

CECIL D. ANDRUS, Governor
 COMMISSION
 ROBERT G. KALB, Sandpoint
 PAUL C. KEETON, Lewiston
 JOHN EATON, Cascade
 JACK HEMINGWAY, Sun Valley
 H. JACK ALVORD, Pocatello



IDAHO FISH AND GAME DEPARTMENT

January 30, 1973



JOSEPH C. GREENLEY
 Director

POST OFFICE BOX 25
 600 SOUTH WALNUT STREET
 BOISE, IDAHO 83707

RESOURCES

Date: 2-1

Chief	
L & M	
Range	
Rec	
Wildf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
For	
S & W	
Soils	
Clks	
Com:	
Action:	

Dr. Richard Knight, President
 Idaho Chapter, The Wildlife Society
 College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences
 University of Idaho
 Moscow, Idaho 83843

Dear Dick:

I assume the proposed position statement on predator management was included in the latest Chapter Newsletter to get reaction from the membership. This letter is to contribute my comments and suggestions.

First off, it appears that a goodly amount of thought has gone into it so far and I appreciate the intent and the initiative.

However, as it is now written, there are a few points that concern me and I feel some modification is needed before I could endorse the proposal. The specifics are listed on the attached sheet and marked copy of the proposed statement.

A sound, reasonable position statement would be a welcome contrast to the emotion and polarization that is affecting the present controversy and I hope the Chapter can come up with an acceptable version that will further both the stature of the profession and sound wildlife management.

Yours for bigger and better position statements! I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

IDAHO FISH AND GAME DEPARTMENT
 Joseph C. Greenley,

Roger M. Williams
 Chief, Game Division

RMW:maf.
 Encl. - Comments
 Photocopy position statement

cc: M. Morache, Chairman, Resolutions Committee

Comments on Idaho Chapter Predator Statement

1. This strikes me as a bit presumptuous; maybe I am nitpicking but it would seem that the agencies themselves or some higher authority actually determine policy. (e.g. Society of Engineers doesn't make policy for M-K or Boise Cascade).

Suggestion: Delete the word "policy."

2. "Management" and "control" - I wonder if you intend a distinction between the two or if the words are interchangeable? In reading through the entire statement, I can't be sure in my own mind.

Suggestion: Define early in the statement a distinction between "management" and "control," and be sure they are used in that context throughout.

3. A rather sweeping indictment! The phrase "---- denotes ignorance ----" is departing from a concept of a reasoned position statement to make accusations (--and to be technical about it, the use of such control may not indicate ignorance at all; it may merely reflect an expedient course in the face of political reality and/or public pressure, a route professionals have all had to take many times in game management).

Suggestion: Change to read "--the use of generalized (or perhaps "widespread, non-specific") predator control --- violates ecosystem management."

4. The word "selective" is open to question as to what is meant: selective by species? - by individual animals? - by area? e.g. - logical control directed at problem coyotes on a spring lambing range would not be selective for individual animals. Would this need then not be recognized because it is "nonselective?"

Suggestion: Substitute "specific local" for "selective."

5. This implies that the Chapter does not recognize the need for control for the protection of livestock on public lands where justified. This is where, in

the past, much of the predator control work in Idaho has been carried out, and where a large amount will undoubtedly be needed in the future. Acknowledging the past abuses that have occurred in these areas, there is and will continue to be a very real and justified need for control on public lands and failing to recognize it in such a position statement is not very realistic. This would leave the profession open, I feel, to justified criticism from livestock interests that we fail to recognize their problem. This is the most critical. I could probably live with the rest of it, but as a member of the Chapter, I'd have to vote "no" on the whole thing because of this point alone, not to mention the fact that the Department would be "violating" this provision of the statement very quickly if and when we take on the predator control work. Suggestion: Delete "on private property."

6. This may be all right but there could be some conflict depending on interpretation of the words "control," "management," and "temporary." For instance, regular annual removal of predators by trappers and hunters could be part of a "management" program that would provide for public use of wildlife and at the same time contribute some extent to needed "control." Also, with respect to the word "temporary," selective local control could very well be needed on a regular annual basis (spring lambing range), but some might not interpret this as "temporary."

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY MEMBERSHIP

pc to say
Kuynt 1#r

THE IDAHO CHAPTER OF THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY

POSITION STATEMENT: RE PREDATOR MANAGEMENT

1. As the professional wildlife organization in Idaho, The Idaho Chapter of The Wildlife Society issues the following position statement as a policy guide to state and federal agencies concerned with predator management in Idaho and to professional individuals in planning and implementing predator management — 2. programs. In doing this we are fostering and promoting an equitable policy of wildlife management as opposed to game management for consumptive use only.

Predators are a natural component of any wildlife community and as such should be recognized in any comprehensive management program. The management of predatory species is just as valid an objective in ecosystem management as is the management of "game" species. Under proper management, predators and traditional game species are inseparable and well founded objectives should be formulated for both. The use of predator control as a panacea in attempts to increase populations of prey species violates the ecosystem management, and denotes ignorance of basic biological principles. } 3.

The Chapter does recognize the need for selective predator control in special instances: 4.

The protection of livestock on private property where justified. 5.

In conjunction with initial ^{introduction or} re-establishment of native species or introduction of exotic species in suitable areas but not to maintain such species if it cannot maintain itself under natural conditions after introduction or re-establishment.

In intensive management areas where it can be demonstrated that predator control would make a significant contribution to achievement of planned objectives.

We emphasize that selective or local control of predators should be a temporary measure executed as part of a well planned management program. 6.

the principles

and is not based on sound biological principles.