

**MEETING REPORT**  
**UTAH WOLF WORKING GROUP (WWG)**  
**Meeting #5**  
**27 April, 2004**  
**DNR Room 1050; Salt Lake City**

**PARTICIPANTS:**

Jim Bowns, Sterling Brown (alternate), Bill Burbridge, Bill Christensen (part), Karen Corts (part), Bill Fenimore (alternate), Allison Jones, Don Peay (part), Kirk Robinson (alternate, part), Trey Simmons (part), Mike Wolfe (alternate, part)

Missing: Randy Simmons, Mark Walsh, Clark Willis

Technical Advisors: Mike Bodenchuk, Craig McLaughlin

Others: Alan Clark (part), Kevin Conway (part), Cindee Jensen, Jerry Mason, Miles Moretti (part), Wes Quinton (part)

Facilitator: Spencer Amend, Dynamic Solutions Group, LLC  
Recorder: Dana Dolson, UDWR

**DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS**

**Members are responsible to see to it that they are on the listserv; this is the official means of communication.**

**Generalizing the deadlines for communication about agenda and meeting records: Additions and corrections to meeting records are due to Walt no later than 2 weeks prior to the next meeting. Agenda suggestions are due to Walt no later than 2 weeks prior to the next meeting. Draft agendas will be issued by Walt no later than 1 week prior to the meeting. Meeting reports will be posted on the listserv no later than 1 week following the meeting.**

**Facilitators will no longer alternate between meetings; Walt will facilitate all remaining WWG meetings. Spencer will stay informed and consult with Walt but will not be back to facilitate unless Walt has a scheduling conflict.**

**Re the joint WWG-UDWR letter: Craig, Miles & Kevin will provide a draft by email to WWG no later than May 7. If possible, the letter will be finalized and sent shortly thereafter. Otherwise it will be finalized at the May 25 meeting.**

**Re interim report: Jerry & Bill B. to draft a letter/interim report to the legislators who are expressing interest in speeding up the process. See topic below for items to be included. Draft due May 5; comments from WWG by May 12.**

**Jim Bowns, Sterling Brown & Clark Willis draft piece on livestock depredation for discussion at May meeting. Draft due by email to WWG by May 18.**

**Sterling Brown will invite Phil Davis [a producer who wears other hats] to the next meeting.**

**Allison will invite Doug Smith to attend the June 29 meeting to talk about wolf/ungulate relationships.**

### **REVIEW/APPROVAL OF 3/30 MEETING RECORD**

The group approved the suggestions made by Allison to the March 30 meeting report. These changes will be made and the revised report posted to the website.

### **REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS FROM 3/30/04**

The list of action items was reviewed. All were completed except that a change was made to the item concerning a letter to the USFWS about the I-70 boundary issue. [See above action item and later topic dealing with this letter.]

### **LIVESTOCK/WOLF INTERACTIONS**

Carter Niemeyer provided a PowerPoint overview which was followed by considerable dialogue with Carter. Several members commented on how useful/helpful they felt this was for the WWG. A summary of the presentation and dialogue follows:

Carter has had a long and varied history with wolves. At one point, he had the nickname “Carter the darter” because of his work darting wolves. Wolf hysteria can occur. Wolves are going to dribble into Utah. In early investigations, everything wrong with livestock became blamed on wolves. There was sometimes political pressure to call it wolf damage. Predators have a “signature” which experienced investigators can identify. Guard dogs help. Keep producers informed. It is important to try non-lethal techniques. Live with it; get smarter. Watch publicity. Look at Idaho’s trapper form. There are now about 400 wolves in Idaho. Frank Church Wilderness and Yellowstone Park are the core areas for wolves. Wolves, and all large predators, sometimes do surplus killing. Wolves coming to Utah will have to run the gauntlet. There is the biological density and the social density with respect to wolves: How many will be tolerated and where are the key questions. Fairly small numbers of producers have been impacted by wolves (3% of cattle deaths are from predators, and out of those 3%, 1% are caused by wolves; 34% of sheep deaths are from predators, and out of those 34%, 0.4% are caused by wolves). Liz Bradley did a good summary of the statistical information related to depredation. It is all about human behavior and values. Control methods are highly effective on wolves; it is easy to control wolves as long as all the tools are available. The odds are against wolves in Utah. With about 800 total, Idaho, Wyoming and Montana are at or nearing carrying capacity for wolves; this could lead to more dispersal. Doug Smith is knowledgeable about wolf interactions with elk and deer.

Are there other tribes that are involved other than the Nez Perce Tribe? Umatilla Tribe in Eastern Oregon is the only other tribe that has shown an interest and been involved.

On Defenders paying claims, does the livestock producers feel they were made whole? Most ranchers have accepted the money, some have not. In some cases they feel they got a good deal. Whole variety of responses to compensation. In MT, the state wildlife agency does not pay for depredation; in WY and ID, they do.

How do you know that wolves did not run the horses through the fence thus causing the wire cuts? There weren't any wolves in the area.

Is there a 24 hour turnaround time before Defenders will pay? More likely when a rancher sees a critter, we would be there in two or three hours. Investigation occurs, rancher receives paperwork, and then it is the responsibility of the rancher to contact Defenders for payment. Have you had to increase staff to accommodate requests? No, they have had people in the vicinity to take care of the requests.

Coyotes do the same thing? Bite marks are the same. Even a dog can tear a small calf. Is that the difference? Size? Have not seen an adult cow or a bull or a horse. Has seen sheep bitten in the neck but a variety of predators. So you have to look at the rest of the body. Dogs do a lot more plucking. They do more mutilating.

If you have multiple Pyreneese dogs, you will have more success in keeping wolves out of the herds.

Do you try to provide producers information on rendezvous sites so they will not bring herds in on them during a bad time? Yes, we try and get as much information out to them. We make phone calls. We try all different kinds of things. Also, Defenders help to get that information to producers.

Are there more incidents now with hounds? Losing hounds to wolves? Yes, it is real and it happens, especially around rendezvous sites. Sometimes the hounds will track down a pack of wolves.

In 2003, 118 sheep owned by one producer were killed by wolves over a 2-week period; was the pack removed? In that situation, 11 wolves remain and they will probably cause problems. Catch and collar is the first approach. Sometimes people are messing around trying to get video to further their cause. Wolves that kill livestock need to be removed. It is bad publicity to have wolves killing livestock on the front page everyday.

Most wolves mind their business. Is it a learned behavior? Don't know what triggers it.

How do they trap around guard dogs? Wildlife Services authorizes the removal, they don't tell them how to do it.

Are these stats from the recovery area or all over Idaho? Not sure. It includes four different things. Records are kept by fiscal year, by recovery area, etc.

144 in 2003 is what? Confirmed and probable? Does it reflect the number missing? The numbers you will see on Wildlife Services is what they think were killed. Based on the attack situation, we are assuming that wolves got them. That is what is called "probable."

Defenders will pay half on probable. They pay 100% on confirmed.

Is there agreement amongst the coalition on the terminology? No, there are different report forms. Idaho has the best form.

Do you ever review deer and elk kills? I have seen a handful. Do wolves kill deer and elk the same way as cattle? No, not really.

Anyone who is determining wolf kills need a lot training.

Coyotes love to kill lambs; wolves kill lambs and ewes in approximately equal proportions. With wolves, adult ewes will be killed right along side the lambs.

Is there a danger of wolves breeding with the dogs? It is possible. It has not been documented yet.

Does the depredation rate hold in the other recovery areas? Yes. It is safe to say that the more wolves you have the more depredation you will have.

Is it true that the same thing is happening in Minnesota? Yes.

In answer to Allison's question, facts and figures are all in the annual report. The report is available on the web [cite for which has been made available already to WWG].

Depredation in the recovery areas, outside the recovery areas generate greater conflict. Wolves coming to Utah will be unique. Wolves coming to Utah will probably be killed the minute they start killing sheep. Before they even make a statistical blip.

What are the chances of wolves establishing packs in Utah? Very skeptical that wolves will get much of a foothold in Utah. Dispersal is not by pairs, just by lone wolves.

Have the producers noticed any decrease in coyote depredation? Usually producers notice they get hit harder in the valley during lambing. It doesn't have anything to do with wolves. Coyotes may benefit from wolf kills.

Does adverse conditioning help? There is no silver bullet.

Have you had any problem with aerial gunning over wilderness? We do not do gunning or collaring or anything in wilderness areas.

One of the FWS employees was arrested for trespassing on private property. Charges have been filed for trespassing. Also, charging him for littering.

Do you issue "shoot on sight" permits? Chronic problem wolves can be taken with a written permit from Carter. 45-day permits on public land for lessees. Also, wolves can be taken in the act of . . . right there and then.

How many producers are there? I don't know. Producers can be anyone with livestock or sheep. An attorney can be a producer.

How easy or difficult is it to regulate a number of wolves, let's say 500. It is not rocket science once we get this delisted situation taken care of. Once you can start hunting them, it won't be difficult at all. But it depends on the social carrying capacity, as well as the biological.

What other damages are you seeing from stock producers? Weight loss, "my cattle have been run". Other factors can enter in such as drought.

Is there anyway to anticipate what the population estimate would be through natural dispersal? I think it will be few and far between. Population numbers will be very small.

Costs: Each state has put stipulations on who will pay the costs. States have said that the Feds will pay. Very expensive to collar wolves. Great Lakes, thru USDA's budget is about \$1M. New Mexico is about \$600 K for that small pack.

Do the numbers of wolves in the recovery areas impact the numbers of dispersing wolves or is it just something they will do? Yes, when the real estate becomes too populated, then they will start dispersing. You will see the population density start to level off shortly.

What is the capacity that the three states can hold? Idaho is nearing capacity now. Northwest Montana has reached theirs. Yellowstone is full of wolves now. Wyoming still has capacity.

Are other means of depredation having an impact on other predators? Yes. Simple things like fladry [flagging] work on coyotes, as well.

Why remove carcasses? What does that do? Rules for wolf management say to discourage predators from hanging around. It is common sense to keep ranch clean. On private land, can't make them do anything. Public land, can recommend that they keep it clean.

Utah is concerned about Mule Deer populations. Can you speculate the impact on deer in Utah? Not sure he has enough information to do that. Big debate right now is this predator/prey debate. I don't know. I don't think deer populations are going to crash due to wolves; but have nothing to base that on. Wolves are very opportunistic; whatever is available will be what is taken.

Have you heard of wolves in Canada that have wiped out an entire herd of black-tailed deer. No, that is what I call rhetoric that is running wild.

What is the prudent way to deal with rhetoric? People need to prove what they say.

Does the Group have standards to acceptable levels of data? No.

What is the Interim Control Plan? 1987, spent \$140K and didn't accomplish anything. Then in 1988, started a paper trail that is the Interim Control Plan. Guidelines, mostly. It is not in effect today. Managed under a 4-D Rule.

Have any producers dropped out of producing due to wolves? One guy in Idaho claims he was driven out of business by wolves. Who knows? There is the other side of the coin that Carter described, as well – i.e., the Idaho cattle rancher turned ecotourism entrepreneur with wolf tours and cabins/hot tubs on his ranch.

Carter recommends that we listen to Dr. Doug Smith out of Yellowstone Park.

Do you have a guess on what percent of the ranchers are willing to work with wolves as opposed to those that want to go back to the 1990s? The majority just want to raise my livestock, I don't want these things around. Just take care of it.

How many ranchers in Idaho would have been accepting of wolves if there was no federal hammer over their heads? Don't know, but the law plays a significant role.

Would ranchers have been more receptive to natural recolonization without the federal involvement? Difficult to say, no speculation will work well.

### USU STUDY

Jeremy Bruskotter made a presentation on his study, followed by a period of dialogue. A summary follows:

His study began by a desire to test Kellert's statement that there has been a transformation in public attitudes toward wolves. People in Utah want wolves; they want them managed; they want economic impacts minimized or eliminated.

How did the study analyze urban versus rural hunters separately? Aggregated data for hunters; no distinct tracking of rural versus urban hunters.

Why would 30% of the people oppose the use of livestock guarding dogs? Some people may not have wanted to support wolves in Utah at all, so chose not to support livestock guarding dogs.

Is there less support if there are negative impacts to big game? I would say yes, but it is difficult to disaggregate the data on economics between livestock and big game animals.

How valid/reliable are results based on the sample size/returns? Good #'s due to the Central Tendency Theory.

How do we know the survey is appropriately representative? We know it is skewed to the number of males.

How can we be certain that the sample is population based? Contracted company that used phone directories and voter registrations.

Length of collection of surveys? 3 months +

Any analysis done of the segment of respondents who are involved in farming/ranching? Not yet, but it may be done.

When will the full report be available? Will have to talk to Dr. Schmidt. Did use other indices such as camping, etc.

When will other subanalyses be made available? Depends on time frame; Jeremy is here thru the end of the summer only.

Lethal control was responded to negatively. Least support for aerial gunning. What kind of a back lash will we get? It would take an important tool from us.

A summary of Jeremy's presentation is attached as an appendix to this meeting record.

### **I-70 BOUNDARY MEETING AND LETTER**

Trey and Sterling updated the group on their recent meeting with USFWS personnel from the SW Regional office [Albuquerque]. The FWS is expecting a letter from WWG or some other authority; they are already preparing a response. FWS is expecting to develop an Interim Plan for the Mexican Wolf in Southern Utah [S. of I-70]. Policy makers were not represented at the meeting. There is little likelihood of moving the I-70 boundary.

Action Item: Craig, Miles and Kevin will draft a combo letter from WWG & UDWR to FWS. This draft will be shared with WWG no later than 10 days from now [due May 7]. It will be finalized at the next meeting if it can't be sent sooner.

### **LEGISLATIVE INTEREST**

Kevin provided feedback to the WWG on the fact that certain legislators are expressing interest in seeing more rapid progress on the Plan. Considerable discussion followed. The following action item relates to that discussion:

Action item: Jerry Mason and Bill Burbridge volunteered to draft a letter/interim report to the legislators. The draft is due to WWG by May 5 with comments back by May 12. Elements to be in the interim report [designed to show not only the complexity of the task, but to identify progress] include: (a) livestock depredation segment, (b) letter to FWS re Mexican wolf & I-70 boundary, (c) ungulate depredation/relational presentations/info, (d) review of wolf downlisting process, timeline, impacts, (e) reference to unlikelihood of breeding pair establishment based on "running the gauntlet", (f) inclusion of public scoping meetings and USU citizen survey, (g) list of experts consulted/other accomplishments.

### **OTHER FINAL ITEMS**

As frequently happens at the end of a meeting when sentiments are running high, several items occurred that have future importance.

Craig will email the Management Plan-Assessment and Strategic Plan Outline again. He has incorporated several changes suggested by the WWG. As Craig spoke about the outline briefly, he made it clear that the author of the Strategic Plan portion will be the WWG. Discussion may be needed, but that was his clear statement.

Jim Bowns, Sterling & Clark Willis either volunteered or were volunteered to draft a piece on livestock depredation for discussion at the next meeting. The draft is due to WWG one week prior to the next meeting [due May 18]. A significant portion of the May 25 meeting will be devoted to this topic.

A producer should be invited to the next [May 25] meeting. Phil Davis was mentioned prominently; he is also a county commissioner, has stock in wolf country, and



is chair of the Idaho Council on Depredation. Sterling Brown will contact him and issue the invitation.

Integral questions – postponed this meeting – really do need to be discussed further.

Doug Smith will be invited for the June 29 meeting; Allison will contact him and issue the invitation.

Spencer indicated that he would not be alternating with Walt for facilitation of meetings; Walt will do all remaining meetings unless scheduling or other serious problems require him to ask Spencer to substitute.

## **Appendix – Jeremy Bruskotter’s Presentation**

### **Utah residents’ attitudes toward wolves: 1994-2003**

We conducted a survey of Utah residents’ attitudes toward wolves, replicating the methods and several questions from a 1994 Utah survey—before wolves were reintroduced into Yellowstone and central Idaho. The study’s primary objectives were to (1) determine if Utahns’ attitudes toward wolves in 2003 differed from their attitudes as measured by La Vine in 1994, (2) if so, to describe in terms of direction and strength, how those attitudes differed, and (3) assess public support for various wolf management practices.

Results (n = 709) suggest that, in general, attitudes toward wolves have remained remarkably stable over the past decade, though general attitudes toward the predator did appear to have shifted slightly in the rural areas of the state. Most notably, rural northerners were more likely to express dislike for the wolf in 2003 than in 1994. However, 2003 respondents differed more dramatically from 1994 respondents in terms of their wolf management preferences. Specifically, respondents in 2003 were less likely to agree that wolf numbers should be limited to minimize their impact on human activities, less likely to agree that Utah was better off without wolves, and less likely to agree that it is wrong to hunt or trap wolves, though this varied by region (see attached tables).

Although respondents from all three regions most frequently expressed like for wolves, only urban residents reached a true majority with 61% indicating like for wolves. This pattern remains consistent throughout, with answers indicative of more pro than anti-wolf sentiments, and the strongest support for wolves coming from urban residents. Despite these generally pro-wolf sentiments, it is important to note that more than a third of all respondents and approximately half of all hunters agreed to the item “Utah is better off without wolves” and 25-45% of respondents (depending on region) disagreed with the item “I would like to see wolves in Utah” indicating that substantial opposition to wolves in Utah does exist.

Although rural and urban respondents differed in terms of their attitudes toward wolves, these two groups agreed on management priorities. Specifically, the two priorities listed most often by respondents from both rural and urban areas were to (1) minimize economic impacts of having wolves, and (2) minimize wolf – livestock conflicts. Additionally, these groups again agreed as to what kind of situations call for lethal control measures. Three quarters of all respondents agreed that wildlife managers should be able to kill wolves if wolves attack livestock, and nearly two thirds of all respondents felt that managers should be able to kill wolves if they attack pets.

Our results indicate that the public is generally supportive of wolves, and that the attitudes of Utahns have remained relatively stable over the past decade. The stability of opinions regarding the management of wolves despite the proximity of wolves residing in surrounding states, the capture of a wolf inside the state, and the contentious nature of the debate in the media may be a hopeful sign for wildlife managers. Management agencies may also find it encouraging that despite widespread public

support for wolves among those respondents who claimed no interest group membership, this segment of the public also agreed that the interests of sportsmen and agricultural groups should play an important role in forming management policies.

As La Vine (1995) argued almost a decade earlier, the issue of how to manage wolves has become less about biological and ecological considerations, and more about the perceptions and preferences of people. Policy makers should recognize that the issue of how to manage wolves transcends the typical biological and economic focus, and involve all interested parties throughout the planning and implementation processes. This kind of public involvement may help to prevent lengthy court battles that are costly to tax payers, delay management implementation, and further escalate the level of conflict surrounding the issue.

Summary table: Urban residents' responses to various survey items 1994-2003 (percentages).

Response item		Urban 1994	Urban 1994 (no info)	Urban 2003
What best describes your attitude toward wolves?	Dislike	18.1	18.6	15.6
	Neutral	20.8	17.5	22.9
	Like	61.1	63.9	61.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.757	0.494	--
Index: Wolves are a necessary component of a healthy ecosystem.	Disagree	20.3	22.8	19.7
	Neutral	8.5	5.0	9.2
	Agree	71.2	72.3	71.2
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.967	0.366	--
Index: Wolves kill and therefore pose a threat to livestock and big game.	Disagree	59.9	63.9	61.2
	Neutral	10.9	9.3	14.4
	Agree	29.3	26.8	24.4
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.399	0.422	--
Index: Wolf numbers should be kept low to minimize their impacts on human activities.	Disagree	30.0	27.6	34.0
	Neutral	16.0	19.4	17.0
	Agree	54.0	53.1	49.0
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.593	0.489	--
Utah is better off without wolves.	Disagree	54.8	55.3	62.6
	Neutral	14.2	14.6	16.8
	Agree	31.0	30.1	20.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.048</b>	0.139	--
It is wrong to hunt and trap wolves for furs and trophies even where they're common.	Disagree	26.8	30.4	36.4
	Neutral	10.8	10.8	16.2
	Agree	62.4	58.8	47.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.010</b>	0.122	--
I would like to see wolves in Utah.	Disagree	27.1	29.1	20.5
	Neutral	16.1	12.6	22.6
	Agree	56.8	58.3	56.9
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.136	<b>0.043</b>	--

<sup>a</sup> Significance based on chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistic; significant scores are given in bold.

Summary table: Big game hunters' responses to various survey items 1994-2003 (percentages).

Response item		BG Hunter 1994	BG Hunter 1994 (no info)	BG Hunter 2003
What best describes your attitude toward wolves?	Dislike	36.8	32.2	36.4
	Neutral	17.1	17.8	20.6
	Like	46.1	50.0	43.0
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.712	0.564	--
Index: Wolves are a necessary component of a healthy ecosystem.	Disagree	52.6	50.6	51.4
	Neutral	8.6	6.7	8.7
	Agree	38.8	42.7	39.9
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.974	0.811	--
Index: Wolves kill and therefore pose a threat to livestock and big game.	Disagree	28.5	34.1	34.3
	Neutral	11.3	11.4	10.5
	Agree	60.3	54.5	55.2
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.529	0.977	--
Index: Wolf numbers should be kept low to minimize their impacts on human activities.	Disagree	7.8	8.7	16.3
	Neutral	5.2	6.5	9.2
	Agree	87.0	84.8	74.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.015</b>	0.138	--
Utah is better off without wolves.	Disagree	27.7	33.0	41.8
	Neutral	15.5	15.4	14.7
	Agree	56.8	51.6	43.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.021</b>	0.344	--
It is wrong to hunt and trap wolves for furs and trophies even where they're common.	Disagree	60.1	59.1	57.1
	Neutral	13.9	10.8	19.0
	Agree	25.9	30.1	23.9
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.449	0.169	--
I would like to see wolves in Utah.	Disagree	51.0	45.1	43.5
	Neutral	12.3	13.2	16.3
	Agree	36.8	41.8	40.2
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.330	0.796	--

<sup>a</sup> Significance based on chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistic; significant scores are given in bold.

Summary table: Rural northern residents' responses to various survey items 1994-2003 (percentages).

Response item		North 1994	North 1994 (no info)	North 2003
What best describes your attitude toward wolves?	Dislike	21.3	10.5	30.8
	Neutral	26.8	31.6	21.9
	Like	52.0	57.9	47.3
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.175	<b>0.003</b>	--
Index: Wolves are a necessary component of a healthy ecosystem.	Disagree	34.6	30.7	37.8
	Neutral	12.6	12.0	9.3
	Agree	52.8	57.3	52.8
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.612	0.508	--
Index: Wolves kill and therefore pose a threat to livestock and big game.	Disagree	42.3	48.6	46.3
	Neutral	14.6	13.9	12.1
	Agree	43.1	37.5	41.6
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.713	0.817	--
Index: Wolf numbers should be kept low to minimize their impacts on human activities.	Disagree	15.7	16.9	26.4
	Neutral	11.8	11.7	14.0
	Agree	72.4	71.4	59.6
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.046</b>	0.169	--
Utah is better off without wolves.	Disagree	38.0	39.5	48.2
	Neutral	20.9	26.3	14.4
	Agree	41.1	34.2	37.4
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.130	0.065	--
It is wrong to hunt and trap wolves for furs and trophies even where they're common.	Disagree	43.1	37.7	47.7
	Neutral	20.0	19.5	18.5
	Agree	36.9	42.9	33.8
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.715	0.286	--
I would like to see wolves in Utah.	Disagree	35.9	25.3	39.0
	Neutral	14.1	18.7	19.5
	Agree	50.0	56.0	41.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.255	0.068	--

<sup>a</sup> Significance based on chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistic; significant scores are given in bold.

Summary table: Rural southern residents' responses to various survey items 1994-2003 (percentages).

Response item		South 1994	South 1994 (no info)	South 2003
What best describes your attitude toward wolves?	Dislike	35.8	29.8	29.4
	Neutral	17.5	22.6	31.0
	Like	46.7	47.6	39.7
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.038</b>	0.366	--
Index: Wolves are a necessary component of a healthy ecosystem.	Disagree	43.8	40.7	36.0
	Neutral	10.0	12.3	12.5
	Agree	46.2	46.9	51.5
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.412	0.775	--
Index: Wolves kill and therefore pose a threat to livestock and big game.	Disagree	34.3	37.3	43.6
	Neutral	11.9	12.0	12.0
	Agree	53.7	50.6	44.4
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.263	0.634	--
Index: Wolf numbers should be kept low to minimize their impacts on human activities.	Disagree	9.4	12.6	20.7
	Neutral	7.2	8.0	18.5
	Agree	83.3	79.3	60.7
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.013</b>	--
Utah is better off without wolves.	Disagree	23.7	27.1	43.8
	Neutral	26.6	25.9	22.6
	Agree	49.6	47.1	33.6
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.036</b>	--
It is wrong to hunt and trap wolves for furs and trophies even where they're common.	Disagree	51.1	52.9	40.4
	Neutral	9.2	5.7	23.5
	Agree	39.7	41.4	36.0
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.002</b>	--
I would like to see wolves in Utah.	Disagree	46.4	44.7	34.3
	Neutral	21.0	21.2	23.4
	Agree	32.6	34.1	42.3
	Sig. <sup>a</sup>	0.111	0.287	--

<sup>a</sup> Significance based on chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistic; significant scores are given in bold.

**MANAGEMENT SUMMARY TABLES: UTAH WOLF WORKING GROUP**

Summary Table: How acceptable are each of the following control methods for wolves that kill livestock?

Response item		Urban resident	Rural resident
Live trap and relocate wolves.	Never	11.4%	20.7%
	Neutral	5.6%	9.2%
	Always	<b>83.1%</b>	<b>70.1%</b>
Live trap and shoot wolves.	Never	53.2%	41.3%
	Neutral	16.4%	14.5%
	Always	30.5%	44.1%
Live trap and lethally inject wolves.	Never	52.1%	39.8%
	Neutral	18.5%	14.3%
	Always	29.6%	45.8%
Shooting wolves from airplane or helicopter.	Never	<b>58.2%</b>	<b>51.7%</b>
	Neutral	14.8%	11.0%
	Always	26.9%	37.2%
Hunting wolves.	Never	33.2%	25.6%
	Neutral	13.7%	14.4%
	Always	<b>53.2%</b>	<b>60.2%</b>
Poisoning wolves.	Never	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>73.1%</b>
	Neutral	8.5%	6.9%
	Always	11.9%	20.1%
Livestock guarding dogs.	Never	13.7%	19.2%
	Neutral	13.4%	13.3%
	Always	<b>73.0%</b>	<b>67.5%</b>
Harassment	Never	18.9%	25.9%
	Neutral	14.0%	10.4%
	Always	<b>67.1%</b>	<b>63.7%</b>

**Bold type** – indicates majority agreement between rural and urban residents.



Summary Table: As wolves return to Utah state managers should be able to kill wolves (percentage agreeing).

Response item:	% Agree Urban	% Agree Rural
As soon as they enter the state.....	12.7%	24.4%
As soon as the state wolf population is able to sustain itself.....	20.3%	17.9%
If wolves attack pets.....	64.8% (2)	64.4% (2)
If wolves attack livestock.....	74.0% (1)	75.4% (1)
If wolves are shown to have a significant negative impact on hunter success.....	24.8%	33.3%
If wolves are shown to have a significant negative impact on big game populations.....	42.2% (3)	49.6% (3)
Whenever wolves wander on to private property.....	30.5%	36.4%
Never.....	7.9%	5.9%
Other.....	10.5%	12.0%

Summary Table: The top priority of wolf management should be to:

Response item:	% Agree Urban	% Agree Rural
Ensure there are always wolves in Utah.....	17.3% (3)	8.5%
Maximize the number of wolves.....	2.9%	3.4%
Minimize livestock - wolf conflicts.....	29.1% (2)	24.4% (2)
Minimize any effects wolves might have on big game.....	5.4%	8.8%
Minimize negative economic impacts.....	37.4% (1)	39.2% (1)
Maximize the visibility of wolves to increase tourism.....	1.6%	2.8%
Other.....	6.4%	12.8% (3)