

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Bill Number: 1698 HB | Title: Gray wolf management |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|

Estimated Cash Receipts

| Agency Name | 2023-25 | | | 2025-27 | | | 2027-29 | | |
|----------------------------|----------|-------------|---------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | GF-State | NGF-Outlook | Total | GF-State | NGF-Outlook | Total | GF-State | NGF-Outlook | Total |
| Office of Attorney General | 0 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total \$ | 0 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Estimated Operating Expenditures

| Agency Name | 2023-25 | | | | 2025-27 | | | | 2027-29 | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | FTEs | GF-State | NGF-Outlook | Total | FTEs | GF-State | NGF-Outlook | Total | FTEs | GF-State | NGF-Outlook | Total |
| Office of Attorney General | .2 | 0 | 0 | 43,000 | .0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department of Fish and Wildlife | 4.7 | 2,267,000 | 2,267,000 | 2,267,000 | 1.3 | 608,000 | 608,000 | 608,000 | 1.1 | 528,000 | 528,000 | 528,000 |
| Total \$ | 4.9 | 2,267,000 | 2,267,000 | 2,310,000 | 1.3 | 608,000 | 608,000 | 608,000 | 1.1 | 528,000 | 528,000 | 528,000 |

| Agency Name | 2023-25 | | | 2025-27 | | | 2027-29 | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|-------|---------|----------|-------|---------|----------|-------|
| | FTEs | GF-State | Total | FTEs | GF-State | Total | FTEs | GF-State | Total |
| Local Gov. Courts | | | | | | | | | |
| Loc School dist-SPI | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Gov. Other | Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion. | | | | | | | | |
| Local Gov. Total | | | | | | | | | |

Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

| Agency Name | 2023-25 | | | 2025-27 | | | 2027-29 | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|----------|----------|------------|----------|----------|
| | FTEs | Bonds | Total | FTEs | Bonds | Total | FTEs | Bonds | Total |
| Office of Attorney General | .0 | 0 | 0 | .0 | 0 | 0 | .0 | 0 | 0 |
| Department of Fish and Wildlife | .0 | 0 | 0 | .0 | 0 | 0 | .0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total \$ | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |

| Agency Name | 2023-25 | | | 2025-27 | | | 2027-29 | | |
|---------------------|--|----------|-------|---------|----------|-------|---------|----------|-------|
| | FTEs | GF-State | Total | FTEs | GF-State | Total | FTEs | GF-State | Total |
| Local Gov. Courts | | | | | | | | | |
| Loc School dist-SPI | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Gov. Other | Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion. | | | | | | | | |
| Local Gov. Total | | | | | | | | | |

Estimated Capital Budget Breakout

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Prepared by: Matthew Hunter, OFM | Phone: (360) 529-7078 | Date Published: Final 2/ 7/2023 |
|---|---------------------------------|---|

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

| | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Bill Number: 1698 HB | Title: Gray wolf management | Agency: 100-Office of Attorney General |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---|

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

| ACCOUNT | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Legal Services Revolving Account-State 405-1 | 43,000 | | 43,000 | | |
| Total \$ | 43,000 | | 43,000 | | |

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

| ACCOUNT | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FTE Staff Years | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Account | | | | | |
| Legal Services Revolving Account-State 405-1 | 43,000 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total \$ | 43,000 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 |

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Legislative Contact: Rebecca Lewis | Phone: 360-786-7339 | Date: 02/01/2023 |
| Agency Preparation: Cam Comfort | Phone: (360) 664-9429 | Date: 02/07/2023 |
| Agency Approval: Edd Giger | Phone: 360-586-2104 | Date: 02/07/2023 |
| OFM Review: Cheri Keller | Phone: (360) 584-2207 | Date: 02/07/2023 |

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Significant provisions of the bill and any related workload or policy assumptions that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency by section number.

Section 1: New section stating legislative findings and intent.

Section 2: Adds a new section to RCW 36.01 requiring the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) to manage the gray wolf within counties that meet certain criteria. When a county meets the criteria, it must enter into an inter-local agreement with DFW and any tribes within the jurisdiction to collaboratively co-manage the gray wolf.

Section 3: Amends RCW 77.12.020 to require the DFW to confirm that the county has met the criteria in Section 2 and has developed a management plan for gray wolves. Within six months of notice, DFW must recommend to the Fish and Wildlife Commission a management plan in collaboration with the county and any tribes within the county.

This bill is assumed effective 90 days after the end of the 2023 legislative session.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

Cash receipts are assumed to equal the Legal Services Revolving Account (LSRA) cost estimates. These will be billed through the revolving account to the client agency.

The client agency is the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW). The Attorney General's Office (AGO) will bill all clients for legal services rendered.

These cash receipts represent the AGO's authority to bill and are not a direct appropriation to the AGO. The direct appropriation is reflected in the client agency's fiscal note. Appropriation authority is necessary in the AGO budget.

AGO AGENCY ASSUMPTIONS:

DFW will be billed for non-Seattle rates:

FY 2024: \$43,000 for 0.16 Assistant Attorney General FTE (AAG), 0.08 Legal Assistant 3 FTE (LA) and 0.02 Paralegal FTE (PL).

II. C - Expenditures

Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

Attorney General's Office (AGO) Agency Assumptions:

This bill is assumed effective 90 days after the end of the 2023 legislative session.

Location of staffing is assumed to be in a non-Seattle office building.

Total workload impact in this request includes standard assumption costs for goods & services, travel, and capital outlays for all FTE identified.

Agency administration support FTE are included in the tables, for every 1.0 Assistant Attorney General FTE (AAG), the AGO includes 0.5 FTE for a Legal Assistant 3 (LA) and 0.25 FTE of a Management Analyst 5 (MA). The MA is used as a

representative classification.

Assumptions for the AGO Public Land Conservation Division’s (PLC) legal services for the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW):

The AGO will bill DFW for legal services based on the enactment of this bill.

PLC is assuming at least one lawsuit will be filed over the bill’s implementation, as wolf management issues tend to create conflict within different interest groups concerning wolf management.

Legal advice requirements concerning the new provision will be greatest in the first few months and continue for the first few FY of implementation, then taper off.

PLC assumes that the AAG time will be a mixture of legal advice concerning Section 2 criteria, one legal challenge to a management plan involving county co-management under Section 3.

FY 2024: 280 AAG hours, 40 Paralegal (PL) hours and 40 LA hours.

DFW: Total non-Seattle workload impact:

FY 2024: \$43,000 for 0.16 AAG, 0.08 LA and 0.02 PL.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

| Account | Account Title | Type | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 405-1 | Legal Services | State | 43,000 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 |
| | Revolving Account | | | | | | |
| Total \$ | | | 43,000 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 |

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

| | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| FTE Staff Years | 0.3 | | 0.2 | | |
| A-Salaries and Wages | 29,000 | | 29,000 | | |
| B-Employee Benefits | 9,000 | | 9,000 | | |
| E-Goods and Other Services | 5,000 | | 5,000 | | |
| Total \$ | 43,000 | 0 | 43,000 | 0 | 0 |

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

| Job Classification | Salary | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Assistant Attorney General | 118,700 | 0.2 | | 0.1 | | |
| Legal Assistant 3 | 55,872 | 0.1 | | 0.0 | | |
| Management Analyst 5 | 91,524 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | |
| Paralegal 2 | 71,520 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | |
| Total FTEs | | 0.3 | | 0.2 | | 0.0 |

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

| Program | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Public Lands & Commissions (PLC) | 43,000 | | 43,000 | | |
| Total \$ | 43,000 | | 43,000 | | |

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part IVB.*

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Revised

| | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Bill Number: 1698 HB | Title: Gray wolf management | Agency: 477-Department of Fish and Wildlife |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

| | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| FTE Staff Years | 5.4 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Account | | | | | |
| General Fund-State 001-1 | 1,356,000 | 911,000 | 2,267,000 | 608,000 | 528,000 |
| Total \$ | 1,356,000 | 911,000 | 2,267,000 | 608,000 | 528,000 |

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Legislative Contact: Rebecca Lewis | Phone: 360-786-7339 | Date: 02/01/2023 |
| Agency Preparation: Barbara Reichart | Phone: 3608190438 | Date: 02/07/2023 |
| Agency Approval: Barbara Reichart | Phone: 3608190438 | Date: 02/07/2023 |
| OFM Review: Matthew Hunter | Phone: (360) 529-7078 | Date: 02/07/2023 |

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Significant provisions of the bill and any related workload or policy assumptions that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency by section number.

Section 2 creates criteria for WDFW to determine if a gray wolf population should be treated as if it has been removed from the state designation as protected or endangered within any county. In counties where the criteria are met, the county must provide notice to WDFW and enter into an interlocal agreement with WDFW and any tribes within the jurisdiction.

Section 3 requires WDFW to deliver a management plan for a county that has attained the criteria to the Commission within 6 months of receipt of notice from a county. The Department must collaborate with the county, any tribes within the jurisdiction, and local law enforcement. The Department must give the wolf advisory group and the northeast Washington wolf-cattle cooperative an opportunity to review and provide comment on the plan.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

The change in criteria in Section 2 will require a rule making process to determine how the Commission will manage the gray wolf as if it has been removed from state designation as protected or endangered under RCW 77.12.020 within any county. Rulemaking will require \$2,500 for a public hearing and \$1,500 for rule adoption in fiscal year 2024.

Total costs for section 2 are \$5,000 in fiscal year 2024.

The costs below are related to the implementation of Section 3.

Within six months of receipt of notice that a county has attained the criteria, WDFW will be required to present a management plan for the county to the commission. The statute does not require the Commission to vote on the management plan within the 6-month window. The Department assumes that 6 counties will be eligible to begin the process in fiscal year 2024 due to location of current breeding pairs and 3 counties will be eligible in fiscal year 2025.

Ongoing, WDFW assumes that one county will be eligible to begin the process starting in fiscal year 2026 and ongoing. County designations will be continuously changing due to the growth and movement of the existing and future breeding pairs and the impact of new management plans on current populations. If a county loses designation as “recovered,” WDFW assumes that the county would revert to the WDFW 2011 statewide wolf management plan and 2017 wolf-livestock interaction protocol. There will be no additional costs associated with counties reverting to the statewide management plan. If a county with a completed management plan loses its eligibility under the revised criteria and becomes eligible again in the future, WDFW assumes that the county will not revert to its original plan and will have to go through a new management plan process.

DEVELOPMENT

WDFW will develop a management plan specific to those counties developed in collaboration with the county and any tribes within the county. The management plan will include collaboration with local law enforcement to receive and investigate reports of problem wildlife, ongoing monitoring of the population by the WDFW, and a conflict management plan. All meetings involving multiple parties, making wolf management decisions, will require the presence of a third-party neutral facilitator.

Each management plan will require 0.5 FTE Environmental Planner 4 (EP4) and 0.2 FTE Administrative Assistant 3 (AA3). The EP4 will:

- Collaborate with the specific county, tribes, local law enforcement and allow for review of each plan by the Wolf Advisory Group and the Northeast Washington Wolf-Cattle Collaborative. This will include six meetings (three in-person/three virtual) per management plan and any additional coordination;
- Writing individual management plans and ensuring compliance with RCWs, WACs, and specifically the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA);
- Developing Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with each county and affected tribes; and
- Coordinating with the Director and other agency staff.

The AA3 will be responsible for coordinating and scheduling meetings among all the parties, in-person and virtual meeting logistics (including arrangements for meeting venues, meals, etc.), facilitator arrangements and payments, handling reimbursements if necessary, and maintaining correspondence with all parties.

COMMISSION PROCESS

To prepare for Commission meetings, coordinate ongoing collaboration with stakeholders and make adjustments to the proposed plans at the Commission's request, WDFW assumes that this will require 0.4 FTE EP4 per management plan. Based on WDFW's experience developing wolf management plans and rules (e.g., the 2011 Wolf Conservation and Management Plan took five years to develop and receive Fish and Wildlife Commission approval; the wolf-livestock conflict deterrence rule making took two years to develop and present to the Commission for a final vote), each county management plan will take an average of one year to be reviewed and approved by Commission. The Department assumes there will be a public input process associated with Commission action, and possibly SEPA processes depending on the content of each plan. Public hearings through the Fish and Wildlife Commission process will be all-day affairs. The Department assumes each management plan will require a rulemaking process and WDFW will need to consult the Attorney General's Office (AGO). AGO fees assume transactional attorney work only and does not include potential litigation hours.

SECTION 3 COSTS

Total costs for the first year of a county management plan process includes:

- \$85,000 for 0.7 FTE Environmental Planner 4 (0.5 FTE for Development and 0.2 FTE for Commission Process) to manage the internal review and collaboration; coordinate with county through their planning process and work with the facilitator to address the tribal coordination, and other public engagement processes, Object A and B.
- \$15,000 for 0.2 Administrative Assistant 3 in the first fiscal year to coordinate meetings and documentation of the management plan process, Object A and B.
- \$60,000 for a contractor who will facilitate non-biased, open public meetings for each region, tribal collaboration, facilitator travel, and rental of meeting rooms, Object C. This estimate is based on similar facilitation contracts.
- \$4,000 for the Environmental Planner 4 to travel to and from stakeholder meetings, Object G.
- Goods and services, Object E, includes \$6,000 per FTE, per year, for WDFW standard costs, which cover an average employee's supplies, communications, training, and subscription costs per year. An infrastructure and program support rate of 33.5% is included in Object T and is calculated based on WDFW's federally approved indirect rate.

Total costs for the second year of a county management plan process includes:

- \$24,000 for 0.2 FTE Environmental Planner 4 (0.2 FTE for Commission Process) to continue the commission process for the initial six counties and begin the process for three additional counties, Object A and B.
- \$2,500 for Attorney General Office fees for rule making per plan and \$1,500 for rule adoption, Object E.
- Goods and services, Object E, includes \$6,000 per FTE, per year, for WDFW standard costs, which cover an average employee's supplies, communications, training, and subscription costs per year. An infrastructure and program support rate

of 33.5% is included in Object T and is calculated based on WDFW's federally approved indirect rate.

TOTAL COSTS

In fiscal year 2024, WDFW assumes 6 counties will initiate the process (year 1), total costs for Section 3 will be \$1,351,000. Total costs for the bill will be \$1,356,000.

In fiscal year 2025, WDFW assumes 3 counties will initiate the process (year 1) and 6 counties will complete the process (year 2), total costs for Section 3 will be \$911,000.

In fiscal year 2026, WDFW assumes 1 county will initiate the process (year 1) and 3 counties will complete the process (year 2), total costs for Section 3 will be \$344,000.

In fiscal year 2027 and ongoing, WDFW assumes 1 county will initiate the process (year 1) and 1 county will complete the process (year 2), total costs for Section 3 will be \$264,000.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

| Account | Account Title | Type | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|-----------------|---------------|-------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| 001-1 | General Fund | State | 1,356,000 | 911,000 | 2,267,000 | 608,000 | 528,000 |
| Total \$ | | | 1,356,000 | 911,000 | 2,267,000 | 608,000 | 528,000 |

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

| | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| FTE Staff Years | 5.4 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| A-Salaries and Wages | 436,000 | 325,000 | 761,000 | 216,000 | 180,000 |
| B-Employee Benefits | 162,000 | 119,000 | 281,000 | 79,000 | 66,000 |
| C-Professional Service Contracts | 360,000 | 180,000 | 540,000 | 120,000 | 120,000 |
| E-Goods and Other Services | 36,000 | 47,000 | 83,000 | 32,000 | 22,000 |
| G-Travel | 22,000 | 11,000 | 33,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| J-Capital Outlays | | | | | |
| M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers | | | | | |
| N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services | | | | | |
| P-Debt Service | | | | | |
| S-Interagency Reimbursements | | | | | |
| T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements | 340,000 | 229,000 | 569,000 | 153,000 | 132,000 |
| 9- | | | | | |
| Total \$ | 1,356,000 | 911,000 | 2,267,000 | 608,000 | 528,000 |

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA

| Job Classification | Salary | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | 2023-25 | 2025-27 | 2027-29 |
|----------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT 3 | | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER 4 | | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| Total FTEs | | 5.4 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 1.1 |

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

NONE

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part IVB.*

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Section 2 will require rule making due to the ambiguity around what it means to “manage the gray wolf as if it has been removed from state designation as protected or endangered under RCW 77.12.020 within any county” This will require changes to one or many of the following WACs: 220-610-010, 220-400-020, and 220-610-110. Section 3 will also require rulemaking for each new management plan.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

Bill Number: 1698 HB

Title: Gray wolf management

Part I: Jurisdiction-Location, type or status of political subdivision defines range of fiscal impacts.

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities: Municipal Police Departments
- Counties: Counties and County Sheriff's offices
- Special Districts:
- Specific jurisdictions only:
- Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option:
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: The number of counties where the gray wolf no longer meets the criteria for state designation as protected or endangered in that county, and the amount of staff time required for local governments and law enforcement to collaborate with the Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) on management plans for gray wolves.

Estimated revenue impacts to:

None

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Non-zero but indeterminate cost and/or savings. Please see discussion.

Part III: Preparation and Approval

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Fiscal Note Analyst: Chelsea Mickel | Phone: 518-727-3478 | Date: 02/07/2023 |
| Leg. Committee Contact: Rebecca Lewis | Phone: 360-786-7339 | Date: 02/01/2023 |
| Agency Approval: Allan Johnson | Phone: 360-725-5033 | Date: 02/07/2023 |
| OFM Review: Matthew Hunter | Phone: (360) 529-7078 | Date: 02/07/2023 |

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

Description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.

This bill relates to providing flexibility for the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to collaborate with local governments to manage gray wolves.

Section 2 states that the WDFW must manage the gray wolf as if it has been removed from state designation as protected or endangered under RCW 77.12.020 within any county where the following criteria are met:

- The state meets the recovery objective of breeding pairs in the state for at least three years;
- There are at least three documented breeding pairs in the county or portion of the county;
- The gray wolf is not designated under the federal endangered species act as threatened or endangered in the county or portion of the county.

When the aforementioned criteria are met, the legislative body of the county must provide notice to the Fish and Wildlife Commission (Commission) and to the director of the WDFW that the gray wolf no longer meets the criteria for state designation as protected or endangered in that county.

After a county has notified the Commission and the WDFW, the county must enter into an inter-local agreement with the WDFW and any tribes within the jurisdiction to collaboratively co-manage the gray wolf, including collaborating with local law enforcement to receive and investigate reports of problem animals.

Section 3 is amended as follows: When the Commission receives notice as described in Section 2 of this act, the WDFW must confirm that the county has attained the criteria and develop a management plan for gray wolves within that county or portion of county where the criteria have been met. Within six months of the receipt of notice, the WDFW must recommend to the commission a management plan developed in collaboration with the county and any tribes within the county.

The management plan must include collaboration with local law enforcement to receive and investigate reports of problem wildlife, ongoing monitoring of the population by the department, and a conflict management plan. The wolf advisory group and the northeast Washington wolf-cattle collaborative must be given an opportunity to review and provide comment on the plan.

B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

Expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments with the expenditure provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.

This bill would have indeterminate expenditure impacts on local governments.

This provisions of this bill would primarily impact counties in Northeast Washington, such as Ferry, Stevens and Pend Oreille, where the majority of gray wolves reside. However, there are areas in the North Cascades and the Southeast corner of the state that may also be impacted due to have gray wolves living in those areas. Counties that meet the criteria in Section 2 of the bill would incur costs notifying the WDFW that the gray wolf no longer meets the criteria for state designation as protected or endangered in that county, entering into an inter-local agreement with the WDFW, and collaborating with the WDFW and local law enforcement to develop management plans. Municipal law enforcement and county sheriffs in affected counties would incur costs collaborating with the WDFW and county governments on management plans and conflict management plans. Local law enforcement would also report problem wildlife incidents to the WDFW during the plans' development.

The average professional compensation at the local level is \$66 per hour, including benefits and overhead. Costs to local governments for collaboration with WDFW would depend upon the number of hours of staff time required for each affected local government. It is unknown whether the scope of local government collaboration would include in-person

meetings and travel, or if collaboration would be mostly remote. Travel and meeting costs would vary depending on the number of local staff representatives attending, meeting location, distance traveled, the number and length of meetings, and the local per diem and hotel costs. It is also unknown how many counties would meet the conditions stated in Section 2 of the bill that would be required to collaborate with the WDFW in the management plan process. Due to the uncertainties listed above, the expenditure impacts on local governments is indeterminate.

C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS

Revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, with the revenue provisions identified by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.

This bill would not impact local government revenues.

SOURCES

Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

House Bill Analysis, HB 1698, Agriculture & Natural Resources Committee, (2023)

Local Government Fiscal Note Program Unit Cost Model, (2023)

Revised Code of Washington, RCW 77.12.020; 36.01 RCW

Washington Gray Wolf Conservation and Management 2021 Annual Report, WDFW, (April 9, 2022)

Washington State Association of Counties