

# PROJECT COYOTE

F O S T E R I N G   C O E X I S T E N C E



April 23, 2018

Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Energy  
115 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05633-5301

Att'n: Sen. Christopher Bray, [cbray@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:cbray@leg.state.vt.us)  
Sen. Brian Campion, [bcampion@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:bcampion@leg.state.vt.us)  
Sen. Mark A. MacDonald, [mmacdonald@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:mmacdonald@leg.state.vt.us)  
Sen. John Rogers, [jrogers@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:jrogers@leg.state.vt.us)  
Sen. Christopher A. Pearson, [cpearson@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:cpearson@leg.state.vt.us)  
Jude Newman, Committee Assistant, [jnewman@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:jnewman@leg.state.vt.us)

**Re: Support for H. 636 that would ban coyote killing contests (“An act relating to miscellaneous fish and wildlife subjects”)**

To the Committee:

On behalf of Project Coyote’s Science Advisory Board and the undersigned scientists we express our support for H.636, which proposes to amend certain provisions regarding the authority of the Department of Fish and Wildlife as related to wildlife—and in particular, to ban coyote killing contests (“CKCs”), *see* § 4716—in the state of Vermont.

The most general reason to prohibit CKCs is that hunters and wildlife managers believe, as a community, that killing animals without an adequate reason is unjustified and unsportsmanlike. Killing an animal for a prize or trophy constitutes killing without an adequate reason. Inasmuch as CKCs are primarily motivated by killing for a prize or trophy, they are wrong.

Some advocates of CKCs argue that they are important for achieving management objectives for other species, especially game species. There is no credible evidence that indiscriminate killing of coyotes or other predators effectively serves any genuine interest in managing other species. If leaders in the hunting and wildlife management community believe that CKCs, in general, serve important objectives, then the principles of wildlife management mandate that (1) these objectives be articulated and vetted by the best-available science, and (2) some reasonable, science-based case be made to justify a CKC as an appropriate means for achieving these objectives. In the absence of such an evaluation, CKCs should be prohibited.

Advocates of CKCs might argue that they are an important means for realizing one or both of these objectives: (1) decrease the loss of livestock to depredation, and (2) increase the abundance of prey species in the interest of maximizing hunting success by humans.

With respect to objective (1), a great deal of science has been developed on how to effectively manage depredations, including both lethal and non-lethal methods. Lessons from that science include:

- (i) Indiscriminate killing is ineffective and it is plausible, perhaps likely, that when associated with a CKC it would lead to increased risk of depredations. A primary reason for this concern is that only some, often only a few, individual predators participate in depredation. Indiscriminate and “pre-emptive” killing of predators associated with CKCs can lead to the disruption of predators’ social structure and foraging ecology in ways that increase the likelihood of depredations. In hunted (exploited) coyote populations, for example, the number of surviving pups that must be fed by the alpha parents and the number of transient individuals may increase. These factors may predispose more coyotes to depredate livestock.
- (ii) The indiscriminate killing associated with a CKC does not target: (a) the offending predator, (b) the site where depredation has occurred, and (c) the time when depredation has occurred. This renders CKCs ineffective as a means of depredation control.

While managing to reduce the loss of livestock is a common goal for all stakeholders, CKCs do not contribute to this goal and may work against it.

With respect to objective (2), a large body of science indicates that killing predators, especially under circumstances associated with CKCs, is not a reliable means of increasing ungulate abundance. The circumstances most likely to result in increased ungulate abundance are also the circumstances most likely to impair important ecosystem benefits and services that predators provide. Even when predators are killed to the point of impairing the ecosystem services, there is still no assurance that ungulate abundance will increase. The reason being is that ungulate abundance is frequently limited by factors other than predators – factors such as habitat and climate.

Beyond objectives (1) and (2), which focus on affecting game populations and livestock depredations, lies a need to better recognize and celebrate the predators’ valuable contribution to the health and vitality of our ecosystems. For example, predators serve human interests through beneficial effects such as rodent control and disease prevention and promoting diverse plant communities and soil fertility. Thus, reduction of the distribution and numbers of apex predators can have detrimental ecological effects.

Some advocates of CKCs might also believe that killing coyotes is vitally important for preventing coyote populations from growing out of control. This concern is unjustified. Science demonstrates that unexploited coyote populations self-regulate their numbers by means of dominant individuals defending non-overlapping territories and suppressing subordinate pack members from breeding.

The Boone and Crockett Club was founded by Theodore Roosevelt in 1887 "over the concerns that we might someday lose our hunting privileges and the wildlife populations for future generations"<sup>1</sup>, is still

---

<sup>1</sup> From B&C’s website: [http://www.boone-crockett.org/join/associates\\_faq.asp?area=join](http://www.boone-crockett.org/join/associates_faq.asp?area=join)

considered one of the most respected sportsmen's institutions in North America. The Club "does not support programs, contests or competitions that directly place a bounty on game animals by awarding cash or expensive prizes for the taking of wildlife"<sup>2</sup> because CKCs contravene the club's "fair-chase" motto.

Thank you for considering our concerns on this important wildlife conservation issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Camilla H. Fox  
Founder & Executive Director

**ON BEHALF OF:**

John A. Vucetich, PhD  
Houghton, MI  
Associate Professor  
School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science  
Michigan Technological Univ.  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

David Parsons, MS  
Albuquerque, NM  
Carnivore Conservation Biologist, Rewilding Institute  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Robert Crabtree, PhD  
Victoria, British Columbia  
Founder & Chief Scientist Yellowstone Ecological Research Center  
Research Associate Professor, Department of Ecosystem and Conservation Science, University of Montana  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Michael Paul Nelson, PhD  
Corvallis, OR  
Professor, and Ruth H. Spaniol Chair of Renewable Resources  
Oregon State University  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

---

<sup>2</sup> See: [http://www.boone-crockett.org/bgRecords/position\\_statements.asp?area=bgRecords](http://www.boone-crockett.org/bgRecords/position_statements.asp?area=bgRecords)

Michael Soulé, PhD  
Paonia, CO  
Professor Emeritus  
Dept. Environmental Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz  
Co-founder, Society for Conservation Biology  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Paul Paquet, PhD  
Meacham, Saskatchewan  
Senior Scientist Carnivore Specialist, Raincoast Conservation Foundation  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Jeremy T. Bruskotter, PhD  
Columbus, Ohio  
Associate Professor School of Environment & Natural Resources  
The Ohio State University  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Marc Bekoff, PhD  
Boulder, CO  
Professor Emeritus, University of Colorado, Boulder  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Bradley J. Bergstrom, PhD  
Valdosta, GA  
Professor of Biology, Valdosta State University  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Shelley M. Alexander, PhD  
Calgary, Alberta  
Associate Professor, Geography, University of Calgary  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Adrian Treves, PhD  
Madison, WI  
Associate Professor  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Rick Hopkins, PhD  
San Jose, CA  
Principal and Senior Conservation Biologist  
Live Oak Associates, Inc.  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Jennifer Wolch, PhD  
Berkeley, CA  
Dean, College of Environmental Design  
Science Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Becky Weed, MS  
Belgrade, MT  
Thirteen Mile Lamb and Wool Co.  
Advisory Board, Project Coyote

Chris Schadler, MS, MA  
Webster, NH  
Wild Canid Specialist  
NH & VT Rep., Project Coyote

William J. Ripple, PhD  
Portland, OR  
Distinguished Professor of Ecology  
Oregon State University

Paul Beier, PhD  
Flagstaff, AZ  
Regents' Professor, School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff AZ  
Past President, Society for Conservation Biology

David Mattson, PhD  
Livingston, MT  
Lecturer and Senior Visiting Scientist, Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies  
USGS Colorado Plateau Research Station Leader (retired)  
USGS Research Wildlife Biologist (retired)  
Past Western Field Director, MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative

Melissa Savage, PhD  
Los Angeles, CA  
Professor Emerita  
University of California, Los Angeles

Philip Hedrick PhD  
Tempe, AZ  
Ullman Professor of Conservation Biology  
Arizona State University

Megan Isadore  
Forest Knolls, CA  
Co-founder and Executive Director  
River Otter Ecology Project  
Member, IUCN Otter Specialist Group  
Founder, Good Riddance! Wildlife Exclusions, LLC

David Fraser, PhD  
Vancouver, Canada  
Professor  
University of British Columbia

Bernard E. Rollin, PhD  
Fort Collins, CO  
University Distinguished Professor  
Professor of Philosophy  
Professor of Animal Sciences  
Professor of Biomedical Sciences  
University Bioethicist

Malcolm R. MacPherson, PhD  
Santa Fe, NM  
Retired Scientist  
Member AAAS and the Society for Conservation Biology

Bob Ferris, MA  
Eugene, OR  
Executive Director, Cascadia Wildlands

Simon Gadbois, PhD  
Halifax, NS, Canada  
Director of the Canid Behaviour Research Team  
Dalhousie University, Canada

Zoë Jewell M.A., M.Sc., Vet. M.B., M.R.C.V.S  
Sydney, Australia  
Adjunct Faculty, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University  
Associate Academic, Center for Compassionate Conservation,  
University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Chris Dairmont, PhD  
Victoria, BC  
Hakai-Raincoast Professor  
University of Victoria

Dale Jamieson PhD  
New York, NY  
Professor of Environmental Studies, Philosophy, and Bioethics, Affiliated Professor of Law, Director of  
the Animal Studies Initiative  
New York University

Kevin Crooks PhD  
Fort Collins, CO  
Monfort Professor, Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology  
Colorado State University

William Lynn, PhD  
Marlborough, MA  
Research Scientist  
Marsh Institute, Clark University

Jonathan Way, PhD  
Osterville, MA  
Eastern Coyote Research  
Research Scientist, Clark University

Geri T. Vistein, MS  
Brunswick, Maine  
Carnivore Conservation Biologist  
Founder of Coyote Lives in Maine

Lisa Micheli, PhD  
Santa Rosa, CA  
Executive Director  
Pepperwood's Dwight Center for Conservation Science

Winston Thomas, PhD  
Founder and CEO, Canine Genetics, LLC  
San Mateo, CA

Megan M. Draheim, PhD  
Washington, DC  
Visiting Assistant Professor  
Virginia Tech

Stephen F. Stringham, PhD  
Soldotna, AK  
Predator Biologist  
President, WildWatch Consulting  
Chair, Advisory Committee, BEAR League

Bonny Laura Schumaker, PhD  
La Canada, CA  
Physicist & Technical Manager, Retired  
(Theoretical Astrophysics and Remote Sensing)  
California Institute of Technology / Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
Founder and President, OnWingsOfCare.org

Rolf Peterson, PhD  
Robbins Professor of Sustainable Environmental Management  
School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science  
Michigan Technological University

David Johns, PhD  
Hatfield School of Government  
Portland State University  
Portland, OR

Thomas L. Serfass, Ph.D.  
Frostburg, Maryland  
Professor of Wildlife Ecology and Chair, Department of Biology and Natural Resources  
North American Coordinator, IUCN Otter Specialist Group  
Frostburg State University

Robert Schmidt, PhD  
Salt Lake City, UT  
Associate Professor, Dept. Environment and Society  
Utah State University

Arnold Newman PhD, Executive Director  
Sherman Oaks, CA  
The International Society for the Preservation of the Tropical Rainforest

Susan E. Townsend, PhD  
Oakland, CA  
Wildlife Ecology and Consulting

Ian R. MacDonald, PhD  
Tallahassee, FL  
Florida State University

Martin B. Main, PhD  
Gainesville, FL  
Professor, Wildlife Ecology and Conservation  
Associate Dean and Program Leader, Natural Resources Extension  
University of Florida

Guillaume Chapron, PhD  
Sweden  
Associate Professor  
Grimsö Wildlife Research Station  
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Jill Sideman, PhD  
Tiburon, California  
Environmental Management Consultant



Richard P. Reading, PhD  
Denver, CO  
Department of Conservation Biology  
Denver Zoological Foundation

José Vicente López-Bao, PhD  
Spain  
Research Unit of Biodiversity (UO/CSIC/PA)  
Oviedo University

\*\*\*\*\*

## Appendix A. Additional Literature Cited

Here we provide additional scientific explanation (with citations) for two ideas expressed in this letter.

**(1) Some advocates of wildlife killing contests (WKC) believe they are necessary or beneficial for effective management of livestock depredation.** We indicated that WKC are unlikely to have this effect. The reason why is that most individual predators do not participate in livestock depredations (Gipson 1975; Knowlton et al. 1999; Sacks et al. 1999a, 1999b; Linnell et al. 1999; Stahl and Vandel 2001; Blejwas et al. 2002; Treves et al. 2002; Treves and Naughton-Treves 2005). Consequently, effective management of depredation requires (1) targeting the offending individual(s), and (2) intervening close to the site where the depredations occurred as well as responding in a timely manner (Gipson 1975; Sacks et al. 1999a, 1999b; Smith et al. 2000; Bangs and Shivik 2001). WKC do not represent the kind of targeted effort required for effective management of livestock depredations.

Moreover, indiscriminate killing of predators is likely to exacerbate risks to livestock. The reason is that killing social carnivores like coyotes (and wolves) can lead to the disruption of predators' social and foraging ecology in ways that increase the number of transient individuals (Bjorge and Gunson 1985; Haber 1996; Treves and Naughton-Treves 2005; Brainerd et al. 2008). These transient individuals that have not been acculturated (aversively conditioned) to living in areas with livestock may be more likely to kill livestock. Studies by USDA's Wildlife Services clearly indicate that many, if not most, depredations are inflicted by the breeders (i.e., alphas) in coyote social groups (Knowlton et al. 1999; Sacks et al. 1999b). Even if the offending individuals are removed, they can be replaced by other members of the social group or from populations outside the area where the WKC is occurring. In some cases, this can also increase reproductive performance in coyotes (Crabtree and Sheldon 1999; Knowlton et al. 1999). Scientific evidence is increasingly suggesting that harvesting predators can exacerbate losses to livestock (Collins et al. 2002; Treves et al. 2010, Peebles et al. 2013, Wielgus and Peebles 2014).

**(2) Some advocates of wildlife killing contests believe they are necessary or beneficial for increasing the abundance of ungulate populations. We had indicated in our letter that WKC are unlikely to have that effect.** The reason why is two fold:

(i) Killing predators cannot result in increased ungulate abundance in cases where the ungulate population is not limited by predators, but is instead limited by other factors, such as climatic conditions or food availability (Sæther 1997; Forchhammer et al. 1998; Coulson et al. 2000; Parker et al 2009). Without careful study, the claim that killing predators will improve wild ungulate populations is simply an unsupported assumption. Moreover, scientists are not good at understanding the conditions that cause a population to be limited by predators as opposed to other factors (Vucetich et al. 2005; Wilmers et al. 2006). For example, an experimental study in Idaho (Hurley et al. 2011) found that annual removal of coyotes was not an effective method to increase mule deer populations because coyote removal increased neonate fawn survival only under particular combinations of prey densities and weather conditions.

(ii) Even in cases where predators do limit prey abundance, human-caused mortality (HCM) could only lead to an increase in prey abundance if the rate of HCM was sufficient to result in a significant reduction in predator abundance. Human-caused mortality is not a reliable means of reducing coyote abundance unless the rate of HCM exceeds 70% (Connolly and Lonhurst 1975). It is difficult to imagine that any set of WKC's would be intense enough or frequent enough to result in that rate of HCM.

Finally, the interest of some advocates of WKC's (i.e., increased ungulate abundance) is antithetical to good natural resource management practices in cases where increased ungulate abundances present a risk of overbrowsing (e.g., Côté et al. 2004).

Thank you for allowing us to further explain ourselves. If additional explanation on this or any other topic would be of value, please let us know. We would be eager to provide any such explanations.

## Citations

Bangs, E., & Shivik, J. A. (2001). Managing wolf conflict with livestock in the northwestern United States. USDA National Wildlife Research Center-Staff Publications, 550.

Blejwas K.M., Sacks B.N., Jaeger M.M., McCullough D.R. (2002). The effectiveness of selective removal of breeding coyotes in reducing sheep predation. *J Wildl Manage* 66, 451-462.

Brainerd, S. M., Andrén, H., Bangs, E. E., Bradley, E. H., Fontaine, J. A., Hall, W. & Wydeven, A. P. (2008). The effects of breeder loss on wolves. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 72(1), 89-98.

Bjorge, R. R., and J. R. Gunson. (1985). Evaluation of wolf control to reduce cattle predation in Alberta. *Journal of Range Management* 38:483-486.

Collins, G.H., R. B. Wielgus, And G. M. Koehler. (2002). Effects of sex and age on American black bear conifer damage and control. *Ursus* 13:231–236.

Connolly, G. E., and W. M. Longhurst. (1975). The effects of control on coyote populations: A simulation model. Division Agricultural Science, University of California, Davis, Bulletin 1872.

- Côté, S. D., Rooney, T. P., Tremblay, J. P., Dussault, C., & Waller, D. M. (2004). Ecological impacts of deer overabundance. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 113-147.
- Coulson, T., Milner-Gulland, E. J., & Clutton-Brock, T. (2000). The relative roles of density and climatic variation on population dynamics and fecundity rates in three contrasting ungulate species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 267(1454), 1771-1779.
- Crabtree, R. L., and J. W. Sheldon. (1999). Coyotes and canid coexistence. In *Carnivores in ecosystems: The Yellowstone experience*, ed. T. W. Clark et al., 127–163. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Forchhammer, M. C., Stenseth, N. C., Post, E., & Landvatn, R. (1998). Population dynamics of Norwegian red deer: density-dependence and climatic variation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 265(1393), 341-350.
- Gipson P.S. (1975). Efficiency of trapping in capturing offending coyotes. *Wildlife Management* 39, 45-47.
- Knowlton F.F., E. M. Gese, Jaeger M.M. (1999). Coyote depredation control: An interface between biology and management. *Journal of Range Management* 52, 398-412.
- Haber, G. C. (1996). Biological, conservation, and ethical implications of exploiting and controlling wolves. *Conservation Biology* 10:1068-1081.
- Linnell J.D.C., Odden J., Smith M.E., Aanes R., Swenson J.E. (1999). Large carnivores that kill livestock: do problem individuals really exist? *Wildl Soc Bull* 27, 698-705.
- Parker, K. L., Barboza, P. S., & Gillingham, M. P. (2009). Nutrition integrates environmental responses of ungulates. *Functional Ecology*, 23(1), 57-69.
- Peebles, K. A., R. B. Wielgus, B. T. Maletzke, And M. E. Swanson. (2013). Effects of remedial sport hunting on cougar complaints and livestock depredations. *PloS ONE*. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0079713.
- Ritchie EG, Elmhagen B, Glen AS, Letnic M, Ludwig G, McDonald RA. (2012). Ecosystem restoration with teeth: what role for predators? In: *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 27(5):265-271.
- Sacks B.N., Blejwas K.M., Jaeger M.M. (1999a). Relative vulnerability of coyotes to removal methods on a northern California ranch. *J Wildl Manage* 63, 939-949;
- Sacks, B. N., M. M. Jaeger, J. C. C. Neale, and D. R. McCullough. (1999). Territoriality and breeding status of coyotes relative to sheep predation. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 63:593-605.
- Sæther, B. E. (1997). Environmental stochasticity and population dynamics of large herbivores: a search for mechanisms. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 12(4), 143-149.

Smith, M. E., Linnell, J. D., Odden, J., & Swenson, J. E. (2000). Review of methods to reduce livestock depredation II. Aversive conditioning, deterrents and repellents. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section A-Animal Science*, 50(4), 304-315

Stahl P., Vandel J.M. (2001). Factors influencing lynx depredation on sheep in France: Problem individuals and habitat. *Carnivore Damage Prevention News* 4, 6-8.

Treves A., Naughton-Treves L. (2005). Evaluating lethal control in the management of human-wildlife conflict. pp. 86-106 in R. Woodroffe, S. Thirgood, A. Rabinowitz editors. *People and Wildlife, Conflict or Coexistence*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Treves, A., R. L. Jurewicz, L. Naughton-Treves, R. A. Rose, R. C. Willging, and A. P. Wydeven. (2002). Wolf depredation on domestic animals: control and compensation in Wisconsin, 1976-2000. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 30:231-241.

Treves, A., K. J. Kapp, And D. Macfarland. (2010). American black bear nuisance complaints and hunter take. *Ursus* 21:30–42. doi: 10.2192/09gr012.1

Vucetich, J. A., Smith, D. W., & Stahler, D. R. (2005). Influence of harvest, climate and wolf predation on Yellowstone elk, 1961-2004. *Oikos*, 111(2), 259-270.

Wielgus, R. B. And K. A. Peebles. (2014). Effects of Wolf Mortality on Livestock Depredations. *PLoS ONE* 9(12): e113505. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0113505.

Wilmers, C. C., Post, E., Peterson, R. O., & Vucetich, J. A. (2006). Predator disease outbreak modulates top-down, bottom-up and climatic effects on herbivore population dynamics. *Ecology Letters*, 9(4), 383-389.