

Wolf Advisory Group

Meeting Summary¹, July 16-17, 2024

WAG members present: Alex Baier, Amy Porter, Bill Kemp, Caitlin Scarano, Dan Paul, Lisa Stone, Lynn Okita, Nick Martinez, Marie Neumiller, Paula Swedeen, Samee Charriere, Scott Nielson, Sierra Smith, Todd Holmdahl, Tyler Allen

Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW, Department) staff members present: Ben Maletzke, Brock Hoenes, Trent Roussin, Seth Thompson, Mike Kuttel, Staci Lehman, Fenner Yarborough, Shubhadeep (Shubh) Bhattacharjee

Facilitation team: Rob Willis, Susan Hayman, Casey Hart, Alec Ege

Meeting Action Items

Responsible Party	Action Item	Target Date
Facilitation Team	Schedule and convene Compensation Proposal Task Group meeting (Amy, Paula, Samee, Tyler, Jim) in preparation for Nov. WAG Meeting.	July 31
Facilitation Team	Schedule and convene Compensation WAC Changes Task Group meeting (Sierra, Todd, Lynn, Samee) ² in preparation for Nov. WAG Meeting.	July 31
Facilitation Team (in consultation with task groups)	Schedule and convene a “producer focus group” to provide /feedback on WAG’s compensation program proposals (1) pay for presence and, 2) Key WAC changes in preparation for Nov. WAG Meeting (consult with two task groups for representatives to meet with the focus group.	August 31
WDFW	Work with the Wolf-Ungulate Task Group to frame a WAG request for an update on ungulate population status at the November WAG meeting.	November WAG Meeting
WDFW	Send WAG members projected hunting levels anticipated this fall that are updated yearly by district biologists.	November WAG Meeting
Sierra Smith/Facilitation Team	Follow up on the lightening round decision to compose a recommendation to WDFW Director Kelly Susewind to create a tally of “unconfirmed” depredation investigations by district. Route to the WAG (especially reaching out to absent WAG members) and WDFW for confirmation of wording	September 30

¹ This summary is a synthesis of the meeting discussion July 16-17, 2024. The meeting summary will be publicly available following finalization of the meeting documentation package.

² After the meeting Jim Brown and/or Fenner Yarborough were invited to join this sub-task group.

	prior to the Facilitation Team sending it to Director Susewind on behalf of WAG.	
--	--	--

July 16, 2024 (Day 1)

Opening

Rob Willis, Ross Strategic facilitator, opened the Wolf Advisory Group (WAG) meeting at 10:00am by welcoming members, WDFW staff, and meeting observers, providing an overview of the meeting objectives and agenda, and reviewing the [WAG Ground Rules](#). The purpose of the meeting was to:

1. Discuss a compensation program proposal and options developed by the Compensation Task Group (WAG and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife [WDFW]), and determine which, if any, to pursue and further develop into a potential WAG recommendation.
2. Discuss WAG members' perspectives on the purpose/intent of poaching penalties and how WAG members see potentially increasing penalties influencing wolf conservation and management.
3. Provide opportunities for WAG members and WDFW staff to build collaborative capacity, promote conflict transformation, and strengthen their relationships with one another.

Introductions

WAG Member and WDFW Staff Introductions

Willis invited WAG members and WDFW staff in attendance to introduce themselves. Willis filled in as a facilitator for Susan Hayman (Ross Strategic).

WDFW Updates

Wolf Team Updates

Mike Kuttel (WDFW) provided several WDFW updates and clarifications:

- A recent Couse Pack depredation and caught-in-the-act event are in an evaluation period. WDFW is not required to share landownership details, and did not disclose them for landowner sensitivity and staff and producer safety purposes. Director Susewind was consulted on this decision, and this approach will be consistently taken with future investigations. Both reactive and proactive deterrents were in place for the Couse Pack situation, and the producer is both cooperative and seeking additional range riding assistance. The caught-in-the-act case met definition requirements according to the enforcement program and county prosecutor. Several other packs currently have confirmed depredations. More information on the Couse Pack situation can be found on the [WDFW Website](#).
- WDFW will be submitting a budget request to the Office of Financial Management to be considered in the Governor's budget. WDFW is requesting \$300,000 for WAG funding for the next biennium and a \$1 million request for other wolf conservation and management efforts. Compensation is included in a separate ongoing funding bucket.

- A WAG member requested additional information on previous WAG and other wolf-related funding for comparison purposes.
- A WAG member noted that WAG members, as private citizens, can choose to lobby legislators for more compensation funding.

WAG Perspectives: Poaching Penalties

At the April 2024 WAG meeting, WAG members discussed poaching penalties in connection with a conversation regarding the Periodic Status Review (PSR) (See [April WAG Meeting Summary](#) for context). Following the April discussion, WDFW Director Kelly Susewind asked WAG members to discuss their underlying interest in poaching penalties and how this would contribute to wolf conservation and management goals. The following are key points of the discussion:

- **Addressing poaching conversations could be *beneficial*** to reduce potential increases in malicious poaching after wolves are downlisted and amplify a social signal that malicious poaching is unacceptable.
- **Creating additional rules or language around poaching could be *detrimental*** because it could: lead to less reporting of poaching, be difficult to separate poaching from simple mistakes, hinder trust, and take extensive time and resources without properly catching poachers.
- **Before continuing a poaching -penalties conversation, WAG members would like to** explore and unpack relationship dynamics between producers and WDFW, weigh benefits of discussing poaching over other topics, consider more evidence that poaching penalties are an effective deterrent, better understand Fish and Wildlife Commission poaching work, and identify more information on frequency and consequences of poaching convictions.
- **If and when a poaching conversation is held in the future,** WAG members would like to separate poaching from other intertwined topics (e.g. fines), ensure rules and definitions are deliberately and clearly crafted, incorporate wolf and other species biological population metrics, discuss expanding poaching conviction abilities beyond two-years, and consider increasing depredation reporting ability beyond 24-hours.

WAG members decided to table further discussion on poaching penalties until a decision on downlisting is made and when the conversation can be held within the context of post-recovery planning.

Compensation for Direct and Indirect Livestock Loss due to Wolf Depredation

Between the April and July 2024 WAG meeting, the Compensation Task Group composed a proposal for a tiered Pay-for-Presence (P4P) Compensation program, to serve as an alternative to Washington’s current compensation program and address the challenges with the program previously identified at the April 2024 WAG meeting. WAG members made specific comments on inclusions, changes, and specific ideas for further discussion in the Proposal Document. These were documented and will be provided to the Compensation Task Group to address in their continued refinement. Several larger conversation topics were identified and discussed in greater detail on Day 2 (See *Day 2 P4P Discussion section below*). Main discussion comments about whether to continue pursuing the overall P4P proposal idea and framework included:

- **Focus on desired process outcomes and simplifications** rather than current RCWs and WACs.

- **Talk with producers** to determine whether they would want a P4P program. Determine how people would know the program reduces burden for producers and WDFW staff and increases program efficiency, while increasing societal wolf tolerance.
- **Seek out both short-term and long-term solutions** to lower producer and WDFW burdens and increase program efficiencies. This will require WAC and/or RCW changes and will therefore be time-consuming. It may be possible to make changes by the next Legislative session. Regardless of the path forward in Compensation protocol, continue prioritizing wolf management.
- **Identify long-term funding solutions** but do not let program costs be a deterrent to pursuing the proposal. Providing accurate program costs and benefits will be important to gain support and investment from the Legislature. While there are state-funding limits, public financing and other creative funding means can be discussed. The proposed program should:
 - Increase compensation rates increase as tiers increase, recognizing there will be significantly fewer but more expensive cases in higher-level tiers.
 - Consider producer data in determining compensation rates.
 - Include compensation without losses to cover for the non-lethal requirement costs.

At the conclusion of the Day 1 discussion, WAG and WDFW staff agreed to move forward with further refinement of the P4P model as presented and discussed. WAG members and WDFW staff also agreed to concurrently develop an alternative that would address the key WAC issues identified by WDFW and the WAG for improving the indirect and direct compensation process. An additional sub-task group will be convened to work on the “WAC-focused” improvements for compensation.

Next Steps

WDFW staff will provide the WACs they have identified internally as challenging to the WAG on Day 2 of the meeting for further discussion.

Public Comment

Three persons provided public comment on Day 1, as documented in [Appendix A](#).

Closing

Willis reviewed the meeting’s action items and invited WAG members and WDFW staff to provide final reflections on something WAG members valued from the day’s conversation.

July 17, 2024 (Day 2)

Opening

Rob Willis Hayman, Ross Strategic facilitator, opened the Wolf Advisory Group (WAG) meeting at 9:30am by welcoming members, WDFW staff, and meeting observers, and providing a meeting agenda overview.

Introductions

WAG Member and WDFW Staff Introductions

Willis invited WAG members and WDFW staff in attendance to introduce themselves.

Compensation Program Part 2: Identifying Potential WAC Changes (continued from July 16):

Willis (Ross Strategic) recapped WAG discussions from July 16th that the WAG wants to make incremental improvements to the existing Compensation process (especially timeline improvements and reduction of paperwork burden for producers and WDFW staff) by identifying WAC changes, while simultaneously undertaking a larger effort to develop a P4P program. WAG members emphasized the importance of hearing producer perspectives of their experiences and what producers see as beneficial changes.

Fenner Yarborough (WDFW) provided three WACs in which WDFW staff identified problematic areas: [220-440-020](#), [220-440-170](#), and [220-440-180](#). WAG members and WDFW staff discussed aspects of these WACs that might be most beneficial to address ([See Appendix B](#)). An additional compensation task group will be created to develop an alternative that focuses on key WAC changes. There are two lenses of making compensation program improvements: workability from a producer perspective, and that it can be implemented from WDFW's perspective.

Next Steps:

Willis proposed that based on the WAG conversation, the WAC Compensation Task Group (Sierra Smith, Todd Holmdahl, Lynn Okita, and Samee Charriere) identifies potential changes and improvements to compensation operating procedures, including a list of changes to the WAC administrative code, and a list of changes to things not in the administrative code. The group will talk to producers, consider case-studies, and then cross walk a list their list with WDFW to see what makes sense to include or change. WDFW staff will work internally to identify ideas to streamline the process. The task group can identify ways to improve relationships between the WDFW team (including but not limited to on-the ground conflict specialists) and producers. The task-group is encouraged to focus on moving forward on solutions. A suggestion included having another entity facilitate the compensation process (e.g. local farm bureau). The task group will identify which conversations make sense to bring back to the WAG.

Compensation Program Part 3: Pay-for-Presence (P4P) Proposal (continued from July 16)

Willis framed up a conversation to confirm areas for further clarification and additional discussion based on topics highlighted during the Day 1 conversation (see Day 1 notes).

Reach of Program: how many head of cattle fall under the Pay-for-Presence (P4P) program and what would be the resulting annual cost?

The WAG discussed:

- A method for determining compensation costs is currently unclear. It will be important to understand reasoning behind calculations.
- The [Annual Wolf Report](#) includes a five-year tally of probable and unconfirmed depredations that will be needed to calculate P4P costs.

- The P4P Task Group could compare wolf pack territory maps to statistics on animals per county. Scott Nielson and Sierra Smith (WAG) volunteered to help determine cattle numbers overlapping with wolf territories to help estimate potential P4P program costs.
- The P4P Task Group will start with cattle and sheep for the pilot project and recognize sheep may be too difficult to calculate for now due to a lack of data. California’s program base rate for sheep may be a helpful place to start. The Task Group can report the level of difficulty to do calculations to the WAG and determine if calculations should expand to other animals. Paula Swedeen will work with Nick Martinez (WAG) to determine values similar for sheep.

Eligibility Requirements

Program application and eligibility requirements include three main points of discussion: wolf activity area, a definition to replace the “commercial” placeholder, and non-lethal expectations. The task group will come back with more information on these topics based on the following discussions:

- *Wolf activity area:* A clear definition is needed for the current “Documented and consistent” presence of wolves description that defines the area for compensation with consideration for ensuring producer eligibility as wolf packs are established over the year. Wolf biologists Ben Maletzke or Trent Roussin (WDFW) will be part of further conversations on this.
- *Commercial Placeholder:* Compensation eligibility should be more inclusive of people who raise livestock for subsistence or for partial income i.e. remove “commercial”). WAG members discussed potential levels of eligibility, application interest, depredation consequences that varying scales of producers face. The WAG discussed potential solutions to allow for inclusivity while reducing administrative and funding pressure including setting potential minimum claim amounts or revenue generation for compensation.
- *Non-lethal expectations:* Non-lethal removal expectations could be incorporated into tiers in a number of ways, such as increasing simultaneously with tier-levels as well as lethal-removal requirements. The task group can work on wording for how non-lethal deterrents should be established with cooperation between WDFW staff and producers. Tier 1 of the P4P program would use non-lethal deterrents to be proactive, and so that producers receive information from conflict specialists. For P4P documentation purposes to qualify for Tier-1, producers could use and share a checklist with conflict specialists to share understanding of what non-lethal methods the producer wants to use. When depredations occur, producers may have to change or increase non-lethal tactics to qualify for a higher tier. Further program specificity is needed for each tier.

Pay for Presence (P4P) Tiered Program Structure

The WAG discussed a need to work on determining the tiered program structure and recognize that there will be trial-and-error in creating this program. This includes:

- Define “consistency” for wolf activity areas and non-lethal expectations.
- Determine payment for each tiered level.
 - Payments may not cover all expenses but would be consistent and easier to access.
 - Investigate Washington data on producer expenses, recognizing varying situations.

- Propose levels for each tier and ask producers for feedback. Sierra Smith and Scott Nielsen will work with the Task Group to obtain information from producer contacts.

Lowering the Temperature: How will we know a P4P program is succeeding to create societal desire to put the program into place?

- Conduct a survey of producer experiences: A producer survey could be conducted at the beginning and end of the pilot program. The WAG discussed:
 - Methodology (e.g. survey at the beginning and end of the pilot program and/or compare shifts in attitudes from the current to proposed program.
 - Duration (e.g., a four-year pilot program to determine if it functions as intended and any shift in social tolerance towards wolves.
- Set up a process for repairing WDFW and producer relationships, recognizing that this is a bigger issue extending beyond WAG.
- Consider literature evidence that these types of programs can be helpful.
- Clarify program intent: The program should help but not provide all solutions for long-term coexistence. P4P should encourage people to work with conflict specialists and increase non-lethal deterrent use.
- Consider potential increases in staffing and program cost requirements. The Task group will have to decide what is feasible once more is known about cost estimates. They should consider that there may not be proviso funding for SE that there is for the NE counties and that the NE and SE pilot areas may need to be scaled down to lower initial expenses.

Next Steps:

Willis confirmed that the current Compensation Task Group who formed the P4P proposal would like to continue participating on the task group. The task group includes Amy Porter, Tyler Allen, Paula Swedeen, Samee Charriere, and Jim Brown. Fenner Yarborough can help continue to find information as needed. Nick Martinez, Sierra Smith, and/or Scott Nielson may be asked to help estimate or determine where to obtain information on number of cattle overlapping with wolf territories. Task group members will continue to work on the proposal, with consideration to the WAG’s feedback.

Lightning Round

Proposal for “Lightning Rounds”: Sierra Smith (WAG) introduced the idea of a “lightning round” where WAG members can propose single, focused ideas that would (potentially) be quick to discuss and (potentially) easy to reach an agreement. If the topic requires a bigger conversation, it could be dropped or deferred for a later discussion.

Smith’s “Lightning Round” Proposal: Smith proposed a lightning round topic pitch to make a recommendation for Director Susewind to include or create a data point that is a tally of unconfirmed or unknown depredations as a result of depredation investigations by district (the scale is open to discussion).

- *Note - A tally for confirmed depredations and the data for unconfirmed/unknown already exists. This would be a tally of already existing data that can be publicly available.*

Decision: The WAG reached consensus to move forward with this proposal, with concurrence by WDFW.

Next Steps: Smith and the facilitation team will write up the lightning round proposal and share it with WAG via email. The facilitation team will also confirm consensus with WAG members not present.

November Topics

Susan Hayman (Ross Strategic) presented potential next steps for the November WAG Meeting including:

- Compensation programs: Pay-for-presence and WAC (*this will be a focus*)
- A “Social Series” on Wolves and Agricultural Communities
- A Range-riding audit presentation
 - In the 2023-25 biennium, language was put in Washington State University’s extension budget for an outside party look at how the agricultural grant program is functioning compared to the proviso language that set up conditions for how the money should be spent. This included looking at program information as it looks to be adaptable to other parts of the state, and to see if money is being spent effectively.
 - It would need to be determined whether this presentation could be given prior to being presented to the Legislature. November would be an optimal time to hear the presentation because the presenters will be near the November WAG meeting location (*near Colville -exact location TBD*).

Other topics that can be actively framed up include depredation reporting, monitoring and data sharing, post-recovery planning (structuring the discussion), and additional social series for other identity groups. WAG discussion clarifications and comments on the proposed topics included:

- The range-riding audit presentation could be a virtual option or be done at the January WAG meeting. It may be beneficial to present at the January WAG meeting because it will be after the Legislature has seen the presentation.
- An update on ungulate populations would be beneficial, whether via email or during a meeting. There are still ungulate issues to not forget about.
 - Hunting will likely be on people’s minds during the time of the November meeting.
 - WDFW can provide an update at the November WAG meeting.
 - Harvest data will be posted. WDFW staff can provide more information on ungulate status in wolf range and can send out a list of hunting prospects that are updated by district biologists every year.

Public Comment

Three people provided public comment on Day 2, as documented in [Appendix A](#).

Next Steps and Closing

Willis reviewed the meeting’s action items and invited WAG members and WDFW staff to provide final reflections. The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Appendix A: Public Comment

Public comment received at the end of each meeting day is paraphrased below:

July 16th

- **Asa (local rancher):** I have worked with WDFW before, and for the past eight years I have been interacting with wolves that have created stressful situations. Not all wolves have collars and there are additional ways to track them. There have been more than a few depredations this year and not all depredations are recorded. Forest Service allotments and other pastures we ranch on are huge. The chances of finding a carcass in a day in the pastures is low. We may not see carcasses for days or months, and it might not go as a confirmed kill because of this. It is often not worth the effort to report depredations if the carcass is too far gone, as we will be told it cannot be a confirmed wolf kill. This spring we found two carcasses in a day but did not get confirmed kills. We are tired of these reports not counting, lose trust, and try to take care of the problem ourselves. We also do not always want the public to know when a calf dies. We want to be left alone so that we can take care of our job. If you do not start to manage the wolves there will be more poaching.
- **David Hedrick (Ferry County)** - The amount that WDFW asked in the next budget is not a significant increase from the previous biennium's budget for non-lethal deterrents. We cannot guarantee money from a legislative budget and do not have the proper budget for wolves or WDFW's current policies. When an agency puts a budget proposal forward it shows where their priorities are. WDFW showed that they will put the costs on the communities dealing with wolves. This turns into a political exercise where ranchers have to rely on people that they do not trust since and now have to do our own monitoring. Problems keep being pushed down the road every few years. The way this will work is when the policy aligns with the capacity of WDFW (funding, time, and personnel).
- **Hannah Thompson-Garner (Director of advocacy for Northwest Animal Rights Network)** - I think the Department should increase the visibility of the meetings to the public for awareness. It would be helpful to have a more reliable system that announces WAG meetings to the general public for increased transparency, visibility, and awareness. The microphone has been hard to hear at the meeting causing the public to miss important details. Regarding the pay for presence model, we support an easier process for producers to receive compensation. However, this is a baseline perspective that wolves do not belong on the landscape and their presence can be paid for instead of assuming humans and wolves can belong on the landscape. Fairness and inclusivity do not appear to extend to wolves. It is important to understand diverse perspectives people in Washington have of wolves on the landscape and so that everyone succeeds. If people accept subsidizing producers, people need to understand the value of wolves on the landscape to create success and to not pit producers and wolf advocates against each other.

July 17th

- **Rachel B (animal advocate):** I appreciate public comment opportunities. It is hard to find out about the meetings. The proposed pay-for-presence program is disappointing. Paying producers for wolves in livestock territory sends the message that wolves do not belong on the lands, but non-native livestock do. Wolves are an important part of the ecosystem, and it seems like those

that want to help the ecosystem have to pay more for it. The pay-for-presence program would not do anything for the acceptance of wolves. Producers do not seem satisfied regarding any compensation program and have a desire to allow livestock to roam freely and to tag and collar wolves. Will this pay producers that use public lands to graze their cattle? Will taxpayers pay more to subsidize cattle in Washington State, reinforcing the message that wolves are creating damage? If you solicit feedback from producers, also solicit feedback from the animal advocacy community.

- **Rachel McClure (Okanagan/Ferry County producer and Cattleman's Association):** There is hesitation for producers to participate in this meeting, as it puts producers in a vulnerable situation. People do not want to have conversations about wolves. I want to make the point that there is room to improve relationships with WDFW, but we also need to put responsibility on ourselves. Some of the best people who can tell where wolves are located, are the ones coexisting with wolves. Look for the wolves, do not depend on the data. Regarding lethal removal, it is frustrating to have a wolf take cattle on the range, but the problem is a wolf that threatens livestock within the perimeter of the house and near the vicinity of humans including children. Wolves in these situations need to be considered for lethal removal regardless of compensation. Additionally, it is often difficult getting range riders where needed, such as where we run our cattle on Forest Service land.

Appendix B: Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Comments

Note - This only includes portions of the WACs where WAG members provided comments.

WAG members discussed questions and changes to WACs: 220-440-020, 220-440-170, and 220-440-180 below. The WAG had more extensive conversations on timelines and non-lethal expectations.

- **Timelines:** WAG members would like WDFW and producers to have similar timelines in processing and submitting claims. Ongoing funding for more staff to process claims would help increase timely responsiveness.
- **Expectations for non-lethal methods:** WAG discussions in the past evolved to determine range riding as the most useful non-lethal deterrent when cattle are grazing within large pastures or public land allotments. WAG members identified a need for clarity in the WACs on language and protocol on using the two most appropriate non-lethal tools and to be agreed upon by both ranchers and conflict specialists. WAG members discussed potential producer compensation based on following a checklist and how that relates to past WAG discussions on undergoing best situational actions. WAG members also discussed differences in compensation compared to non-lethal-control requirements.

**Note for tables below: text in column 2 is high level flip chart notes. The italicized words are additional meeting notes.*

WAC 220-440-020

WAC Language	WAG/WDFW Identification of Potential Changes for Further Discussion
"Damage claim assessment" means department approved methods to evaluate crop loss and value caused by deer or elk damage to commercial crops, livestock losses and value caused by bear, cougar, or wolves, or damages to other property.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage claim assessment “dept. approval methods” vs. the producers are doing the work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dep. Approval – <i>clarify process</i> ○ Options for methodology ○ Checklist is not a complete list
"Guard dog" means dogs trained for the purpose of protecting livestock from attack by wildlife or for herding livestock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Redefine “guard dog” to any dog. Change this to be consistent for all instances in the WACs.</i>
"Owner" means a person who has a legal right to commercial crops, livestock, or other private property that was damaged during a wildlife interaction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Owner”: <i>Clarify in instances of leasing</i> • No definition for commercial owner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Not clearly defined</i>

WAC 220-440-170

Payment for livestock damage and other domestic animals—Limitations.

WAC Language	WAG/WDFW Identification of Potential Changes for Further Discussion
<p>Commercial livestock owners who have worked with the department to prevent depredation but continue to experience losses, or who experience unforeseen losses, may be eligible to file a damage claim and receive cash compensation. Cash compensation will only be provided to livestock owners by the department when specifically appropriated by the legislature or other funding entity. Damages payable under this section are limited to the lost or diminished value of livestock caused by wild bears, cougars, or wolves and shall be paid only to the owner of the livestock, without assignment. Cash compensation for livestock losses from bears, cougars, and wolves shall not include damage to other real or personal property, including other vegetation or animals, consequential damages, or any other damages except veterinarian services may be eligible. However, livestock owners under written agreement with the department will be compensated consistent with their agreement which may extend beyond the limitations in this section. The department is authorized to pay the market value for the eligible livestock or guard dog lost or the market value of indirect livestock losses as a result of harassment by wolves, including reduced weight gains for livestock, and no more than ten thousand dollars to the livestock owner per claim. Claims for cash compensation will be denied when:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit on \$10,000 / claim? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Up to \$30K now but still not enough ○ WDFW checked that 30K is currently accurate for livestock • “Commercial livestock owner” is not right term • “Owner”: Clarify in instances of leasing (also in 220-440-170)
<p>(3) The owner fails to provide the department with an approved checklist of the preventative and nonlethal means that have been employed, or the owner failed to comply with the terms and conditions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Approved checklist” • Preventative checklist used in context of DPCA-L as part of contract • Not eligible unless submit checklist • Is there an unstated ranking of non-lethal means?

of his or her agreement(s) with the department;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Should Dep. Staff be helping more with check-list use?</i>
(7) The owner has not provided a completed written claim form and all other required information, or met required timelines prescribed within this chapter;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clarify written claim form</i>
(9) The owner or designee has salvaged or rendered the carcass or allowed it to be scavenged without an investigation completed under the direction of the department.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Allow “salvaged”</i> • <i>How often enforced?</i> • <i>Contention whether producers feel they must sit with animal until WDFW arrives on scene to prevent scavenging.</i> • <i>Compensation comes down to evidence which can be impacted by scavenging.</i>

WAC 220-440-180

Application for cash compensation for livestock damage or domestic animal—Procedure.

WAC Language	WAG/WDFW Identification of Potential Changes for Further Discussion
<p>Pursuant to this section, the department may distribute money specifically appropriated by the legislature or other funding entity to pay commercial livestock or guard dog losses caused by wild bear, cougar, or wolves in the amount of up to ten thousand dollars per claim unless, following an appeal, the department is ordered to pay more (see RCW 77.36.130(2)). The department will develop claim procedures and application forms consistent with this section for cash compensation of commercial livestock or guard dog losses. Partnerships with other public and private organizations to assist with completion of applications, assessment of losses, and to provide funding for compensation are encouraged.</p> <p>Filing a claim:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timelines – 30 days? • <i>Flagging similar to 220-440-170</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Checked on 10K claim limit (30K now) ○ <i>Commercial livestock is not right term</i>

<p>(1) Claimant must notify the department within twenty-four hours of discovery of livestock or other domestic animal attack or as soon as feasible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 hours is too short: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Wording and timelines are ambiguous. There is a lack of understanding of who to talk to when problems arise or who to report to when staff are off.</i> • Recognize as soon as feasible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>How to implement this?</i> • <i>Window of time important to ensure producer not disqualified if depredations are not caught right away, but recognizing degradation occurs on timeline</i>
<p>(3b) Federal officials may be responsible for the investigation when it is suspected that the attack was by a federally listed species.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified in MOUs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not equal WAC update ○ <i>Verify federal and WDFW discrepancies does not disqualify producers. Allowing federal investigations should provide a benefit</i> • <i>What does it look like for US FWS to step in for an investigation?</i>
<p>(4) To be eligible a claimant must submit a written statement, electronic or hard copy, within thirty days of discovery of a loss to indicate his or her intent to file a claim.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Clarify written claim form</i> • <i>Seems like extra documentation –why submit statement then claim</i> • <i>Flag to look at timelines (WDFW can look for earlier timeline versions (2015-16 WAG)</i> • <i>Consider point of reference/depredation discovery. What is a fair point for the “clock” to start</i>
<p>(5) A complete claim package must be submitted to the department within ninety days of the discovery of an attack on livestock or guard dogs to be eligible for compensation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flag timelines for discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Consider point of reference/depredation discovery. What is a fair point for the “clock” to start</i>
<p>(7a) Proof of legal ownership or contractual lease of claimed livestock.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Leases are not always written – flag this for discussion</i>
<p>(7e) Copies of applications for other sources of loss compensation and any payment or denial documentation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are there competing timelines? Discuss timelines</i>
<p>(9d) For losses caused by bear or cougar, livestock value will be determined by the market value for an animal of the same</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Why is this different for wolves?</i> • <i>Does this bring up inconsistencies?</i>

<p>breed, sex, and average weight at the time the animal is lost.</p>	
<p>(10) Claims for higher-than-normal livestock losses, reduced weight gains, or reduced pregnancy rates due to harassment of livestock caused by wolves must include: (a) At least three consecutive years of records preceding the year of the claim. Claims will be assessed for losses in excess of the preceding three-year running average;</p>	<p>10a –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check 3-year timeline: <i>Averaging of losses the past three years as a shifting baseline to compare to the current year losses presents compensation issues. The three-year requirement made sense when wolves were first reintroduced but not anymore.</i> • No timelines in WAC for WDFW <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Timeline on producers ○ Response & compensation review of application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Additional time for compensation after claim is approved</i>
<p>(13) If the claimant accepts the department's offer, the department will provide payment to the claimant within thirty days from receipt of the written acceptance document(s).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the timelines