

# Colorado Gray Wolf Reintroduction 10j and EIS US Fish and Wildlife Service

## Cooperating Agency Call Notes

October 5, 2022  
2:00 – 3:00 pm MST  
Microsoft Teams Meeting

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Nicole Alt	FWS
Kurt Broderdorp	FWS
Darren LeBlanc	FWS
Martin Lowney	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)
Jim Heffelfinger	Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)
Jim DeVos	Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)
Clay Crowder	Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)
Joel Humphries	Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
Carol Dawson	Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
Les Owen	Colorado Department of Agriculture
Reid DeWalt	Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW)
Eric O'Dell	Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW)
Robbie LeValley	Delta County
Richard Truex	Forest Service (FS)
Jenna Sloan	Forest Service (FS)
Richard Rice	Forest Service (FS)
Melissa Dressen	Forest Service (FS)
Fred Jarman	Garfield County
Matt Canterbury	Jackson County
Amber Swasey	Mesa County
Jeff Comstock	Moffat County
Justin Musser	Montrose County
John Mack	National Park Service (NPS)
Kim Hersey	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR)
Callie Hendrickson	White River Conservation District
Lori Fox	WSP
Jessica Forbes-Guerrero	WSP
Margaret Stover	WSP
Ken Mills	Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD)
Dan Thompson	Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD)

## DISCUSSION

The Service asked the group if they had any questions on the DEIS so far.

- AZDGF asked about the scope of the analysis and the impacts to Mexican wolf recovery. They also expressed concerns about the section on trophic cascades and how the chosen alternative could impact Mexican wolves.
  - The Service responded that the scope is unusual but is focusing on the environmental impacts of the Service authorizing take through the 10(j) rule. The Service noted that how dispersing wolves are dealt with is not under the 10(j) but is under separate section 10(a)1(A) permits.
- UDWR commented that the section 10(j) rule could allow for relocation of wolves.
  - The Service responded that CPW would be covered by the section 10(j) rule but relocation actions by agencies outside of the state of CO would be covered under another tool.
- AZDGF asked for the Service to consider using the term “northern gray wolf” to avoid confusion.
  - The Service responded that the ESA listed entity is the “gray wolf” but that they could consider adding some clarifying language to the document.
- APHIS asked that the management flexibility be extended to the CO Department of Agriculture, not just to CPW.
  - The Service acknowledged the comment from APHIS.
- Moffat County asked for clarification about differing rules for wolves migrating into Colorado versus those introduced under alternative 1.
  - The Service explained that any wolf found in Colorado would be managed under the section 10(j) rule, regardless of whether it was introduced or migrated into the state.
- Moffat County asked about the likelihood of alternative 2 coming into play and whether the 2-2-2 rule could be met.
  - The Service noted that while meeting the 2-2-2 threshold for an existing population (as defined in the EIS) is unlikely, if it is not included in the analysis now it cannot be added later. If something unforeseen happens or if there is a delay it makes sense to include the alternative.
- Moffat County asked about implementing the section 10(j) rule on NPS lands.
  - The Service explained that the section 10(j) rule explicitly states that NPS and National Wildlife Refuge lands are not included in the rule.
- Moffat County asked about the indirect effects section and how the economic impacts were quantified.
  - The Service and WSP explained that data is limited but that they continue to look at different studies on economic costs, including economic cost differentials between lethal and nonlethal management. They also asked for cooperators to share any relevant data they are able to with the Service.

- BLM suggested the Service add a glossary to the EIS and include reporting requirements and level of evidence needed.
  - The Service thanked BLM for their suggestions.
- AZDGF asked why the essentiality discussion was not included in the DEIS.
  - The Service explained that it will be included in the rule and that the EIS will assume the decision that is in the rule.
- WGFD expressed concern about having too much focus on Yellowstone wolves, noting that the reintroduction in Colorado has different factors at play. They also shared that they have information on depredation costs that they could share.
  - The Service thanked WGFD for the comment and the depredation cost information.
- CO Department of Agriculture asked about the economic impacts section and asserted that the Yellowstone wolf reintroduction would not be a good comparison to Colorado's reintroduction and would result in an underestimate of livestock losses.
  - The Service noted that data on economic loss in the livestock industry as a result of wolves is scarce. They asked anyone with further data to share it along with their comments.
- BLM asked who will monitor when take is permitted.
  - The Service answered that its typically the designated agent (the State, the Service, etc.) but the specifics will be more fleshed out in the draft rule.
- APHIS noted that predation in Colorado could be higher than in other areas because livestock is more widespread. APHIS will send data on numbers of sheep and cattle.
  - The Service thanked APHIS for their comment and for offering to share data.
- White River Conservation District noted that they sent a paper on the economics of the Western Slope that discusses each cow's value and shared that the economist on the paper could meet with the Service if desired.
  - The Service thanked the Conservation District and WSP noted that they are already looking into the study that was sent.
- White River Conservation District spoke about the trickle-down effects to the community from the loss of a cow's economic value.
  - The Service reiterated that if states or other cooperators have economic data to share to please let them know.
- BLM will share data on depredations and compensation, looking at impacts in a localized context.
  - The Service thanked BLM for sharing data on depredations and compensation.
- White River Conservation District asked for clarity on animal husbandry requirements. APHIS shared that they have more information on animal husbandry and will send it to the Service

- The Service said that they will take another look at animal husbandry.
- CO Department of Agriculture asked about the language on permitted livestock in authorized areas. They asked that cows that might get into the wrong pasture from an adjacent allotment still be covered in the rule's language.
  - The Service thanked CO Department of Agriculture for their comment.

The Service invited cooperators to call with additional questions and reiterated that comments are due on Friday (10/7) or by Sunday evening (10/9) at the latest. The Service and WSP will meet to go over the comments. The Service will schedule another cooperating agency meeting on October 26<sup>th</sup> at 2pm to review how comments were addressed.