

**Legislative Council**  
September 3, 2020

**AMENDMENT 1 TO PROPOSITION 114**

Page 5, strike lines 2 through 12 and substitute:

**“State spending.** PROPOSITION 114 WILL COST APPROXIMATELY \$300,000 IN BUDGET YEAR 2021-22 AND \$500,000 IN BUDGET YEAR 2022-23 FOR PUBLIC OUTREACH AND DEVELOPMENT OF A GRAY WOLF REINTRODUCTION PLAN. BEGINNING IN BUDGET YEAR 2023-24, COSTS INCREASE TO ABOUT \$800,000 PER YEAR FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRAY WOLF REINTRODUCTION PLAN. IMPLEMENTATION COSTS WILL ONLY BE INCURRED IF FEDERAL APPROVAL IS RECEIVED, OR GRAY WOLVES ARE NO LONGER LISTED AS ENDANGERED AND THE STATE IS ABLE TO BEGIN ITS REINTRODUCTION PLAN. IF THE GRAY WOLF REMAINS LISTED UNDER THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (ESA), THEN 75 PERCENT OF THE COSTS OF GRAY WOLF REINTRODUCTION IN COLORADO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL ESA PROGRAM GRANTS FROM THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, AS WELL AS U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE STATE WILDLIFE GRANTS. ANY REMAINING BALANCE OF THE REINTRODUCTION COSTS WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR GREAT OUTDOORS COLORADO (GOCO) FUNDING. IF THE GRAY WOLF IS DELISTED, THEN REINTRODUCTION COSTS COULD BE PAID BY A COMBINATION OF GOCO FUNDS, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE STATE WILDLIFE GRANTS, HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE FEES, AND APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. ACTUAL EXPENDITURES WILL DEPEND ON THE DETAILS OF THE PLAN DEVELOPED BY THE COLORADO PARKS AND WILDLIFE COMMISSION AND THE AMOUNT OF LIVESTOCK LOSSES CAUSED BY WOLVES.”.

## **Testimony from Coloradans Protecting Wildlife Regarding Proposed Language for the 2020 Blue Book for Proposition 114 (Formerly Initiative 107)**

Dear Legislative Council,

Thank you for this opportunity to testify regarding the proposed final draft language for inclusion in the 2020 voter blue book regarding Proposition 114, formerly Initiative 107, reintroduction and management of gray wolves.

This testimony is provided by Patrick Pratt, deputy campaign manager for Coloradans Protecting Wildlife, one of the two campaign committees registered to oppose Proposition 114. This is the official testimony of Coloradans Protecting Wildlife.

We appreciate having had the opportunity to provide input as the language for the blue book was drafted. We provided edits in all three rounds, many of which were not adopted. We understand the need to present the issue fairly, without bias, and clearly so as to limit voter confusion. However, we do not believe the current draft accomplishes these goals.

Below are a number of proposed edits to the final draft that we encourage you to adopt before final approval of the blue book language. These edits are unbiased and help clarify the issue. Many of our proposed edits are straightforward, however, rationale for our proposed edits is provided when necessary.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide edits and testimony. We appreciate your efforts to present voters with relevant, useful information as they weigh the merits of various ballot measures.

Sincerely,

Patrick Pratt  
Deputy Campaign Manager, Coloradans Protecting Wildlife  
Account Manager, Pac/West  
[pratt@pacwestcom.com](mailto:pratt@pacwestcom.com)  
(303) 501-1075

## Edits to the Final Draft of Blue Book Analysis for Proposition 114 (Formerly Initiative 107)

### General comments:

- Moose are an important species in Colorado, having been introduced by the state in 1978. According to Living with Wolves, a pro-wolf “non-profit organization dedicated to engaging the public worldwide in education, outreach and research to promote truth and understanding about wolves,” a wolf’s preferred diet consists of ungulates including elk, caribou, deer, and moose. Given Colorado’s cherished moose population and its inclusion in the preferred diets of wolves, moose should be named, along with deer and elk, as wildlife that will be impacted by wolf introduction.
- The importance of subspecies needs to be made consistent. If the blue book language seeks to distinguish between subspecies, then it should be mentioned that the subspecies to be introduced under this proposal, the Canadian Gray Wolf, is not native to Colorado. If the blue book language does not seek to distinguish between subspecies, then the Mexican Gray Wolf should be included in discussions of wolf populations, including the map on page 3.

### Page 1

- Line 3: change “develop a plan” to “replace its existing plan for naturally migrating wolves with a new plan to reintroduce and manage gray wolves in Colorado.” The rationale for this change is that Colorado Parks and Wildlife already has a free-ranging wolf plan in place. *Findings and Recommendations for Managing Wolves that Migrate into Colorado*, <https://cpw.state.co.us/Documents/WildlifeSpecies/SpeciesOfConcern/Wolf/recomendations.pdf>. Adopted by the Colorado Wildlife Commission in May 2005.
- Line 6: Under “What Your Vote Means,” change the Yes section to read, “A ‘yes’ vote on Initiative 107 means that the Colorado Parks and Wildlife Commission will reintroduce wolves west of the Continental Divide and develop a plan for their reintroduction and management.” [Added language is underlined]. The rationale for this change is that the language as currently drafted may lead some voters to believe that they are simply voting yes on the development of a plan, rather than the actual reintroduction of wolves.

### Page 2

- Line 22: add Montana to the states where wolves were not eliminated. “...48 states, except for the northern portions of Minnesota, Michigan, and Montana.” [added language is underlined]
- Line 22: following the states where wolves were not eliminated, add the sentence, “Because the subspecies of gray wolf that was native to Colorado was eliminated, the subspecies that would be introduced under this ballot measure would not be native to Colorado.” [Added language underlined].
- Line 23: add moose to the list of prey consumed by wolves.
- Line 26: add moose population information to the population figures for elk and deer.

- Line 36: add mention of a pack of wolves confirmed in Colorado. “...recent years, including a pack of wolves confirmed by Colorado Parks and Wildlife officers to be living in northwest Colorado in 2020...” [added language is underlined]

#### Page 3

- Line 2: please add reference markers like cities, towns, and roads.
- Line 2: Gray Wolf populations in New Mexico and Arizona should be added to this map. <https://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/mexicanwolf/#:~:text=Credit%3A%20Aislinn%20Maestas%2C%20USFWS.&text=The%20wild%20population%20of%20Mexican,a%20minimum%20of%20163%20animals.>
- Lines 7 and 8: delete “under certain conditions” at the end of Line 7 and beginning of Line 8.
- Line 28: include that wolves were delisted in the northern Rocky Mountains “because they exceeded population objectives in the area.” [Added language underlined].

#### Page 4

- Lines 3 and 4: add that livestock losses due to wolves are likely higher than the confirmed number due to factors like not being able to locate a carcass. Additionally, add that wolf depredation adds stress to livestock herds, decreasing fertility rates, reducing animal weights, and causing emotional distress.
- Lines 6-11: add that the Colorado Parks and Wildlife Commission has already adopted a management plan to allow wolves to migrate freely into Colorado. See note for Page 1, Line 3 above for further details.
- Lines 9-11: add that USFWS proposed delisting gray wolves because recovery population objectives have been exceeded.
- Line 26: according to Coloradans Protecting Wildlife, one of the two campaign committees opposing this ballot measure, the first argument against wolf reintroduction should be:
  - o Wildlife management should be led by state experts and informed by science. Colorado Parks and Wildlife is the agency responsible for managing wildlife in Colorado. The Colorado Parks and Wildlife Commission has studied wolf introduction multiple times over decades and has adopted resolutions against wolf introduction in Colorado in 1982, 1989, 2004, and 2016. Further, Colorado Parks and Wildlife has a wolf management plan in place that allows wolves to freely migrate into Colorado. This plan is working as evidenced by the confirmed wolf sightings, including an entire pack in January and March 2020.
- Line 27: include elk in wildlife that is below objectives in some areas. “Elk and deer herds in some areas...” [Added language underlined].

#### Page 5

- Lines 2-11:
  - o add that the total costs of wolf reintroduction are estimated at \$5.7 million by year eight with additional ongoing costs to follow.
  - o add that costs associated with this proposal that cannot be covered by revenue from hunting and fishing license fees must be backfilled by the legislature,

presumably through the General Fund, which was just cut by \$3.3 billion for the current fiscal year.

- for context, add that in 2018, other states with gray wolves like Washington and Wyoming, each paid more than \$1 million in wolf management expenses.