

**Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)
to Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW)
Meeting Summary¹**

**November 15, 2021 8:30 AM – 4:30 PM MDT
Cheyenne Mountain Zoo, Colorado Springs, CO
4250 Cheyenne Mountain Zoo Rd, Colorado Springs, CO 80906**

Participants

SAG Voting members in attendance: Matt Barnes, Jenny Burbey, Bob Chastain, Renee Deal, Dan Gates (virtual, by Zoom), John Howard, Francie Jacober, Lenny Klinglesmith, Darlene Kobobel, Tom Kourlis, Brian Kurzel, Hallie Mahowald, Jonathan Proctor, Gary Skiba, Steve Whiteman

SAG voting members not present: Donald Broom, Adam Gall

SAG Ex Officio members in attendance: Colorado Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Executive Director Dan Gibbs, Colorado Department of Agriculture Division Director Les Owen, and Reid Dewalt (Assistant Director for Aquatics, Terrestrial and Natural Resources), for Parks and Wildlife Director Dan Prenzl

CPW Staff Present: Cory Chick (Southwest Region Manager); Lauren Truitt (Assistant Director for Information and Education); Katie Lanter (Policy and Planning Supervisor); Brian Dreher (Terrestrial Section Manager); Dave Klute (Species Conservation Unit Supervisor, virtual, by Zoom); Eric Odell (Species Conservation Program Manager); Travis Black (SE Deputy Regional Manager); Matt Thorpe (SW Deputy Regional Manager); Luke Hoffman (Game Damage Program Manager); Rebecca Ferrell (Branding and Communications Section Manager); Mike Quartuch (Human Dimensions Specialist/Researcher)

Keystone Policy Center (KPC) Staff Present: Julie Shapiro, Cally King Newman, Jonathan Tyrrell, Yesica Chavez

Technical Working Group (TWG) Members in Attendance: Martin Lowney (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service State Director)

Purpose/Objectives

The SAG met to discuss principles, outcomes, and elements of a livestock damage compensation program and to inform development of a draft, bulleted outline of a potential compensation plan.

Next steps

- The next meeting will be held December 14 and 15 in a joint meeting with the TWG in Denver at the CPW Hunter Education Building at 6060 Broadway.
- The January meeting will be potentially virtual due to updated State guidance and more information will soon follow.
- CPW will introduce a relevant issue paper updating regulations to allow hazing of gray wolves as an informational item at the November 2021 Parks and Wildlife Commission (PWC) meeting in Lamar. The SAG will discuss this issue paper during the December meeting.

¹ Summary prepared by Keystone Policy Center.

- Keystone Policy Center has released a report detailing findings from summer 2021 public engagement and will present the report during the November 2021 PWC meeting. The SAG is encouraged to view the PWC meeting and read the engagement report.
- Future meetings include continued discussion about livestock compensation plans, other livestock interactions, wolf management, and engagement, education, and outreach topics, and potentially funding.

Welcome

CPW Director Dan Prenzlöw, via recorded video message, welcomed the SAG to the Cheyenne Mountain Zoo for its sixth meeting and underscored that the objective for the meeting was to provide feedback on livestock interactions and on desired outcomes, principles and potential elements of a Colorado compensation program. Director Prenzlöw reminded the group that CPW is statutorily required to: 1) Assist livestock owners in preventing and resolving conflicts between gray wolves and livestock, and 2) Pay fair compensation to livestock owners for any losses of livestock by gray wolves, as verified pursuant to the claim procedures authorized by sections 33-3-107 to 33-3-110 and, to the extent they are available from moneys in the wildlife cash fund provided in section 33-3-107 (2.5). Recognizing that there are different values and perspectives on grazing and use of public lands, the Director emphasized the purpose is not to debate these topics but to focus on what is held in common to establish a successful program for both people and wolves. He emphasized the value of the SAG as an advisory group and emphasized the value of consensus. *(Note: it was further clarified in a subsequent breakout discussion that the Director, in the Director's intent letter presented at the June meeting, had also specifically described that the SAG is not tasked with considering changes to CPW game damage programs that currently exist, i.e., those for other species.)*

SAG member Bob Chastain also welcomed the group to the Zoo. Members and staff thanked the Zoo and its staff for hosting the meeting.

Informational Overview: Livestock compensation programs and components

Matt Thorpe (SW Deputy Regional Manager) and Luke Hoffman (Game Damage Program Manager) gave a presentation overview of the 2004 Colorado Wolf Working Group's recommendations on livestock damage compensation; relevant definitions of damage types; and current practices of and lessons from other states where wolves are present.

Luke noted the recommendations of the 2004 Wolf Working Group were to compensate for losses due to confirmed depredation at 100 percent of fair market value or purchase price (i.e., whichever is higher) and losses due to probable depredation at 50 percent of fair market value, in a manner that does not provide for abuse of the program. The 2004 group also recommended compensation be extended to guarding and herding animals, and that CPW could work with USDA Wildlife Services (APHIS-WS) to provide support for nonlethal management and proactive husbandry practices. The 2004 group also recommended the ability to lethally control wolves that cause problems.

Luke shared definitions, advantages, and challenges of ex-post and pay for presence compensation schemes. Ex post compensation strategies compensate for direct losses after damage has occurred based on fair market value. Notable advantages are that these programs are well established and understood and that losses are verified and documented. Notable challenges include the additional time and effort required to find and verify losses. Pay for presence compensation strategies compensate producers for presence of predators, in this case, wolves, on working lands. Luke noted programs that

adopt a hybrid approach between the two compensation schemes have been applied in states such as Arizona.

Definitions of elements of a compensation program included: confirmed losses, probable losses, fair market value, multipliers, and direct and indirect losses.

- Confirmed losses are investigated and verified by agency personnel, which can be state wildlife, federal (USDA), and/or local elected officials, depending on the state policy, on the basis of physical evidence, such as, but not limited to bite marks, tooth mark spacing, scat and track evidence. CPW requires a preponderance of evidence under its current program.
- Probable losses do not require the same standards of verifications as confirmed losses. Most states adapt the federal definition of probable losses to fit their state's programmatic needs and compensate at a rate of 50 percent fair market value.
- Fair market value is determined by type of livestock, age, and weight, among other factors, and is based on a program's own pricing schedule or other reputable pricing schedule.
- A multiplier/compensation ratio is a set number which is multiplied by the fair market value for the animal, which can be claimed after certain conditions are met, depending on a state's program.
- Whereas direct losses reflect the actual death of livestock, indirect losses are associated costs of exposure to predators, such as reduced conception rates and other future economic losses.

Luke summarized other states' compensation programs' funding sources, practices, and recommendations for Colorado. Other states receive a combination of state, federal, and/or private funding for compensation programs. States that employ a compensation multiplier compensate at a rate of up to 1.5 to 7 times fair market value for claimed missing livestock, after certain conditions have been met. Some states also employ pay for presence programs, which also require fulfillment of certain conditions, which vary by state. Recommendations to Colorado include compensation being based on most appropriate data and science available; that a verification process is well defined; that the program is reasonable and timely to address the needs of producers; and that the program is consistent with regulatory and statutory requirements. Other states also recommended that a sole agency be the administrator of a compensation program, to prevent confusion and pitfalls of decentralized administration structures.

TWG member Martin Lowney (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service State Director) spoke to his experience with game damage compensation programs. He noted his work with Colorado producers under CPW's current game damage program and reflected on differences between smaller producers that work on pastures and larger commercial producers that work on ranges. He suggested it was easier to find dead livestock in pastures than ranges due to land size and often, herd size, and that livestock type (cattle vs. sheep) can also be a consideration for missing livestock. He also noted, from his work with other states where wolves are present, the unfair distribution of predation between producers; he noted that neighbors can have differing depredation patterns even when both employing nonlethal conflict minimization tools.,

The SAG held a general question and answer session with Matt, Luke, and Martin. Discussions included the importance and role of pastures and rangelands as working lands and the differences in finding carcasses and using conflict minimization tools in both cases, often due to size of landscape and vegetation present. One member suggested use of technology such as drones to facilitate ease of finding kills on rangeland while others suggested that such technology would be challenging to use due to the need to have drones within eyesight while flying them. Some members suggested creating separate frameworks for different landscape types. Members also discussed the opportunity to think within and

beyond current statute and regulation and the workflow through the Colorado Attorney General's office following recommendations from the group. Members also discussed the preponderance of evidence standard for verification of loss and other requirements to claim compensation, such as duty to mitigate, which is often loosely interpreted for livestock operations. Members also asked for further detail for administration of compensation programs in other states, which were noted to be most often state wildlife agencies, state departments of agriculture, or third-party livestock loss boards, in some cases. One member also asked to further explain matching funds, which were noted to be required under federal grant programs, through direct or in-kind matches. One member also asked about the change of other states' programs over time, such as attempts to change policy. Another member asked to clarify the set rate of fair market value, which was noted to be based on USDA Marketing Service reports for a set month before the date of loss.

SAG Discussion on Compensation Plan

Principles and outcomes

The SAG split into small breakout groups of four to five members to discuss desired principles and outcomes of a wolf livestock damage compensation program. Members returned to plenary to share out from small group discussion, with outcomes synthesized as follows:

Draft desired outcomes of a program include:

- Livestock owners are not financially harmed
- Wolves are restored
- Conflicts are minimized
- Trust and support/buy-in are built across communities

Draft principles for a compensation plan include:

- Build trust (and 'good will') with the agricultural community through the process and plan
- Be consistent, equitable, fair and robust
- Value both fair compensation and personal responsibility
- Be simple and straightforward to participate in and administer
- Provide opportunity for choice and options
- Recognize different kinds of grazing contexts
- Promote conflict minimization
- Support with sustainable funding that provides adequate capacity to implement compensation, conflict minimization and education, ideally supported by a diversity of funding sources
- Use State-Federal partnerships for implementation and funding

The initial breakouts also surfaced potential principles regarding specific elements of a compensation plan, such as the following: Confirmed direct losses should be covered; evidence of wolf activity should be required for compensation of unconfirmed losses; there should be opportunity for innovative compensation for indirect losses. Discussion of such elements continued in subsequent breakouts (summarized below).

Further plenary discussion included the following: One member cautioned against creating separate compensation frameworks for different grazing operations, while others noted a high degree of variability between operations may not lend to a one-size-fits-all approach. Members discussed the goodwill principle in the context of improving upon the current compensation program, with some

noting the current program functions to compensate but not to improve social tolerance. Some suggested that use of the term “goodwill” could set up an expectation of producers feeling owed, or conversely could result in a program that emphasizes goodwill upfront but does not establish compensation as an obligation into the future. One member suggested outfitters should be explicitly discussed in compensation. Others suggested a program that tied compensation to conflict prevention requirements may not appropriately incentivize use of conflict minimization tools, but instead create a “check-the-box” attitude toward conflict minimization techniques.

The SAG split into two groups to discuss confirmed and probable losses, missing livestock, indirect losses, multipliers/compensation ratios, and pay for presence. Details and emergent themes of discussions are presented below.

Confirmed losses

Takeaways:

- No official votes were taken, however discussion in each breakout reflected general agreement to compensate producers for confirmed losses at 100 percent fair market value.
- There was also openness to explore potential for additional amounts (i.e., multipliers and/or in-kind or funding support for conflict minimization) for confirmed losses to account for missing livestock and/or indirect losses, however more discussion is needed on the specifics of this as well as discussion of other elements of the program.
- There was general discussion of the need to do more than the current compensation program in order to make the overall wolf restoration and management effective and to have more successful social outcomes than in other states. Doing ‘more’ reflects not only compensation, but could include support for the presence of wolves and for conflict minimization as well as for education and outreach to communicate and implement the program.

SAG members noted that fair market value is a relatively straightforward concept and consistent with the current plan, however noted that sales receipts should be honored as with the current program. There was discussion of how the weight of livestock and fair market value is determined.

SAG members discussed the importance of a trust environment among producers and investigators and trust in the verification process. Members suggested trust is important to maintain in compensation verification, depends on who investigates, and is tied to elements of a compensation plan other than confirmed losses. SAG members discussed the current big game damage compensation program, including factors such as the preponderance of evidence standard, the burden of proof and the role of CPW or Wildlife Services (APHIS-WS) agents in investigating and verifying losses. Some members suggested it is important to make burden of proof more accessible than currently to verify loss for compensation. Members asked CPW staff to clarify the preponderance of evidence standard to verify compensation and discussed how this definition may also be modified to incorporate probable losses.

Members noted the difficulty of verification in some conditions, especially on large ranges where scavengers are present, and noted that the current program provides 10 days to report a loss. Some members suggested goodwill among producers could be built with a more liberal burden of proof, while others suggested modifications to standards may decrease public trust in the program. Members suggested strength of criteria may also depend on and build existing and future trust between producers and agency as well as agency personnel. To this end, some suggested CPW and APHIS-WS should work together to investigate and confirm losses. Some members expressed distrust in APHIS-WS agents’

training, while others supported the current work APHIS-WS does in the state, especially the northwest region. Members expressed concern for CPW's capacity in staffing and funding. Some members suggested confirmed losses should only be able to be verified by game wardens while others expressed concern that producers should not have to bear the costs of should there be insufficient staffing for confirming losses.

Probable losses

Takeaways:

- No official votes were taken, however discussion in each breakout reflected general agreement to compensate producers for probable losses at least 50 percent of fair market value; pending clarification of and consideration of specific definitions and criteria for probable loss.

It was noted that the 2004 recommendations supported 50% compensation for probable loss. The definition, criteria and decision tree for determining probable loss were a point of discussion and confusion, with some SAG members asking for more information from CPW about how probable loss would be determined and how a missing but probable loss to wolves would be distinguished from missing livestock without evidence to support probable loss. Some suggested that something less than a complete preponderance of evidence standard would be appropriate to compensate for probable losses, while others suggested concern if conditions to verify probable losses were less than a certain threshold, e.g., scat and tracks only.

Ultimately for some members, this decision tree and criteria would be important to determining whether probable losses should be compensated at more than 50%. There was also discussion of whether and how livestock producers could be trained to document a probable wolf kill if CPW or another authorized investigator (i.e., USDA APHIS/WS, as applicable) is unable to confirm it. It was noted that CPW can use a negotiated settlement process for livestock loss and this might be used to address probable loss; this requires a high trust environment for success.

Some SAG members also expressed concern with inconsistencies for compensation for probable losses due to wolves but not bear or lion and advocated for consistent approaches among predators. Other members suggested the other factors, such as listing status, social perception, and existing tensions make wolves an exceptional case.

Members discussed theoretical economic considerations for probable losses, with members generally agreeing that the overall economic consequences of probable losses were relatively minor due to frequency of probable depredation, and the group suggested compensation for probable was a more of a social issue than an economic one. Some members suggested it is socially valuable to compensate for probable losses to build greater goodwill with affected producers and suggested that compensation in amounts at least 50 percent of fair market value would be economically adequate and socially valuable. Other members expressed willingness to compensate for probable losses at up to 100 percent of fair market value, whether directly, based on the degree of probable likelihood of wolf depredation, or through in-kind values, such as conflict minimization tools.

Some members were also willing to compensate for confirmed and probable losses at greater than 100 percent with in-kind funds for conflict minimization materials. One member suggested this strategy may lend to greater potential for donations to this fund.

Missing livestock

Takeaways:

- SAG members indicated openness to further discussion of the possibility of compensation for missing losses, particularly for open range, however they have a variety of questions on the details of how this would be determined and compensated and how this relates to other aspects of the compensation and conflict minimization program. Seeing the whole 'package' will be important to determining what elements are supported beyond confirmed and probable loss.

Discussion of missing losses included how to distinguish missing losses from probable losses, considerations of how topography and operation size affects ability to find missing livestock, and the timelines for claims. Multipliers were discussed (see below) as a compensation mechanism for missing livestock, and in tying compensation to confirmed kills. Alternatively, program criteria for missing livestock could include criteria such as known wolf presence, the absence of attractants, ruling out other predators or causes, etc.

Members discussed their knowledge of trends of increased frequency of missing livestock in the Northern Rocky Mountain region, with some suggesting missing livestock increased from normal levels of two to three percent to ten percent and expressed their concern about this degree of loss for producers' economic viability. Others suggested that this finding was not consistent throughout the region. Members nonetheless expressed concern of significant economic losses if a large number of a herd was missing during the end of the season. In most cases counts are unknown until roundup time; summer losses are an important consideration.

There was discussion of what baseline information would be needed to understand historic losses and missing livestock; a 'death rate' approach was suggested by one member. Some members suggested permitting records, sales contracts, multiple-year running averages, range riders, and technology such as drones could be used to account for missing livestock, although others suggested regulatory issues with use of drones on public lands. Members expressed concerns over accounting for operation and grazing land size, as well as vulnerability of certain age classes of livestock, such as calves.

Others expressed concern about disincentivizing conflict minimization strategies if compensating for missing livestock and suggested the use of conflict minimization tools should be required or otherwise linked to compensation for missing livestock. Members also discussed concerns about compensation for missing livestock at all, with some members suggesting the number of missing livestock would initially be small in proportion to the number of wolves released during the first few years of the program and/or that compensation for missing livestock without verification would erode public trust in the compensation program. Other members suggested that the agency should lead with trust/faith in producers' honesty when claiming missing livestock. It was also suggested that public concerns about fraud are not generally substantiated and at odds with producers' principles of self-determination and self-sufficiency. It was further suggested that the burden of the verification process is high as compared to expected financial benefits of compensation.

Indirect losses

Takeaways:

- SAG members noted that good will could be built by acknowledging and trying to creatively address indirect losses. While skeptical of the ability to provide a consistent, objective

framework to measure and compensate, they were open to further discussing how a variety of options might be available to enable individual, impacted producers to innovate around documenting indirect losses as well as to considering how indirect losses might be addressed through multipliers, pay for presence, or other programs.

Members generally acknowledged that while indirect losses occur, they are difficult to objectively document, quantify and thus compensate. Some members spoke to the indirect costs not only of effects associated with exposure to wolves, but also to the cost of conflict minimization tools' effects on livestock such as their weight. Members suggested that indirect losses may be due to change in other confounding factors and scientific evidence for indirect losses due to wolves is weak; they encouraged that there needs to be evidence to claim indirect losses. Others noted that wolf presence in some areas with greater losses could be indicative of their effects on livestock, and that trust should be a factor considered in compensation for indirect losses. Additionally, members suggested that insurance programs may also be used to compensate for indirect losses, although another member suggested little buy-in to current insurance programs because of onerous burden of proof standards. Others encouraged that producers that are impacted should have the opportunity to try to innovate around quantification of indirect losses, working with CPW to document impacts.

Some SAG members encouraged tying indirect loss compensation to conflict minimization practices. Some also suggested there should be a discussion of potential positive indirect impacts of wolves for livestock. Some suggested that outfitters should also be considered when developing an indirect loss program.

Multiplier/compensation ratios

Takeaways:

- More discussion is needed on the details of how and when multipliers would apply for missing livestock and/or indirect losses, and how this relates to the overall compensation program.

Discussion of multipliers was linked to discussion of missing livestock and indirect losses (above).

Some members of the group suggested multipliers would foster trust and goodwill in the ranching community, while others expressed that use of multipliers may decrease general public trust. One member expressed concern that wolf predation, while unlikely to affect many producers, may have significant and potentially devastating economic effects on some producers. Another suggested many producers and landowners operate with small profit margins and the potential to claim a multiplier may help to avoid loss of business, especially for those who might disproportionately experience increased depredations after wolves are reintroduced.

One member suggested multipliers may help offset losses that were unable to be mitigated due to inability to deploy conflict minimization tools. On the other hand, opponents of multipliers expressed concern that their implementation might disincentivize use of conflict minimization techniques, and even if qualifications to claim a multiplier required use of conflict minimization tools, that may lead to a check-the-box attitude toward use of those tools.

One member suggested valuing missing livestock with a multiplier at a greater rate than probable depredations did not make sense from an economic perspective. Members suggested other states with compensation plans that included multipliers did not have significant public trust and were largely politically motivated. Suggestions for qualifying conditions to claim a multiplier included documented

depredations in multiple years, as a tiered structure following conflict minimization and other forms of loss, or after depredating wolves were documented to be present. One member suggested a tiered funding structure for multipliers, probable losses, and direct losses, to allow producers the opportunity to choose which compensation element they would buy into.

Pay for presence and related concepts

Takeaways:

- Further discussion is needed to understand how pay for presence or other programs might be designed and implemented to address indirect losses, to promote conflict minimization techniques, and to support wolves, livestock and people on the landscape.

Pay for presence of wolves and/or habitat programs were encouraged as an alternative to attempting to quantify indirect losses. SAG members discussed that pay for presence programs are not mutually exclusive with damage compensation. It was noted that monitoring for wolf presence is one consideration and that while collars will be deployed initially, camera traps and other technology would be needed over time.

The Arizona pay for presence program has a point system considering core area, wolf territory, pups, conflict minimization techniques, livestock presence, and number of wolves; the fixed amount of funding is proportionately assigned based on points. SAG members discussed that irrespective of the points system and complex calculations, these factors could provide a basis for understanding criteria for pay for presence.

Use of risk reduction/conflict minimization tools was seen as important and members emphasized that education and outreach on these techniques should be part of a pay for presence program. It was also suggested that pay for presence may not need to be limited to livestock producers but could apply to other landowners, similar to a habitat lease or conservation agreement.

SAG members also suggested that there are benefits to wolf presence and this should be factored into these programs. Some members suggested extra income from increased tourism opportunities might help offset indirect losses while other members called into question tourism potential. There was also comment on the temporal aspects of a compensation plan and a question as to whether the plan would be different when wolves are no longer endangered.

Next Steps & Action Items

Julie Shapiro reviewed next steps (summarized above). One SAG member noted the desire to further discuss the issue paper on hazing regulations being presented to the PWC and suggested advance notice to the SAG on such issues to be better aware of such issues. Following discussion of future topics of discussion, one member suggested funding be a point of focus for an upcoming meeting, to allow the SAG members to mobilize their networks to support funding strategies, if needed.

Public Comment

Public comment was held in two sessions; one prior to lunch and one prior to the Next Steps & Action Items discussion. All public comments are summarized here.

Rhonda Dern (CO resident) suggested that depredation numbers are low according to statistics, suggested compensation should not be provided for livestock depredation on public lands and that CPW has the funds to compensate for depredations. She also suggested livestock owners received too much

compensation for conservation easements. She noted her opposition of hunting of wolves and suggested she did not like the composition of the SAG.

Mark Holmes (Pueblo Co., resident) spoke from the perspective of CPW volunteers and the amount of time and effort they put in to caring for state parks and wildlife as well. He also expressed concern that the cost of public lands grazing and the livestock industry in Colorado is greater than the benefit it presents to Colorado.

Michael Wenzz (Pueblo Co., resident) noted CPW asked residents to remove attractants to avoid bear and wildlife conflicts and that the same should be extended of producers in removing carcasses. He suggested the SAG review information from the Blackfoot challenge, a cost-share program that encouraged carcass removal in the Northern Rocky Mountain region, and that a similar guide could be developed for Colorado producers. He also suggested research into a cost-share program for livestock operators and snow leopard protections in Southeast Asia, lessons from which could be applied to Colorado.

Tom Zieber (Gunnison Co., resident) reflected on a previous comment he made that compensation was a failed policy that did not satisfy livestock producers or wolf advocates, and instead functioned as a backstop. He suggested focus should instead be placed on nonlethal conflict minimization tools. He also stated he did not believe lethal take of wolves promoted goodwill and suggested wolves present a greater economic benefit than detriment, referencing studies on reduced vehicular collisions where wolves were present.

Kelly Murphy (Colorado Wolf and Wildlife Center) spoke against the notion of removing public comment from SAG meetings, suggesting it would discredit the public's role as stakeholders in this process. She suggested ranchers can thrive without use of lethal control and instead can use nonlethal conflict minimization tools, such as learned from other producers through programs such as Working Circle. She suggested producers be open to solutions that can work for everyone.

Shane Brown (El Paso Co., resident) noted he was a professional landscape architect in Colorado Springs, and thought Colorado has a unique opportunity to allow humans and nature to coexist successfully. He suggested wolves can increase tourism and that lethal management could increase depredation. He suggested outside-the-box thinking to embrace wolves and reduce livestock depredation.

Jacqueline Russell (CO resident) noted her experience as a former assistant attorney general focused on agriculture and natural resource issues. She suggested use of lethal management would not foster good will and should be a reason to disqualify a producer from compensation. She advocated for use of nonlethal conflict minimization tools. She suggested the SAG is not demographically representative of Colorado and that its membership should be reconsidered to amend this.

John Hinton (Douglas Co., resident) suggested mining lands in the state could play a role if taken into consideration for wolf restoration and management. He noted his support of compensation for ranchers and strong favor for nonlethal conflict minimization tools.

Lorianne Willingham (Colorado Wolf and Wildlife Center) expressed her support for wolf reintroduction. She suggested use of wolves' fear of humans to producers' advantage. She suggested more effort should be placed on coexistence and compensation and advocated against lethal management of wolves.

Erika Moore (El Paso Co., resident) expressed her disagreement with comments to eliminate the public comment section. She expressed support for adaptation to be included in the plan, for trainings in conflict prevention techniques to be made available to producers, and that outfitters could add wolf

viewing trips to cash in on wolf tourism. She suggested funding seems to be a central concern to having a compensation program.

Claire Ryan (Colorado State University, student) discussed pay for presence, agreeing that building goodwill is important, but that a compensation program alone was not enough to calm tensions. She suggested predation is unfairly distributed across producers, who have a responsibility for wolf issues. She suggested implementation of a pay for presence program based on the number of wolves on land and livestock exposed to increase tolerance of wolves. She suggested Colorado is in a position to adapt and build upon systems from Idaho, Montana, and Arizona. She suggested building social tolerance in producers would make it easier to implement wolf management actions post-reintroduction.

Ethan Ray (Pikes Peak Community College, student) commented about the Wood River wolf project, an Idaho-based study that involved farmers, ranchers, and scientists and reduced depredation by 90 percent. He suggested the importance of coexistence with wolves and animals was a value shared by all present.

Debra Taylor (Denver and Teller Co., resident) told a story about her grandfather, a South Dakotan rancher. She suggested poachers and climate were more significant drivers of depredation than wolves. She suggested the importance of a robust compensation and conflict minimization program, and that many Colorado residents were not aware of the State's current game damage program. She suggested probable and indirect losses may be sooner caused by climate change than wolves. She hoped compensation would be liberal for verified wolf kills.

Lindsay Grigg (CO resident) stressed her opposition to lethal management, referencing recent management actions taken by Idaho and Montana to hunt wolves in large numbers. She suggested wolves will stabilize to carrying capacity through self-regulation as they have done in the Yellowstone ecosystem. She expressed opposition to wolves being listed as a big game species.

Karin Mahuna (El Paso Co, resident) noted the public was present to advocate for the opportunity to make wolf recovery and reintroduction successful, for wolves and Coloradoans. She suggested the SAG needs to have a discussion about ethics and values and to consider the intrinsic values of wolves. She suggested goodwill should go both ways and should be applied to wolves as well. She expressed support for 100 percent compensation for verified kills and skepticism for compensating for probable kills. She promoted partnership with researchers to study this effort and expressed concern that bears and lions, and not just wolves, could be the source of probable loss.

David Hand (El Paso Co., resident) suggested wolf depredation in the Northern Rocky Mountain region is rare compared to other livestock losses. He suggested pressure to falsify reports of depredation have occurred and expressed support for verification before compensation. He noted support for the SAG to review the Wood River wolf project.