

**Livestock Loss Board Members Present:**

Doreen Gillespie – Chairperson  
Elaine Allestad  
Dave McEwen  
Joe Kipp

**Staff:** George Edwards – Executive Director  
Brian Simonson – DoL Centralized Services Administrator

**Guests:** Butch Gillespie  
Lenore McEwen  
Dalin Tidwell via telephone  
Clayton Gernaat  
Mike Hofer  
Tom Wipf  
Mark Daniels  
Trina Bradley

**Call to Order and Administrative Items**

**Introductions**

- Each board member and board staff introduced themselves.

**Board Minutes**

Board members reviewed the July 2, 2021 minutes.

**Motion:** Joe Kipp made a motion to approve the minutes. Elaine Allestad seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

## Reports

### George Edwards, LLB Executive Director

This is the time of the year when most claims come in. So far, we are at 217 head for \$189,000 which will match or exceed our prior record year in 2019 where we had paid over \$260,000. Mr. Edwards said in lieu of what was reported by Wildlife Services, the 2021 totals will be really close to the board's annual \$300,000 appropriation. It's only been a very short time since the legislature increased the appropriation from \$200,000 to \$300,000. He said the board may want to seek an additional increase from the legislature especially if wolves are relisted. 2009 total head counts were similar to current losses but went down dramatically once wolf hunting and trapping began. He stated he has a grave concern about the board's ability to pay all claims if wolves are relisted.

Mr. Edwards included copies of the federal grant awards in the board's book. The first sheet in the book is for \$30,000 to be used for wolf only compensation. The second sheet for \$75,000 which is for only wolf loss prevention grants. Currently no federal money has been made available for grizzly caused loss or prevention. Federal grants keep being pushed back further and further. Current federal funding can be used in 2022. Once the board has ironed out a new grant process, it may end up being a two-stage process. Federal grant money requires a 50 percent cost share, but the board may set a lower amount for state funded grants.

Mr. Edwards said he failed to put the current budget sheet in the board book but had emailed it to the board members. Nothing stands out on the financial report. Ms. Allestad brought a copy of the financial report which was passed to each board member. Expenses are \$396 dollars higher due to a pay raise authorized by the legislature compared to 2020. A big reason the board is always behind under personnel services is due to a mandated vacancy savings being applied each year. Mr. Edwards must be careful with board operation expenses to make up for this shortfall. The board remains in good shape financially. The other aspects of the board's budget are the annual \$300,000 for compensation and \$100,000 for loss prevention grants. Mr. Edwards asked Brian Simonson to look at the sheet to see if anything jumps out at him. Mr. Simonson reiterated that the five percent vacancy savings comes out each month from Mr. Edwards payroll and benefits so that number will continue to grow. That happened last year and the year before, it happens every year. Board members felt it is unfair to apply vacancy savings to an agency with one person. They said maybe they should visit with the governor or lieutenant governor. Ms. Gillespie said a meeting with them needs to be setup because it seems ridiculous to have the budget reduced for one person which in turn always hurts the board's annual budget. It's the principal of the thing as it throws us behind every year. That is the reason we wanted to pass legislation last session to separate our employee from the Department of Livestock. Mr. Simonson said he is under the understanding that even if the legislation had passed it wouldn't have removed the vacancy savings

requirement. Mr. Edwards went on to the topic of loss claims. They are coming in at a rate of at least two to seven claims each twice a week. All claims are being processed within days of their receipt. Payments are being sent out in a timely manner.

### **Dalin Tidwell, USDA Wildlife Services State Director**

Mr. Tidwell provided numbers of investigations performed to date in 2021. There were a total of 175 grizzly bear investigations with 146 confirmed and 45 probable, 102 wolf investigations with 96 confirmed and 19 probable, 50 mountain lion investigations with 133 confirmed and 51 probable, 26 black bear investigations with 36 confirmed and one probable. 2021 has been a record year for investigations. In 2020 there were 148, 2019 there were 157 and in 2018 there were 138. This year the Red Lodge area calmed down due to the removal of a problem grizzly bear. Mr. McEwen asked for a comparison on black bears. Mr. Tidwell said they had 41 investigations in 2019 and 19 investigations in 2018.

Mr. McEwen asked if there was a mandate for electric fencing. Mr. Tidwell was not aware of any, but they are easy to defend. Ms. Allestad asked about the possible classification. Mr. Tidwell said something has eaten the animal but there is not enough left to determine the cause of death. He also said the other classification on investigation reports are for cases where there is not a mark on the animal, or they also put coyote loss in this category. He said during wolf hunting and trapping seasons, investigations have leveled off.

Mr. Kipp asked about Department of Interior funding for Wildlife Services work. Mr. Tidwell said the money has come in. Mr. Kipp asked that they continue to push to keep this funding in place.

### **Old Business**

#### **Grant Process and Form**

Ms. Gillespie began the discussion asking Ms. Allestad for her suggestions. Ms. Allestad had sent emails to Ms. Quisno but had not heard back. She had also corresponded with Mr. Edwards on grant form suggestions. He incorporated them into a sample form for this discussion. The first point was to limit grant requests to ten or twenty percent of the total value of the livestock being covered. Mr. Edwards said many years ago an applicant had requested a grant that exceeded the total value of the herd being covered. This grant request was denied. Mr. McEwen stated he was a little distraught about the ability to take ten percent for administrative costs. He requested that the ten percent cannot be used for matching funding. Ms. Allestad supported this but wanted to make sure it isn't discriminatory. Mr. Edwards said it would have to be applied to everyone. Trina Bradley said it would not be beneficial to her. She said she provided many volunteer hours that would be administrative, and it benefits everyone working with her on a grant. She works for a group of ranchers and is doing it for free, but

her time does have a value. She added a large part of the cost share is her time. It is actual labor working to put a project together. Some nonprofit groups are already paying staff as part of their normal job.

Mr. McEwen said there are some groups taking money out to pay for their own groups wages and that is going to come to an end because that's not the where the money is intended to be used. Ms. Allestad said there may be a different way to word it. Ms. Bradley asked what happens if a group applies then gives money to someone else, but they take the credit for a project. Ms. Allestad said we have to be very careful how we approach this because we don't want to be discriminatory. It's publicly known that we would like the money to go to more individual producers, whether they're a group you're putting together or it's Woolgrowers, or Stockgrowers or, another group. They could put together a group of ranchers. Mr. McEwen said putting down labor for a project is not administrative fees. Mr. Edwards added for example somebody putting in fence posts and installing a fence is labor and would not be administrative. It would be an in-kind value for actual work on the ground for a project. Ms. Bradley questioned manual labor vs time spent organizing and preparing a grant. She said I don't get paid to do what I am doing. She then asked if this is a legislative thing and asked if the board writes the rules. Mr. Edwards said it is the board who write the rules and administer board grants.

Mr. Edwards said Mr. McEwen is looking at just eliminating administration fees. Ms. Allestad said we could try that. Mr. McEwen said he is not trying to eliminate anyone's manual labor. The administrative part is subject to payroll tax, withholding tax and those sorts of things. Ms. Allestad said it could be identified as something not ordinarily done by their organization it wouldn't qualify but some organizations have people that only do administrative functions. If this is the case, it wouldn't qualify. Mr. McEwen said we could say it does not include personnel labor time. We could put it both ways and then decide who might be attempting to scam the system. Mr. Simonson said if you somehow made an exception for voluntary versus salaried administrative cost. Ms. Allestad said if it's volunteered and but included in the grant application, then it becomes paid for. Ms. Gillespie said she would like to see it the way Mr. McEwen stated. Mr. McEwen said we must be very discretionary. The money needs to be used on the ground to help the ranchers, it's not to fund an organization. Ms. Gillespie said she totally agrees. Ms. Allestad said we could just eliminate the last paragraph. We could just say in-kind does not include administrative costs. In kind can include rent of horse trailers for range riders or equipment to put in a fence. Ms. Gillespie said we will take the last paragraph out and leave the rest in. Mr. Edwards said that was just the suggestion of hours multiplied by \$20 dollars when he and Ms. Allestad were working on form ideas. He said for federal grants they made him use 2014 figures at \$17 dollars an hour. Ms. Allestad said I think we can add that for an in-kind match estimate. The number of hours for the project and enter here. Put in parentheses does not include administrative fees.

Ms. Gillespie said that sounds perfect. We should just rewrite this this way.

Mr. Edwards said he will make the form so it can be filled out online or by paper with it being a checklist style form. Mr. Edwards said it is easy to look up livestock numbers under the per-capita system, but tribal members do not pay per-capita fees. Mr. Edwards asked Mr. Kipp if there is an easy way to lookup the number of livestock owned by a tribal member. Mr. Kipp said it may vary by reservation. Because this type of verification is not possible, there are three different ways to obtain livestock numbers. The owner could provide a copy of their BIA livestock account in the past three years. They could provide a copy of their mortgage or a veterinarian slip for bred cows. Mr. McEwen said this would allow for a third-party verification.

**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made a motion to approve the proposed grant form with amendments. Strike the last paragraph on the first page, add language that in-kind match does not include administrative costs and language about the percentage of livestock. Add language about third party verification of livestock numbers for ranchers on a reservation. Joe Kipp seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Mr. Edwards asked if the board is using the \$20 dollar figure. Ms. Gillespie and Mr. McEwen said yes. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. McEwen said a good source to find out what is working for loss prevention is USDA Wildlife Services. He would like to hear regarding wolves, what non-lethal actions are being taken and what is working. He wants to hear from the rancher's suffering loss and what is working for them. We need to put the money towards what is working. He wants a list compiled of what is really working verse what is claimed to work. Mr. Edwards said over 90% of the ranchers don't check the box on the claim form asking if they are using prevention. Asking those who have submitted claims would not be productive. Mr. McEwen said guard dogs have not worked well for Helle's. Wolves just kill the dogs. Mr. Edwards said each year the board pays for guard dogs killed by wolves. Mr. McEwen said we need to get some ideas of what is working from verifiable people. Ms. Allestad said she would like the board to focus in on hot problem areas rather than just wherever. Mr. Edwards said the board has used high predation as the number one priority in the past grant reviews. Mr. McEwen said it doesn't do me any good to put up an electric fence if we don't know when bears will show up. It would be much easier to manage them if we knew they were going to be there every day. It isn't worth putting out the money for the one or two time a year encounter. Mr. Edwards said it may be cheaper to pay claims over the cost of the project. Mr. McEwen agreed. He said I think we can get with USDA and FWP to help identify active areas and give those grants a little more priority. Mr. Kipp said Dymond Running Crane or Jeff Horn with the tribe would be the one to ask for tribal lands. Dymond would be the best one to talk to. Ms. Bradley suggested looking at claims for hot spots. Mr. Edwards said Glacier County is a hot spot, but Powell County is also right up there. Mr. McEwen said another question to ask is if the project is on federal or private land because there isn't allot of prevention that we can do on the federal ground. It would be nice for us to know if it's a permanent fixture and it's going on federal land. We got to think about that a little bit. Ms.

Allestad said it should be added to the form. Mr. Kipp said on tribal land, it is designated as agricultural. If it's on tribal, is it designated as agricultural land. It's considered private property.

**Motion:** Dave McEwen made a motion to add asking if a project is on private, state or federal lands. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. Edwards asked when would the board like to put a deadline for grant applications. Ms. Allestad asked if it would be electronically be submitted so the board can look at them. Mr. Edwards said he would scan them in and send them out to the board. Mr. McEwen said the grants should be let by the first of March. Several board members said January 31<sup>st</sup> will be the end date for this cycle.

**Motion:** Dave McEwen made a motion set January 31<sup>st</sup> as the cutoff date for grant submissions. Elaine Allestad seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. Edwards asked the board; do you want to fund projects that have already occurred since July 1<sup>st</sup> where when we got the grizzly money for this grant cycle? He has been telling people to keep receipts as he didn't know when the board would set a start date. Mr. McEwen said so you want to accept projects that started after July 1<sup>st</sup> up until the present. He said yes but he doesn't know of another grant process that allows this. Board member said this would be ok. Mr. Kipp asked when the last time grant money was available. Mr. Edwards said there was no money available prior to July 1<sup>st</sup> as the feds did not award any money for the prior year. Mr. Edwards said the federal money has a mandatory 50% cost share. He said the board can set a different cost share for state money. Currently the board has about \$160,000 in state funding for grants. A lower percentage for state funded grants may entice more ranchers to apply. Mr. McEwen said 30%.

**Motion:** Dave McEwen made a motion set the cost share at 30% for state funded grants. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. Kipp asked what percentage of livestock owned will the board accept for a cost share. An average five-acre electric fence USDA built would cost the producer five grand. That includes the charger and everything else. Mr. McEwen asked how many cows you can calve on five acres. Mr. Kipp said maybe 100 heifers, but it would be tight. Mr. Edwards said a colony has put up seven to eight miles of fence for their sheep herd. You need to look at it not only in the terms of your calving pasture but even a larger project and the percentage of animals that are covered. It goes back to what Ms. Allestad, and I had happen at a prior meeting where the guy asked for more money than his entire herd would cost to replace. He said he could use values he provides to Wildlife Services each year. We could use those values towards a percentage. Mr. McEwen said the average

cow herd size in the United States of America is 25 head. So, if you took 25 head at \$1,400 dollars is about \$35,000 dollars. You wouldn't give a grant for 50% of that net worth. Now give me a figure what would be fair enough to get something meaningful done. Mr. Kipp said in his area the average herd size is 100 cows. He said we give them a ten percent grant match of the livestock value. Ms. Allestad said we should use the value provided to Wild Services. Mr. McEwen asked Mr. Kipp if he felt that ten percent would be a meaningful number. Mr. Kipp responded yes, it would be strategic protection. Ms. Gillespie and Ms. Allestad said the ten percent will work. Ms. Allestad said we will treat all livestock the same, so a cow is a cow even if it was registered. Mr. Edwards said he will put the ten percent of total value on the new grant form.

## **New Business**

### **Legislation - Red Tape Review**

Mr. Edwards said there are four factors to look at for red tape review mandated by the governor's office. The board needs to look at current laws to see if they are excessive, outdated, unnecessary or burdensome. The board is asked to look at laws to see if they disproportionately impact small businesses and does it have a significant stakeholder concern.

Mr. Edwards said the first law is 2-15-3110, board membership doesn't meet the criteria for review. He noted the law says grants for wolves and grizzly bears take priority over mountain lions. He then asked the board to identify anything they want for a legislative change. Ms. Allestad, Ms. Gillespie and Mr. Kipp said they would like more time to think about potential changes. Mr. McEwen said per the meeting earlier this month with Lieutenant Governor Juras, a policy statement or law change is needed regarding confidentiality of names of claimants and remove the monthly reporting to the Board of Livestock per her suggestion. We need to vote on that today. He also said confidentiality includes all paperwork submitted to the board on claims. We are already complying with the federal law on investigation reports in order to work with Wildlife Services.

**Motion:** Dave McEwen made a motion to have a statement in place on confidentiality and removing monthly reports to the Board of Livestock. Mr. Edwards interjected that the monthly reports is in current law so the board does not have a choice on this. It's in law 2-15-3113. Mr. McEwen change the motion to only be on confidentiality of names as part of claims information. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. Edwards asked the board to provide him with any law changes they identify needing a change. Ms. Gillespie told the board to have them to Mr. Edwards by December 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Gillespie said we will now move on to the multiplier. Mr. Edwards said Ms. Juras suggested that the board should begin the process for a multiplier even though there is no money to pay one now. He needs ideas to go to a department attorney to begin the rule making process. Mr. Edwards began the discussion by providing elk hunting district maps for discussion as a possibility to establish regions. He said different regions could have different amounts for a multiplier. He followed up by asking how large a region should be. Mr. McEwen said it's somewhat like Wyoming where there is a different multiplier depending on location and that is why the law was written that way. Ms. Allestad said they used some scientific information, but we are not at this point. She acknowledged that the Wyoming multiplier is not working out. She said she believes in the multiplier, but it needs to be done on a case by case basis. Mr. Edwards read the new law to the board. He said a lot of people will show up for a rules hearing. Mr. Kipp said he did a survey with Wildlife Services Specialist Mike Hoggan. They looked at areas with very little cover, some riparian areas and the foothills. They asked for brand tallies. Those on the east side of the reservation were one and a half percent short coming out of the area. The ones in the middle were three to four percent short. The west was seven to ten percent short. It depends on where they are at and the cover. He gave an example of a rancher on the west side of his pastures. He saw seven wolves and out of ten cows there were only three calves left. He said for it to be done justly, it would be with the help of the wildlife services specialist in that area. Mr. Edwards said that at least gives him one factor to start on a rule. Ms. Allestad gave an example of one area that had problems. They got a range rider in there and the problem moved to an adjacent area. She said we just need to come up with an average and not to put the burden on wildlife services. In some cases, put the burden on the rancher to show their loss. As an example, show weight loss differences. We need to come up with an average unless the rancher can prove additional loss. Mr. Edwards said this is a big enough deal that the chair may want to appoint a committee. Mr. McEwen said this state is unwilling to put forth the money to pay a multiple of any kind. He said he believes there were producers scamming the system in Wyoming. Ms. Allestad agreed. Mr. McEwen said if you don't have a confirmed kill then its corruption. The rancher better have a confirmed kill. Secondly you have to have your numbers when you went out. A brand inspection is needed so the rancher better has verification which may be ear tags or inspection. Verification needs to be done both ways going to and coming off a pasture. It has to be a third-party verification. It would have to be a state or federal official. Ms. Allestad suggested creating a working group with maybe a legislator and two of the board members to come up with suggestions. Mr. McEwen said public funds will have strings attached as something else to keep in mind. Ms. Gillespie said during the July board meeting, Kristen Juras said the board can reach out to stakeholders but only board members can serve on a committee. Ms. Allestad said instead of calling it a committee, call it a working group.

**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made a motion to have Mr. Edwards check to with Kristen Juras to make sure we are not going against policy or law to put a working group together and if ok to establish a working group along with two



board members. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** Mr. McEwen said someone is needed from wildlife services and possibly state brands for the group. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

### **Claims Policy**

Ms. Gillespie asked Mr. Edwards to explain the claims policy. He said Kristen Juras suggested the board review their current claims policy. The board adopted their policy during their first meeting in 2008. Currently the form has been amended to reflect law changes. This was to include a line asking for a tribal ID number because of the law requiring owners to be current on per-capita fees. Tribal members are exempt from paying the fees, so this line was needed in order to process loss claims. Mr. Edwards asked if the board would accept the current form and if they wished to continue the policy currently in place where Wildlife Services sends paper forms to ranchers with a confirmed or probable loss. He added the board cannot change Wildlife Services process of mailing only paper investigation reports to the ranchers as they are prevented from providing names of those who have had a loss even to this board.

**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made a motion to accept the current form and to use paper forms in order to follow the paper only investigation process used by Wildlife Services. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** Mr. Kipp asked if the Wildlife Services form talks about the size of the animal. Mr. Edwards said no for example it only lists a calf. Mr. Kipp then asked about payments for confirmed and probable loss. Mr. Edwards said it has been the policy of this board to pay 100% for both confirmed and probable loss. Mr. McEwen asked if the form contains anything about a registered animal. Mr. Edwards said in the cover letter it tells the owner they must provide proof of registration or proof of a contract and directs the person to call him if they have any questions. Mr. McEwen said he would like to amend the motion to say the procedure for registered animals be reviewed. Ms. Allestad said she didn't know if this would be a friendly amendment. Mr. Kipp withdrew his second.

Ms. Allestad said if the animal that died it is probably tattooed and can be identified. Mr. Edwards said some producers do not register the animal until later in the year, so he has been demanding that the producer submit the dam and sire certificates as an alternate way of proof. If they don't supply some form of proof, they don't get paid for a registered price. Mr. McEwen asked what is registered price? If an owner has one hundred head of calves, not all are going to be sold as registered bulls. Some of them will be cut. To pay someone simply on their average, he has a problem with that. Mr. Edwards said the problem with that is the law 2-15-3112 which specifies the average price for the registered animals. Again, this is something identified by Kristen Juras and if would require a law change in order to change how they are valued. This is something the board could take up under Red Tape Review to further define how the board could determine a value.

Mr. Edwards gave an example of paying for registered heifers earlier this year. He looked up sales from ten different registered angus sales and paid the owner the average of those sales. He said he did that because the owner did not have a sale for their registered females within the past year. He did this so he could show an auditor if asked, how this value was determined.

Mr. McEwen said he withdraws his part to amend the motion. He said his problem with the current process is that out of one hundred bull calves, you're not going to sell all of them as registered animals. It's probably about fifty percent. Mr. Edwards said the law would need to be amended because an administrative rule will not work in this situation. Mr. McEwen said we need this as a red tape review, and we will just have to cripple along for a year to include all types of covered livestock. Mr. Kipp said it should be made so we can ask them what percentage of their stock are sold as registered.

**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made a motion to reinstate her previous motion accept the current form and to use paper forms in order to follow the paper only investigation process used by Wildlife Services. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Ms. Allestad said she would like to have a letter written by Mr. Edwards stating our board is opposed to relisting the wolves and to send it to the governor and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. Ms. Gillespie asked if she wanted to make this as a motion.

**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made a motion to have a letter from the board opposing the relisting of the wolves to the governor and the Secretary of Interior. Dave McEwen seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Ms. Gillespie said she is appointing Elaine Allestad vice chair of the board and is now asking for public comment.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. McEwen said he has some public comment. We passed a relocation bill; SB 337 and it states FWP could not dump bears that were causing problems. The commission is meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> on relocation spots. The proposal will be identifying relocation sites. There will be public comment on the sites and then it will go out for more comment for 30 to 40 days. This is a federal problem, and they need to take care of this. He said he hasn't seen the actual proposal yet. Their proposal is probably the same sites they have already been using. He asked Mr. Edwards to go to this meeting because this directly affects us and what we do. Mr. Edwards asked for direction from the board, so he accurately states the board's position. Mr. McEwen said in discussions with FWP they will be proposing the same sites which are already overpopulated already. We don't support the proposal. Mr. Edwards said he will state this to the commission. Ms.

Allestad said we need to do this in the form of a motion. Mr. Kipp said that he does not want any bears relocated onto any of the treaty lands. He is supportive of this and doesn't know if it can be incorporated into this statement.

**Motion:** Joe Kipp made a motion to have Mr. Edwards give testimony opposing the relocation of problem grizzly bears. Dave McEwen seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Mr. Edwards said he will prepare the testimony and send it to board members for their final approval. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Mr. McEwen stated FWP gets \$900,000 in wolf tag revenue. They provide \$120,000 to Wildlife Services for wolf management. If wolves are relisted this money goes away. He said U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services needs to provide this money and money to this board if wolves are relisted. Ms. Allestad asked if this language should be included in the letter. He responded absolutely because money is needed for management and the total lack of science including the impact to our citizenry.


**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made a motion to add Mr. McEwen's comments in the letter to the governor and Department of Interior. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

Ms. Bradley wanted to share on December 6<sup>th</sup>, Rocky Mountain Ranchlands Group and Western Landowners Alliance are holding a working/guard dog workshop in Choteau at the Pavilion. Representatives from different dog breeds will be there and she would like Mr. Edwards to attend to talk about grants. Western Landowners Alliance is this a great ag group that covers all the western states. They are holding their annual convention in Chico on November 8<sup>th</sup> - 11<sup>th</sup>. She said they have a section called the working wild challenge and that is like conflict, prevention, etc. They also have the conflict reduction consortium, which is where they really focus on conflict reduction between wildlife, livestock and people. More information is available on their website. She said this meeting is occurring the same week as Farm Bureau's annual convention.

**Motion:** Elaine Allestad made to adjourn. Joe Kipp seconded the motion. **Discussion:** None. **Vote:** All in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

**Adjourned**

DATED this 18th day of March 2022

  
Doreen Gillespie, Chairman  
Montana Livestock Loss Board