but the Natural Resource Board (NRB) has established this effort as a priority and expressed desire to have LE staff involved as they are well trained in data collection. LE staff will not make conclusions regarding data; DNR veterinary staff will do this. Biologists and the DNR veterinarian are more qualified to collect carcass data (not evidence) and data will be less than adequate if not collected by a veterinarian.
  - Carcass evaluations are very importance considering perceptions.
- USDA-Wildlife Services
  - USDA-WS staff are well trained in carcass evaluations and cause of death or injury. USDA-WS staff would be well suited to this evaluation effort. At the time of year when this effort would occur, workloads for WS staff are decreasing or lower. This option will be discussed further.
- Data is lost very quickly when carcasses are skinned and allowed to sit for extended periods or frozen and thawed. Outlined procedures were discussed with veterinarians at the University of Wisconsin and it was determined that evaluations need to occur at the time of skinning; crucial for proper data collection. Even skin-on frozen carcasses will have data lost.
- This additional registration procedure is voluntary and hunters with violations will likely not comply; voluntary procedures are not adequate. Trained personnel should supervise hound hunting activities to fully get an accurate view. The WAC should advise the NRB that this additional procedure be mandatory or not done at all. The NRB does not have authority to make this procedure mandatory for the 2014 season.
- A subset of wolves harvest by other means must be evaluated for data comparison. Wolves are pack animals and bite wounds could be from other wolves.
- SUMMARY
  - Explore the possibility for USDA-WS staff to conduct carcass evaluations.
  - Add “taxidermist” to list of persons skinning wolves.
  - Explore the possibility of LE personnel attending hound hunts as supervised hunts.
  - Propose to NRB that this be a mandatory procedure if continued in the future.

**Public Attitudes towards Wolves and Wolf Management in Wisconsin** - Presentation by Bob Holsman, DNR Science Services.

- A summary of survey data was provide; to access the full report visit <http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/WildlifeHabitat/wolf/documents/WolfAttitudeSurveyReportDRAFT.pdf>
- The committee was provided an advanced copy of the survey for review prior to this meeting.
- The current version is a draft; final editorial changes will be made with no content changes.
- A summary of methods was provided at a previous meeting and is outlined in the report.
- Survey was designed to help inform the process for developing the new wolf management plan.

- The sample size was very large for a survey of this type. The survey was rigorously tested and evaluated. The sampling protocol was to choose randomly selected households but with over-sampling in areas where wolves currently exist so regional analyses of data could be conducted.
- The terms “wolf range” and “non-range” do not represent any biological meaning but rather are terms used for convenience.
- County clusters were designed to show regional opinions and an argument could be made to cluster in various different fashions.
- 15% of respondents declined to participate: 63% of these said they didn’t know enough about the subject. Most common reason that hunters did not participate was because they did not know enough about this subject (46%).
- Everyone had the opportunity to provide data on statewide issues as well as at their county-level.
- Statewide, residents held attitudes towards wolves that were more favorable than unfavorable. Opinions were more favorable for people living in non-range; this has been found in other studies nationally. A relatively high percentage of people were neutral or undecided on wolf opinions.
- Reasons indicated for maintaining a sustainable wolf population: they have a right to exist, they are important ecologically, and to help keep deer in balance with habitat.
- Most people disagree with the statement, “wolves provide no benefits to people.”
- Both respondents in wolf range and non-range agreed with the statement, “wolves are special animals that deserve our admiration.”
- Attitude Index Score: Each response was assigned a score and an index score was assigned to responses (-12 to 12; 0 being neutral, positive scores indicating positive attitudes towards wolves, etc.). There were spikes at both ends of the scale but most scores centered on a positive value.
- Preference for statewide wolf population number: Most respondents indicated a preference for maintaining the “same” amount of wolves statewide. Most respondents indicated the same or more wolves, fewer indicated less or none, and some indicated “I don’t know.” The most frequent response was to maintain the “same” population.
- Preference for wolf population number in county of residence: Most respondents living in urban, rural, and towns/villages indicated a preference for maintaining the “same” amount of wolves in their county of residence.
- Respondents experience with wolves (direct and indirect): More people in wolf range have seen wolves than in non-range and are more likely to know someone who has lost an animal to wolves.
- View of wolf abundance in respondent’s county: Most indicated “present”, some indicated “rare”, “abundant”, or “very abundant.”
- Willingness to live near wolves: Most said yes (50%; 43% said no). The general pattern is that respondents living in rural areas were less likely to live near wolves.
- Mean Attitude Index Score by county: Douglas County had the highest index score (4.4); this is not only due to the urban population because the majority of rural respondents indicated a willingness to live near wolves too. All other county clusters had positive mean index scores. Deer hunting correlates to lower index scores; more-rural counties have higher participation rates in deer hunting. Some clusters had a higher percent of respondents indicate they want fewer wolves; shows that differences in opinions exist across wolf range.
- Geography: Respondents in wolf range were 48% rural, 32% town/village, and 20% urban. Attitudes relate more to where a person grew up rather than where they currently live (38% of

rural residents grew up in towns or cities). Rural residents that grew up in urban areas are more favorable towards wolves than rural residents that grew up in rural areas. Cannot generalize public opinions based on where persons currently live.

- *Deer hunter and non-hunter comparisons:* The majority of deer hunters disagreed with the following statements; “wolves have a right to exist”, “wolves are important ecologically”, and “wolves help keep deer in balance with habitat.” Majority of wolf range and non-range deer hunters want many fewer wolves. The majority of non-hunters want the same number of wolves.
- *Risk perception about wolves:* Little previous research exists. The majority of respondents in range and non-range indicate concern or worry regarding risks associated with wolves; includes personal safety, children’s safety, and pet’s safety. The more abundant respondents perceived wolves the more risk they perceived, and vice versa. Deer hunters indicated greater concern than non-hunters and deer hunters with more experience indicated greater concern than deer hunters with less experience. The majority of non-hunters expressed concerns regarding risks. Data in wolf range and non-range, and among groups, were similar. Deer hunter responses from the annual deer hunter post-hunt survey and the wolf public opinion survey showed similar results regarding deer hunter concerns about wolves. The majority of urban and rural residents expressed concerns regarding risks.
  - In wolf range, about the same amount of respondents expressed concerns with wolves as they did bears.
  - In non-range, more people expressed concerns with bears than wolves.
- *Wolf harvest season:* The majority of respondents in both range and non-range supported a regulated wolf harvest season. Data indicates that most residents believe that wolves should be managed either through hunting or depredation controls.
- *Final considerations:* The survey was designed to inform discussions regarding the wolf management plan. The survey is not a referendum or a vote. The survey is the beginning of a conversation on wolf management in the state.

**Committee Discussion on Wolf Public Opinion Survey Results** - Discussion directed by Bob Holsman, DNR Science Services, with comments provided by committee members.

- Some of the reduction in deer numbers was by design although carnivores receive much blame. The issue with deer and wolves is convoluted.
- Results were weighted by standard methods. Data was redistributed based on the number of persons in each group of respondents.
- County populations refer to adult populations; survey was targeted at adults 18 years or older.
- *Perception of risks:*
  - Perceptions of risks are valid and real although may not reflect actual risks.
  - Data on perceived risks of bears and coyotes to pets or hunting dogs does not exist in Wisconsin but may exist nationally. More risk was perceived with bears than wolves and this should be considered when discussing these perceptions. There are 20,000 bear statewide and thus a greater likelihood for encountering bear. As wolves expand or become more abundant in new areas, perceptions may change.
  - Unclear why deer hunters perceive risks of wolves at greater levels than other groups. Risk perception verse the reality of the risk occurring is based on a lack of control in a particular situation and experience with animals or the situation. A lack of experience

with wolves or other carnivores may lead to greater perception of risks with new hunters or older hunters with little experience with these animals. People in wolf range are more likely to be concerned with wolf risks and deer hunters who reported seeing more wolves perceived more risk than those that have seen fewer wolves; perhaps a perception of inquisitiveness versus stalking as some tree stand hunters perceive wolves that they see as “stalking” them. Some hunters carry bows, not rifles, and this could relate to perceived risk. People may have quit hunting because of the perceived fear of wolves; more bowhunters carry side arms than previously. Fear may also be associated with walking out of the woods in the dark.

- The scale system for rating opinions was biased to allow the public greater opportunity to provide more input regarding having fewer wolves than more wolves. On a 6-point scale, the standard is to split the data with three options on one side and three options on the other; thus “same amount of wolves” was clumped with “more” and “many more”, and on the other side “fewer”, “many fewer” and “none” were clumped together. The current management goal and status quo is to reduce the population and so it is more logical to split these options down the middle with “same” clumped with “more” and “many more” since it is in opposition to the status quo.
- The survey did not ask why people perceive fear of carnivores but rather their perceptions of risk. The basis for wolf risk to children may be that parents naturally tend to fear for their children or that carnivores have been known to attack pets at residences. People may also get injured in nature and have fears associated with carnivores in those situations. Residents indicated a greater concern for pets than children; more people may travel with pets than children, may own more pets than they have children, or are bringing urban values regarding pets and children safety to rural areas.
- Management response for perceived risks should be consistent with all species; we now have data that shows perceived risks for bear and coyote as well. Perceived risks need consideration and management actions backed with science. In general, wolves removed via conflict management actions on the basis of risk to human health and safety are a small portion of all wolves removed for management purposes, and very small compared to bears removed.
- The 2013 depredation report lacks a field for management actions (e.g., trapping initiated) and number of wolves removed; this should be included as in past reports.
- The public was allowed to use their own perception for how abundant they believed wolves to be. It is unlikely that perceptions changed from late 2013 to early 2014 when the survey was implemented. The survey did not address a management goal/threshold of 350 wolves.
- Much of the survey report is based on 6 questions. Some believe that these questions lend data biased towards positive attitudes towards wolves. The committee can simply look at the questions regarding whether people want more or less wolves in the state. These 6 questions provide background and a basis for public opinions.
- Engaged or affected residents expressed concerns regarding wolves and must be considered.
- There was a comment section included in the survey; the majority of comments received were from persons on the ends of the continuum and comments on multiple other non-wolf issues.

- Wolf harvest: only 21-27% of residents statewide oppose regulated wolf harvest; these data supports the work the committee has done to develop a wolf harvest season. Residents do not wish to maintain wolves solely for trophy hunting.
- Provide more information for non-range participants; this information is lacking in some tables and sections for areas of wolf range.
- The survey indicates that most residents do not support the current population reduction. These data reflect that the WAC membership is imbalanced in respect to actual opinions on wolves in the state. Opinions towards wolves are favorable in areas of the state where wolves exist.
- In rural areas there is a willingness to live near wolves but the question is how many wolves. Some indicate that the opinions of people living in rural areas should be weighted more than those who live in urban areas. Opinions may have been lowered if they had more information on depredation and other negative issues associated with wolves. The respondents that said they want the “same” number of wolves or “I don’t know” may not have had interactions with wolves and so their data may not mean anything real.
  - Bob Holsman is confident that the questions were valid and the data provides a reliable measure of public attitudes as these questions were used previously in other surveys, the survey was peer reviewed, and the members of the committee previously approved the survey and questions for use.
- The survey is a tool, not a definitive tool. Respondents completed the survey understanding that the DNR is currently managing the wolf population.
- Bob Holsman and his team were commended by many committee members for the quality of work, survey, and report.

**Wolf Management Plan Alternatives** - Discussion directed by Dave MacFarland with comments provided by committee members.

- A preliminary template for how to develop and present management plan alternatives to the public was provided. This will be finalized at a future meeting and provided to the DNR administration for consideration.
  - DRAFT TOPICS - Depredation and lethal control levels, areas of the state where wolves will continue to serve their functional ecological role, harvest opportunities, ability of the program to meet depredation costs, frequency of sightings by the public, percent of current range which would remain occupied by wolves and identification of areas where they will persist, and estimated monitoring costs.
- Alternatives must provide a description of the objectives and likely outcomes for context.
- The Michigan survey was used to model alternatives.
- A reasonable number of alternatives should be provided for gathering constructive input from the public; 3-5 alternatives, can be less. Alternatives provide supporting background to help the public make informed decisions on which they support.
- Alternatives are for gathering public input and not for inclusion in the management plan. Input will guide discussion on developing the new plan.
- If a target is a metric (non-numeric goal), similar description and outcomes will be provided.
- Considerations
  - Provide a variety of monitoring techniques based on various situations.

- Costs or techniques of monitoring impact the department's ability to monitor at a high level of precision. The public opinion survey indicated high concern with wolves being relisted as a federally protected species; this indicates an interest in the cost and techniques of monitoring.
- Add information about ecotourism; potential impacts whether positive or negative.
- Add information regarding risk concerns; was a major portion of the public survey.
- Add information about the ecological sustainability of the wolf population; likelihood for the population increasing or decreasing.
- Add information about the connection and impact on prey species.
- Add information regarding missing mortality data; decrease illegal harvest and other sources of human-related mortality. This is more a monitoring need rather than an alternative.
- The development of alternatives may create a situation for greater controversies and misunderstanding with the public. The concept of a minimum winter population can be misunderstood. We should ask the public how we should measure the population (a number or a metric) and not whether they prefer 3 or 5 different population goal numbers.
- Add information on whether tribal reservations have suitable habitat capable of supporting sustainable wolf populations if the statewide population drops below a specified threshold.
- Every wolf harvested via depredation controls or road kill are wasted wolves. The more wolves available on the landscape correlates to increased waste; work to eliminate waste.
- Alternatives must be truly measurable and some of the information presented today is not measurable and thus not included. Objectives must be measurable and based in data.
- Because of federal oversight, it is likely that the state will always have to report a population number; this is different than a management goal which can be numeric or metric. No other state has an established numeric wolf population goal.

**Review of State Wolf Management Plans** - Discussion directed by Dave MacFarland with comments provided by committee members.

- Portions of the MI, MN, ID, MT, and WY state wolf management plans and Wisconsin population, harvest, and depredation data were provided to the committee.
- The next committee meeting will be dedicated to discussing this information further.
- Age data is the raw data from the Matson's laboratory. Age data should be considered cautiously as wolves do not develop distinct layers of cementum annuali as do bear.

#### Wolf Management Zone

- A Lake Michigan Zone was previously identified to manage depredation but the zone was too small to be effective from a management perspective.
- Current wolf management zones
  - Zones 1, 2, and 5 - forested areas, lower human density, and higher wolf habitat quality and availability.
  - Zones 3 and 4 - areas of higher human conflict and higher human density.
  - Zone 6 - low wolf density and lower quality habitat.

- The current zones are not perfect but in a post-delisting monitoring period it makes sense to keep the zones the same.
- Zone 1
  - Split the northern portion of Zone 1 into a separate zone.
  - The far NE corner of Zone 3 north of Highway 8 should be part of Zone 1.
- Zone 2
  - A portion of Menominee County is located in Zone 2 per tribal request as they desired connectivity with Zone 2. These areas were not originally part of the Menominee reservation.
- Zone 3
  - Eastern Barron County - make the zone boundary Highway 53 to eliminate the cutout area of the zone; simplifies the zone boundary. The Zone boundary follows old DMUs and depredation issues; geographically the change is logical.
- Zone 4
  - Zones 2 and 4 - very little difference so might not need to be managed as separate zones.
  - Eliminate Zone 4 and make the SE half part of Zone 6 and the NW half part of Zone 2. This would follow the results of the Mladenoff model. Proposed that Highway J and Highway 51 be used as the boundary due to agricultural lands. Zone 4 was originally created to allow more liberal management and harvest. The SE half of Zone 4 is more consistent with the land uses of Zone 6 and the NW half is more consistent with Zone 2. There are very few depredations in this area and just because there is agriculture in an area, doesn't mean that wolves are causing depredations.
- Zone 5
  - Move the northern boundary for Zone 5 north and the southern boundary of Zone 3 south to connect the zones. This would allow the use of hounds in this area. The Black River Corridor is a highly traveled corridor for wolf movement. If Zone 6 was changed to an unlimited quota zone a high number of wolves from zones 3 and 5 could potentially be removed here.
  - Connect Fort McCoy to Zone 5 so it isn't a geographic island. FMC does not allow the harvest of wolves. The area between FMC and Zone 5 is inconsistent and confusing. The area contains a high level of agricultural lands and human development.
  - Adams County has considerable agricultural lands and the river between Adams and Juneau would make a natural boundary. There are also considerable forested lands in Adams County and this area is also part of what is classified as the Central Forest. This area also had established wolf populations and the boundary similarly reflects the old DMUs. This area was similarly identified by the Mladenoff habitat suitability model as suitable for wolves.
- Considerations
  - Areas of high agricultural development should be avoided when considering areas where wolves may persist. Very little regulated harvest occurs in areas where depredations occur and will not be addressed by zones or harvest unless zones are very small in size; harvest by zones is not effective to address depredations.
  - The public opinion survey indicated a relatively high desire for establishing wolf refuges. Current state law requires that all areas of the state must be open to wolf harvest; the

committee does not have authority to create refuges. Tribal lands and the marten protection area effectively act as wolf refuges currently. Provide a list and recognition of these areas.

- Developing wolf management zones is difficult without knowing what the future population objective will be. The development of wolf population objectives should be completed first so zones can be developed to fit or achieve them.
- Overall, the current zone boundaries follow the Mladenoff HSI model fairly well. The 2008 Mladenoff study was based on where wolves lived, and represent areas where wolves are likely to be found.
- Changing the established zone boundaries may cause confusion among the public as they have been used during the first two harvest seasons.
- Some feel the current zone boundaries are adequate and others feel the zone boundaries should be amended.

**Wolf Management Goals and Objectives** - Discussion directed by Dave MacFarland with comments provided by committee members.

- Considerations
  - The administration is looking for guidance from the committee and have expressed no indication whether they prefer numeric or metric goals.
  - Wolf population goals and objectives will be discussed at future meetings to determine greater detail; finalize by the end of the September 10 meeting.
  - All goals should be reasonable for public consideration and the committee should not present any that are unrealistic.
  - During the past couple years, with the USDA-WS having full management tools available for responding to depredation, both the number of farms and number of animals killed has considerably decreased compared to the 10 years pre-delisting. Comparisons are apples to oranges.
  - Some county boards have voted for a goal of 350.
  - Previous options presented in 2010 were to manage for a goal of 500 and an alternative option was to manage for a threshold of 375 with no specific goal. These options were never finalized for public or other scientific community comment.
  - Some believe that more consideration should be given to the opinions of people living in wolf range than to people living in the southern part of the state. The public survey shows that people in southern Wisconsin favor wolves more than persons in northern Wisconsin, although statewide, favorable opinions towards wolves exists.
  - In Montana, there is a discrepancy between the pack occupancy model and the minimum winter count. A switch from a winter- to a fall-based population estimate is expected to yield different results.
- Numeric Goals
  - There is ambiguity in the current management plan for whether 350 is a goal or a threshold; about 90% of the references indicate that this is a threshold and not a goal. There is confusion on whether the group that developed the management plan interpreted this as a goal or a threshold.

- The majority of survey respondents indicated a preference for maintaining the current population; set this as a goal. The most recent DNR published data at the time of the public survey indicated that there was a statewide minimum winter wolf count of 660 wolves.
- If a goal to maintain a low level of wolves is presented then a numeric goal based on the max number of wolves that the state can support should also be presented.
- Options
  - 350, 660, and 850 - one low goal, one moderate, and one high. Regardless if confusing, numeric goals should be based on the current monitoring method (overwinter minimum population count).
  - Numbers should be a range (plus or minus 20%) to decrease controversy with hitting a specific number.
- Pro
  - Using specific numeric population goals the state has maintained Wisconsin as one of the best white-tailed deer states in the nation.
- Con
  - Any time we specify and don't hit a specified population number, it causes controversy. We saw this with deer and numeric goals have recently been eliminated as a result.
  - The public views the various federal and state delisting goals as incremental steps which is not their intended purpose.
- Metric Goals
  - Use 350 as a minimum threshold that we keep the population above and establish metrics to maintain a sustainable wolf population, provide ecological functioning, and manage depredation.
  - Michigan set metric goals that allow wolves to fulfill their ecological functioning while minimizing and addressing depredation.
  - The number of packs and population size are highly correlated and estimating the number of packs would be a more cost-effective method of survey.
  - The tribes prefer a non-numeric population goal; their interest is in allowing wolves to fill suitable niches.
  - The threshold should be the federal delisting number of 100. Managing for the federal delisting threshold would place wolves back on the state threatened species list. The public expressed concerns regarding the relisting of wolves to threatened or endangered species status; setting a population threshold at 250 would not address public concerns; a higher number would be more suitable.
  - Concern that the number of hunting hounds depredated by wolves will not be included as a metric. The highest level of dogs depredated was in 2006 when there were an estimated 500 wolves in the state and the lowest level of dog depredations occurred when the wolf population was the highest.
  - Options
    - Percentage of occupied suitable range.
    - Number of packs or pack sizes.

- Include the perception of human safety as the survey results indicated perceived risks associated with wolves exist.
- A minimum threshold for the number of breeding packs in the state (number of packs that have at least 2 pups survive to the end of the year per definition used by other states).
- Consider the impact on prey species.
- Number of hunting hounds depredated.
- Pro
  - More cost effective.
  - Several members have expressed interest in developing or pursuing the possibility of developing a threshold number with measurable metrics (number of farms with depredations, etc.).
- Con
  - Population estimates will continue to be developed and this is numeric. If we can use these numbers we can use numeric population goals.

### **Additional Discussion**

- The timeline for developing the wolf management plan is dictated by the timeline to have permanent rules in place for the 2015 wolf harvest season. A draft must be provided to the NRB in January for them to review and approve by February. The Committee must have a draft completed in October to collect public comments in October and November. A preliminary draft with public comments must be presented to the DNR administration by December for review.
- Additional future discussions will include monitoring and research needs.

### **Comments from the Public in Attendance**

- An outline of comment guidelines was provided to the public and to the committee.
- Comment 1 - The general public does not support hound hunting and they are more concerned with the welfare of the dogs than the hunters. The general public would not put their dogs at risk of conflict with bear or wolves. The public has real concerns with wolves and the concerns are based on myths; some people don't know why they fear wolves. The new plan must include an education section. The county board resolutions regarding the 350 goal are not credible as these boards did not hear discussion on both sides of the issue and because these resolutions were not placed before their county constituents for comment.
- Comment 2 - The committee discussion was exhausting. There was a lot of unproductive back-and-forth discussion with an unknown map or plan. There are trained scientists in the room and yet some committee members contradict these scientists. The committee should use the resource they have available and other wolf experts elsewhere. The 350 number was never meant to be a goal, it was a threshold. The majority of Wisconsinites support wolves and it was shown in the public survey. Many people are moving to northern Wisconsin and to say that residents don't want wolves in their own back yard is untrue. It is upsetting to hear raised voices used by committee members. Hound conflicts with wolves or bears are territorial disputes. The committee needs to be more considerate towards other members' views and use calmer voices.

- Comment 3 - Wildlife is held in the public trust and trophy hunting violates the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. Scientists on the committee support non-numeric goals and this should not be dismissed.

**Next Meetings (2):** The September WAC meetings will be on Wednesday, September, 10 and Tuesday, September 30, 2014.

**October Meeting:** TBA

In order to meet the timeline for developing a draft management plan by October and providing a final draft to the Natural Resource Board in January, some months will require two committee meetings. An additional third meeting was determined to be unnecessary in September.