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1. Executive Summary

In 2010, the Natural Resources Board (NRB) approved the Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) Response Plan of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR), which guides the DNR’s approach to addressing CWD in Wisconsin. This 15-year plan is to be used from 2010-2025.

In 2015, the NRB directed the DNR to review the CWD Response Plan in accordance with the Plan’s stated action item to conduct reviews after the 2015, 2020 and 2025 hunting seasons. In 2016, the DNR initiated the first 5-year review of the Plan. Additional driving factors behind the review were Gov. Scott Walker’s CWD initiatives, presented at the 2016 Wisconsin Conservation Congress Annual Convention, as well as separate sets of recommendations from the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation and the Wisconsin Conservation Congress (WCC). Three organizations came together as sponsors of a broader review process – the DNR, the WCC and the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP).

The sponsors established an ad hoc, multi-stakeholder advisory committee (aka Review Committee) to further discuss and assess the CWD response plan, and to recommend modifications to it. Membership of the CWD Response Plan Review Committee consisted of Wisconsin agencies and non-governmental organizations listed below, each with a stake in addressing CWD in Wisconsin. Involvement from the Wisconsin Tribes was also identified as a key component of the review. A representative from the six Chippewa Bands was invited to participate in the Review Committee and the non-Chippewa Bands were offered the opportunity to meet with DNR to discuss the response plan review effort. Members of the public provided comments during the designated public comment period on each meeting’s agenda.

- Wisconsin DNR - Law Enforcement
- Wisconsin DNR - Wildlife Management
- Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
- Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Lab
- Wisconsin Department of Health Services
- Wisconsin Department of Tourism
- Wisconsin Conservation Congress
- Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers' Association
- Whitetails of Wisconsin
- Whitetails Unlimited
- Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
- Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
- Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
- Wisconsin Conservation Congress
- Safari Club International
- Archery Trade Association
- Sporting Heritage Council
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
- Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Lab
- Wisconsin Department of Health Services
- Wisconsin Department of Tourism
- Wisconsin Conservation Congress
- Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers' Association
- Whitetails of Wisconsin
- Whitetails Unlimited
- Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
- Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
- Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
- Wisconsin Conservation Congress
- Safari Club International
- Archery Trade Association
- Sporting Heritage Council

The sponsors actively engaged the public and the County Deer Advisory Councils (CDACs) across the state in these discussions through surveys and participation in public meetings.

The sponsors established an internal planning team and retained a professional facilitator (Raj Kamal from Credens LLC) to plan and conduct the facilitated sessions, and to write this report. All the subject
matter content of this report was provided by the sponsors, the Review Committee members, subject matter experts invited to speak at the Review Committee meetings, the public and the CDACs.

The Review Committee met four times between October 2016 and February 2017 to review, modify or add, as appropriate, Objectives and Action Items of the 2010-2025 Response Plan. In its deliberations and discussions, the Review Committee utilized information provided by invited expert speakers on CWD, various published articles, Review Committee members, the public and the CDACs. After considering all the input, the Review Committee prepared a final list of 62 recommended Action Items across the six Objectives of the Plan. Some of the original Action Items were edited or modified, and new ones were added. The Committee also prioritized the Action Items within each Objective, as shown in the “Objectives and Recommended Action Items” section of this report.

The next steps for this initiative include a review of this report by the leaders of the sponsor team and a presentation to the NRB on March 1, 2017.
2. Objectives and Recommended Action Items

After considering all the input received from invited CWD experts, published articles, its own discussions, the public and the CDACs across the state, the Review Committee recommended a prioritized list of updated Action Items for the six Objectives of the CWD Response Plan.

Prioritization Process

Review Committee members were asked to identify their high priority Action Items within each Objective. Each of the 17 stakeholder organizations received one set of dots even if there were multiple representatives from that stakeholder. Voting was done by placing dots on the updated Action Items deemed high priority by each stakeholder. Since each Objective had a different number of Action Items, the number of dots used by the Review Committee also varied for each Objective. For example, the Review Committee identified 19 Action Items for Objective #1, and then, each Committee member marked with a dot his/her top 12 priority Action Items from those 19. The number of dots used for any Objective was deliberately smaller than the number of Action Items for that Objective, to facilitate prioritization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective #</th>
<th># of Action Items</th>
<th># of dots per Committee member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not every Committee member used all the dots for each Objective. All Action Items identified by the Review Committee have been presented in this document, including those that did not receive any dots. The Action Items for each Objective are presented in a descending order of priority (shown in the Votes column below), as determined by the Review Committee.

Interpreting the table below (an example): Objective 1 had 19 Action Items. Each of the 17 stakeholders received 12 dots; in other words, members had to identify their top 12 among the 19 Items. The 17 votes for Action Item A reflect that every one of the 17 stakeholders deemed it in his/her top 12 list for Objective 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives &amp; Action Items</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1 – Prevent New Introductions of CWD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Through outreach and enforcement of carcass transportation restrictions, the DNR will seek to prevent the movement of whole wild cervid carcasses and potentially infectious tissues from counties with CWD in wild cervids into the rest of the state.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The DNR will seek to educate hunters on the risks of carcass movement between Wisconsin and other states and provinces.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The DNR and DATCP will continue a cooperative working relationship. This may include efforts to work jointly for federal and/or state funding as available.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Enhanced fencing (e.g. double or electric fencing) for facilities with CWD positive cervids is needed to minimize the risk of disease transmission.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The DNR and CDACs will continue to recommend annual statewide deer quotas and seasons designed to keep deer populations at the established population objectives for deer management units. When deer population objectives are reevaluated as part of the statewide unit review process (currently every three years), disease control must be a primary consideration.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. DATCP will continue to work with the farmed cervid industry to maintain compliance with monitoring, testing, record keeping and cervid movement regulations.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. The DNR will develop regulations to restrict the use of cervid urine-based products to those produced by CWD free facilities that use best management practices.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Legislation is needed for a statewide ban on the baiting and feeding of wild cervids to reduce the risk of disease transmission and establishment of CWD and other serious cervid diseases in new areas.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. DATCP, DNR and partners will encourage development of biosecurity and management strategies for the captive cervid industry to minimize the risk from CWD positive facilities to wild and farmed cervids.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Have a proper disposal site for cervid carcasses available in each county, and have these sites posted in the big game rules and regulations.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. The DNR will continue to allow rehabilitation of cervids in CWD affected counties, and release those rehabilitated cervids back only into a CWD affected areas.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. The DNR and DATCP will update a Memorandum of Understanding that clearly identifies each agency’s responsibilities and roles for wild and captive cervids.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. The authority is needed to develop incentives and penalties for cervid farmers to minimize risk of escapes.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. When CWD positive facilities are condemned, DATCP may expedite the depopulation of facilities with CWD-positive animals.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. To reduce the number of animals escaping from cervid farms, authority to regulate fencing for all species of farmed cervids should be consolidated. (Currently DNR only has authority on white-tailed deer)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Objectives & Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>In order to minimize the future risk of disease transmission to wild cervids, the authority to regulate fences of depopulated CWD positive facilities is needed.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Increase penalties for illegal baiting violations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Captive cervid operations should be insured to cover all costs related to the recovery of escaped cervids from that facility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>All deer older than 12 months that die or are killed on any cervid farm should be tested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 2: Monitor for and Respond to New CWD Disease Foci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Surveillance strategies will be implemented to detect new areas of CWD outside of the current counties with CWD in wild cervids. These strategies will include encouraging people to report cervids that exhibit signs consistent with CWD.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>In a collaborative process, the DNR and partners will develop a statewide disease response and management action plan template to respond to wild cervid CWD detections in new areas. The action plan should include timeframes for implementation of surveillance and management actions by DNR and partners.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Surveillance will also include statewide hunter-harvested wild cervid testing using bona-fide science and a weighted approach that balances efficiency and effectiveness.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Testing may be required for all, or a subset of, wild cervids harvested in surveillance areas to achieve monitoring goals.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>After the detection of a wild or escaped captive CWD positive cervids in new areas, there will be intensive sampling and testing of cervids in at least a ten-mile radius surrounding the new positive in order to assess the spatial extent and intensity of the outbreak. timeline and intensity will be based on surveillance goals, established in consultation with local partners.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>If DNR and partners decide that an aggressive course of action is warranted for disease management in new areas of detection, then localized herd reduction tools may be considered in an effort to seek to manage the disease.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>If any county has a new CWD detection, all captive cervid farms in that county should be tested.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 3 – Control Distribution and Intensity of CWD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The DNR and CDACs will continue to use both traditional and optional season structures, along with antlerless permit issuance to achieve population objectives for wild deer and disease management goals.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The DNR and partners will review the management plan after receiving new significant scientific information that would impact the plan, in addition to periodic reviews after the 2020 and 2025 deer seasons. Based on these reviews, they will make recommendations on any needed modifications.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>The DNR will monitor peer-reviewed research findings and continue to apply management options that may effectively control CWD and can be implemented into the traditional or optional deer season frameworks.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives & Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>The DNR and DATCP may work cooperatively with adjacent states on CWD management by updating and/or establishing a Memorandum of Understanding with corresponding agencies in these states.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>The DNR will conduct sampling and CWD testing that is sufficient to monitor trends in prevalence and disease pattern within historical monitoring areas. The DNR will monitor spatial and prevalence patterns at selected higher prevalence areas and counties with CWD detection in wild cervids.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>The DNR will explore the use of landowner incentives to meet CWD response plan goals.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Trends in the size of the deer population in counties with CWD positive wild cervids will be monitored using field and aerial survey techniques.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>The DNR and CDACs may consider offering localized hunting opportunities outside the traditional season framework in order to achieve CWD response plan goals.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>In consultation with local partners, the DNR may consider targeted culling of wild cervids on public lands and on private lands where permission can be obtained, in order to achieve CWD response plan goals.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Every year the DNR and DATCP will report and make available to the public all related costs associated with CWD management including surveillance, monitoring, research, implementation and enforcement costs as well as sources of funds used and partner inputs.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>The DNR will define the CWD endemic zone in Southern Wisconsin to differentiate where CWD is well established in the wild cervid population versus areas affected by isolated detections in wild or farmed cervids.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 4 – Increase Public Recognition and Understanding of CWD Risks and Public Participation in Disease Control Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Working with a professional communications firm and partners, the DNR will develop communication strategies that improve public understanding of CWD and engage the public, hunting and non-hunting alike, in managing the disease.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The DNR and DATCP will provide up to date information to the public about CWD status in wild and captive cervids in Wisconsin and ongoing research into the disease.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>The DNR will leverage the messaging capabilities of electronic registration to inform hunters on managing risks associated with CWD and encourage testing of harvested cervids.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Working with a professional communications firm and partners, the DNR will develop communication based on the best and the most recent science available at the time of production, and continue to update communications as new or better information becomes available.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>The DNR, DATCP and DHS will monitor public opinions about CWD management in order to develop messages and delivery mechanisms that enhance public understanding of the risks associated with CWD, and foster public engagement in</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives & Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 5 – Address the Needs of Our Customers</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. To assess the impacts of outreach and education efforts, the DNR, DATCP, DHS and other agencies, as appropriate, will support and/or conduct social scientific and economic studies to monitor behaviors and attitudes of the public in general on a regular basis, especially in response to a change in CWD management strategy.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The DNR, DHS and DATCP will continue to provide meat processors and taxidermists with information on ways to reduce risks when disposing of cervid carcass waste.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The DNR and WVDL (Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory) will support efforts to seek to develop quicker and less expensive sampling and testing procedures.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The DNR will ensure that hunters have continued access to CWD testing in areas with the highest prevalence of CWD.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The DNR, DHS and DATCP will continue to provide hunters with information on ways to reduce risks when field dressing, and butchering, consuming and disposing of cervids.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The DNR and DHS will monitor and support research to better assess the risks that CWD may or may not pose to humans.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The DNR, through the Wildlife Damage Abatement and Claims Program, and in conjunction with local and community organizations, will cooperate with food pantries and meat processors in CWD affected counties to provide hunters an avenue for donation of harvested deer in excess of their personal needs.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. The DNR, DHS and DATCP will continue to work with local governments, landfill operators, and municipal wastewater treatment facilities to increase their understanding of the safety and cost-effectiveness of landfiling cervids in order to increase the availability of landfills for carcass disposal.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. The DNR will explore alternative strategies for reducing or recovering costs and/or privatizing hunter service testing such as developing opportunities that would allow hunters to collect their own samples or charging testing fees to partially cover costs of sample collection and testing.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The DNR and DATCP will continue to support and cooperate with research to better assess the risks that CWD may pose over time to livestock, including farmed cervids.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. The DNR will continue to offer indemnification to landfills that accept cervid carcass waste.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. The State should restore funding for carcass removal and CWD testing of car-killed deer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. The DNR will continue to cooperate with DHS to maintain the registry of persons known to have consumed venison from CWD-positive deer.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. The DNR will actively market the pantry program to encourage an increase in hunter harvest, if necessary, in CWD affected areas.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. The DNR will partner with others to seek funding from nongovernmental organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives &amp; Action Items</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help meat processors offset the costs of processing and storing donated venison.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 6 – Enhance the Scientific Information about CWD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The DNR will continue to cooperate with outside researchers by sharing tissues and</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data and may initiate or collaborate on research when appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. An evaluation of the economic impact of the Wisconsin deer herd on the state’s</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economy is needed to better understand the overall impacts of CWD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Funding is needed to support applied management-focused research on CWD, and to</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote research into prion biology that may, in time lead to effective procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for prevention and/or treatment of CWD in cervids and decontamination of environments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The DNR will continue to develop methods for assessing the progression of CWD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution and prevalence in wild cervids, and its ecological impact for Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Meeting Summaries

The sponsor team scheduled a series of four meetings for the Review Committee, as shown in the diagram below. All meetings were held at the Lussier Family Heritage Center in Madison, Wisconsin. As preparation for each of these meetings, the Review Committee members were asked to complete “pre-work”. After the third Committee meeting, the preliminary Objectives and Action Items drafted by the Review Committee were shared with the public at large and the County Deer Advisory Councils (CDACs) for input. At the fourth meeting, the Committee considered all input and created a final version of Objectives and Action Items. Action Items were then collectively prioritized by the Committee within each Objective (discussed above). Summary descriptions of each meeting are provided below.

Meeting #1

During its first meeting, the Review Committee reviewed its charge, roles and responsibilities, and heard presentations from invited experts on CWD. Specifically, the Review Committee was charged with:

- Engaging key stakeholder organizations and resource agencies interested in wild and captive ungulate herd health monitoring and management to review the 2010-2025 Wisconsin CWD Response Plan and to recommend CWD Action Items for the next 5 years.
  - Reviewing and recommending CWD response plan goal and objectives
  - Reviewing and recommending CWD action items for each objective
  - Suggesting new CWD action items for the next 5 years.
  - Reviewing feedback from the public through County Deer Advisory Councils (CDACs) on proposed revisions and making a final recommendation to committee sponsors.
In its work, the Committee was to consider the current interest shown and input provided by multiple stakeholders and organizations across the state, including:

- Governor Walker’s CWD initiatives
- Legislators
- Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
- Wisconsin Conservation Congress’s biosecurity plan
- Spring hearing county resolutions, and
- Tribes

The Committee then heard from three invited expert speakers who presented their research and answered questions from the Committee and the audience:

- **Dr. Margaret Wild, DVM, PhD**, Chief Wildlife Veterinarian, National Park Service, Biological Resources Division, Wildlife Health Branch, Fort Collins, CO.
- **Dr. Michael Samuel**, Professor of Wildlife Ecology, Assistant Unit Leader, USGS BRD, Wisconsin Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.
- **Dr. Nick Haley, DVM, PhD**, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Midwestern University – Glendale, AZ.

Following the presentations and Q&A with the three expert speakers, the facilitator asked the Committee members to reflect on what stood out to them from the day’s discussion, including any observations, new information, questions, ideas, etc. Many reflections focused on the need for further research. Detailed reflections are listed in Appendix A of this report.

Next, citizens present at the meeting were afforded an opportunity to provide input; three citizens did so.

At the end of the meeting, the Committee identified specific follow-up questions that were later addressed by the planning team.

**Meeting #2**

Between the first and the second meetings, as “pre-work” for the second meeting, the Committee members were asked to read the 2010-2015 CWD Response Plan, and to identify their comments on the current six Objectives and associated Action Items, and to identify new Action Items they wanted to suggest. The planning team provided two templates to the Committee members to facilitate this pre-work and its subsequent compilation.

At the start of the second meeting, the planning team provided answers and updates on follow-up items from the first meeting, and discussed the website where various documents were available to the Committee and the public.

The morning session focused on identifying new Action Items suggested by the Committee members, and the afternoon session focused on comments on the current Action Items. The sequence facilitated
alignment of the new Action Items with the current Action Items. The new Action Items suggested are listed in the notes for the second meeting, in Appendix B of this report. Following the discussion of new Action Items, the facilitator asked the Committee members to reflect on what stood out to them from the morning’s discussion, including any observations, new information, questions, ideas, etc.

The afternoon session focused on soliciting comments from the Committee members on Objectives 4, 5 and 6 of the current 2010-2015 CWD Response Plan, listed in Appendix B of this report.

The Committee then identified additional follow-up items, and the meeting ended with citizen input.

**Meeting #3**

Between the second and the third meetings, as “pre-work” for the third meeting, the Committee members were asked to read and provide comments on the notes from the second meeting (held on November 14, 2016) and be prepared to discuss their comments for Objectives #1, 2 and 3 using Template A, on December 12.

At the third meeting, Bob Nack from the DNR discussed the steps for the Committee between December 2016 and March 2017. Following up on questions from the second meeting, staff from Department of Health Services (DHS) and DATCP provided information on regulations regarding meat handling at deer processing establishments (they need to be licensed), and on the use of DHS guidelines by Food Pantries. An email response on the topic was read by DATCP staff; the email was shared with the Committee.

The Committee made comments on Objectives 1, 2 and 3 of the current 2010-2025 CWD Response Plan. These comments are listed in Appendix C of this report.

The Committee provided feedback on the day, the planning team reviewed the next steps, and the meeting ended with citizen input.

**Meeting #4**

Many significant activities took place between the third and the fourth meetings. The planning team prepared an updated list of Action Items for the six Objectives based on the work of the Committee in the first three meetings, and invited the public and CDACs across the state to provide feedback on those Action Items via surveys. The Committee members also provided their input on the Action Item list, and reviewed the summary results of the surveys as “pre-work” for the fourth meeting.

The fourth meeting started with Bob Nack from the DNR discussing the overall steps in the process. During the fourth meeting, the Committee was tasked with discussing, preparing and prioritizing a final
recommended list of Action Items, including those from the original plan the Committee wanted to bring to the future, and any new ones from CDAC input.

Ben Beardmore from the DNR presented summary results from the survey taken by the Review Committee, and the results of the CDAC input provided by 68 counties. He highlighted areas of similarities and differences between the importance placed by the Review Committee on various Action Items, and the support or opposition from the CDACs. The CDAC input was broken down by different groups of counties.

The Committee members reviewed and discussed the CDAC input, identified new Action Items to add, and modified some of the original Action Items. After considerable discussion and taking the CDAC input into account, the Review Committee settled on a final version of the language and composition of recommended Action Items across all six Objectives.

The original 2010-2025 CWD Plan contained 6 Objectives and 27 Action Items. The Review Committee did not modify the total number of Objectives, or their reference numbers. However, the addition of new Action Items, modification of some of the original ones and prioritization of all Action Items resulted in changes to the reference numbers for Action Items within each Objective from the 2010-2025 Plan.

Citizens present at the meeting were requested to provide their input. One citizen provided input in person, and email input from two others was read aloud by one Committee member.

After the citizen input, the facilitator discussed the process of voting and prioritizing the Action Items. The Review Committee was composed of representatives from many stakeholders, each of whom brought its own unique perspective to the table. To identify where the collective priorities of the Review Committee lay, the facilitator asked each Review Committee member to mark his/her individual top priority Action Items using dots. The voting resulted in identifying the collective priorities given by the Review Committee to various Action Items for each Objective. The voting process and the prioritized list are presented in the “Objectives and Recommended Action Items” section of this report. 

Next, the Committee members provided their feedback and reflections on the overall process and interactions of the Committee. Bob Nack discussed the timeline for the next steps, and thanked the Committee members for their hard work.

Appendix D of this report provides additional details of the fourth meeting.
Appendix A: Notes - Meeting #1

Meeting #1 Agenda (Oct 27, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:40</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 – 10:20</td>
<td>Objectives &amp; Committee charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 – 10:50</td>
<td>Process, roles &amp; timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 – 11:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>Background / overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 2:30</td>
<td>CWD expert speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 2:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:15</td>
<td>Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 3:45</td>
<td>Citizen input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:00</td>
<td>Next steps; Feedback; Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

The first meeting of the Wisconsin CWD Response Plan Review Committee was held on October 27, 2016 at the Lussier Family Heritage Center in Madison, Wisconsin. A list of attendees is provided at the end of these notes.

Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief, with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) opened the meeting and provided an overview of the day’s agenda and the Committee’s planned work. Next came introductory remarks from the leaders of the three sponsors of the Committee - Deputy Secretary Kurt Thiede from DNR, Dr. Paul Mcgraw from the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), and Larry Bonde, Chairman of the Wisconsin Conservation Congress (WCC).

Committee Objectives and Charge

- Engage key stakeholder organizations and resource agencies interested in wild and captive ungulate herd health monitoring and management to review the 2010-2025 Wisconsin CWD Response Plan and to develop CWD recommendations for the next 5 years.
  - Review and recommend CWD response plan goal and objectives
  - Review and recommend CWD action items for each objective
  - Suggest new CWD action items for the next 5 years.
  - Review feedback from the public through County Deer Advisory Councils on proposed revisions and make a final recommendation to committee sponsors.

In its work, the Committee will consider the current interest shown and input provided by multiple stakeholders and organizations across the state, including Governor Walker’s CWD initiatives, legislators, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation, Wisconsin Conservation Congress’s biosecurity plan, Spring hearing county resolutions, and Tribes.
Process and Timeline

The diagram below shows the timing of the four planned Committee meetings:

After the 3rd meeting on December 12, 2016, public comments will be sought during a 2-week period on committee recommendations, and will be summarized for the County Deer Advisory Council (CDACs). This feedback will be included in the Committee’s discussions during the 4th and the final meeting.

Deliverables

- Preliminary recommendations after 3 meetings, to make available for public comment
- Final report provided by the Committee to the Sponsor Team (DNR, DATCP, WCC)
- Final report presented to the Natural Resources Board (NRB) on March 1, 2017.

Roles and responsibilities

- The Committee members are expected to represent their organization / agency, complete all pre-meeting assignments, attend and actively participate in meetings, and review and provide timely comments on meeting notes. The Committee will focus on identifying “What” is important.
- CDACs will conduct the public meetings in January, and provide timely feedback on Committee recommendations.
- The Sponsor Team will decide “How” to best accomplish the recommendations of the Committee.
- The independent facilitator will conduct meeting facilitation, gather and summarize notes, prepare material for public comment, and prepare the final report.

History of CWD in Wisconsin

Julie Widholm from the DNR provided a brief history of CWD in Wisconsin, and the 2010-2025 Response Plan’s six objectives, twenty-four action items, other influences on CWD during 2010-2015, and key successes and challenges during 2010-2015.

External Expert Speakers

Three expert speakers presented their research and answered questions from the Committee and the audience:
• Dr. Margaret Wild, DVM, PhD, Chief Wildlife Veterinarian, National Park Service, Biological Resources Division, Wildlife Health Branch, Fort Collins, CO.
• Dr. Michael Samuel, Professor of Wildlife Ecology, Assistant Unit Leader, USGS BRD, Wisconsin Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.
• Dr. Nick Haley, DVM, PhD, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Midwestern University – Glendale, AZ.

Slides of their presentation were made available to the Committee members.

Reflections
Following the presentations and Q&A with the three expert speakers, the facilitator asked the Committee members to reflect on what stood out to them from the day’s discussion, including any observations, new information, questions, ideas, etc. Many reflections focused on the need for further research, and included:

1. There are opportunities to try new things, though some of them might not have social acceptance.
2. There is a need for additional research in genetics resistance for captive cervid population, though this is a longer term proposition. There is also a need to find a short term solution to decrease the spread of CWD.
3. We need more research on the effect of CWD on wild and captive populations; this is particularly important to the captive industry.
4. More funding for vaccine research is needed.
5. We need to educate public and the hunters about news, research, publications etc. re: CWD, and the diversity of views and opinions related to it.
6. We need to continue to be adaptive, and to continue the research.
7. Need to research how bodily fluids of infected deer affect forage crops, and whether forage crops can facilitate in the spread of CWD if crops are transported outside of a CWD affected area.
8. A lot of people are calling for more research when the funding has declined.
9. The initial CWD plan was good but was not accepted by public. Now, we are back to trying to develop a plan that will work and will be accepted. We need creative ways to find resources for research and to support initiatives.
10. We need to prioritize our risk levels for this complex disease which has no simple answers. We might need short term concessions for the longer term sustainability.
11. Scientists tell us that this is a complex issue with no simple solutions or a “silver bullet.”
12. We seem to have come full circle in our management techniques – we began with a “buck only” approach, now we are back to “buck only”. We need to work with nature and genetics. We had excellent scientific presentations, and need to combine millions of years of evolution with science to find a solution.
13. It is necessary to adapt management strategies over time, though that makes it difficult to compare prevalence since management strategies are changing.
14. There is a trend for lesser testing for hunter-harvested deer.
15. Liked the level of expertise, knowledge and concern shown by the speakers, and Committee members about the current and future handling of CWD.

16. CWD does not seem to be having a detrimental effect on the CWD Zone. We don’t want to go back to the heavy-handed management of the Zone.

17. Minimum standards should be set for sampling all parts of the state, which should be developed without budgetary constraints. Budget, economic and social impacts of CWD prevalence should be part of planning goals, alternatives and impacts. Informing and educating hunters and wildlife enthusiasts about the impacts of CWD should be a priority.

**Citizen Input**

Following the Reflections, citizens present at the meeting had an opportunity to provide input; they were asked to follow specific guidelines, presented later in these notes. Three citizens provided input and asked questions:
1. A representative of the Humane Society provided written input.
2. A citizen and local hunter expressed concern about observing high degree of CWD in their area, and suggested that the DNR should incentivize testing.
3. Another citizen requested to see research that has been conducted on the hazards of consuming a CWD infected deer.

**Follow-up Items**

During the meeting, the Committee members identified various follow-up items, listed below:
1. Provide a list of Committee members, to the Committee members.
2. Shares slides presented by DNR and the experts at the meeting.
3. Provide summary information on the total expense of CWD management, the sources of funds used, and the impact of CWD management expenses related the overall budget for the Wildlife Management program.
4. Provide a copy of the external expert report that pre-empted the CWD response plan.
5. How much CWD funding has been cut since 2007?
6. Provide a map of captive herds and those with CWD positives in Wisconsin.

**List of meeting attendees and participants**

The October 27, 2016 meeting was attended by the following primary Committee members (in alphabetical order by first name):
1. Amanda Falch, Wildlife Rehabilitation Advisory Council
2. Ben Johnson, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
3. Bill McCrary, Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
4. Bruce Krueger, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
5. Dan Barr, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
7. James Lanier, Quality Deer Management Association
8. Kim Pokorny, Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
9. Larry Bonde, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
10. Laurie Seale, Whitetails of Wisconsin
11. Mike Riggle, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
12. Mike Spors, Whitetails Unlimited
13. Mitch King, Archery Trade Association
15. Rebecca Osborne, Wisconsin Department of Health Services
16. Tony Grabski, Sporting Heritage Council
17. Julie Widholm, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Secondary Committee members in attendance included:
- Joel Espe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
- Jerome Donohoe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association

Stakeholder groups that weren’t in attendance:
- Safari Club International- Wisconsin Chapter
- Wisconsin Department of Tourism
- Wisconsin Association of Meat Processors
- Chippewa tribes/GLIFWC

The DNR staff who attended the meeting included:
- Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief
- Kevin Wallenfang, Deer & Elk Ecologist
- Maggie Stewart, Assistant Big Game Ecologist
- Ben Beardmore, Social Scientist
- Peter Dunn, Captive Wildlife Administrative Warden

Natural Resource Board members in attendance:
- Greg Kazmierski

Invited CWD expert speakers were (in order of speech):
- Dr. Margaret Wild, National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado
- Dr. Mike Samuel, Wisconsin Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Madison, Wisconsin
- Dr. Nick Hailey, Midwestern University, Glendale, Arizona

The following citizens signed in for the meeting:
- Ken Koscik
- Melissa Tedrowe
- Simon Legal

Independent facilitation support for the meeting was provided by Credens LLC.
Guidelines for Citizen Input

The following Guidelines were shared with the Citizens in writing and orally:

“Thank you for your attendance and participation at today’s Chronic Wasting Disease Response Plan Review Committee meeting sponsored by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the Department of Trade, Agriculture, and Consumer Protection (DATCP), and the Wisconsin Conservation Congress (WCC). This Committee will review current plan goals, objectives and action items, and suggest new actions to guide CWD management efforts.

We request fellow citizens to review and adhere to the following guidelines:

1. This is a working meeting of the Committee, and similar to a county board meeting or other official meetings, the public is not permitted to interject at will.
2. The Committee values input from citizens, and its agenda today includes a specific time (3:15 – 3:45 PM) for citizens to provide their input to the Committee. Citizens who wish to speak during the designated time will be asked to:
   a. Fill out a contact card;
   b. Indicate to the facilitator (raise their hand or other signal) that they wish to speak;
   c. Be first recognized by the facilitator before speaking;
   d. Take turns when providing input, if multiple citizens wish to speak since only one person will have the floor at a time;
   e. Provide written input on the contact card if the designated time runs out.
3. Each citizen will have up to 3 minutes to provide input. The time limit is placed so that other citizens have time to provide their input.
4. Committee members may ask clarifying questions to citizens, as necessary. Citizens are requested to provide their input without engaging in a debate or argument with Committee members, guest speakers or other citizens. Those engaging in inappropriate behavior may be asked to leave the meeting.

Your adherence to these guidelines will help the Committee work through complex discussions, encourage public participation, and lead to a respectful exchange of ideas and information.”
Appendix B: Notes - Meeting #2

Meeting #2 Agenda (Nov 14, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:30</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit Template B (pre-work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation plan &amp; steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange input from pre-work (Template B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 12:30</td>
<td>Discuss input from pre-work (Template B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00</td>
<td>Discuss comments on Objective 4 (Template A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 3:15</td>
<td>Discuss comments on Objective 5 (Template A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 3:45</td>
<td>Citizen input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:00</td>
<td>Next steps; Feedback; Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

The second meeting of the Wisconsin CWD Response Plan Review Committee was held on November 14, 2016 at the Lussier Family Heritage Center in Madison, Wisconsin. A list of attendees and the agenda are provided later in these notes.

Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief, with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) opened the meeting and provided an overview of the day’s agenda.

Following up on questions from the first meeting, Tami Ryan, Wildlife Health Section Chief from DNR reviewed the Department’s deer necropsy policy. Bob Nack then discussed the web page (http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/wildlifehabitat/cwdplan.html) where the Committee meeting materials are available. CDAC will be asked to comment on the preliminary output of the Committee after the 3rd meeting, and then the Committee will take the CDAC comments into account while finalizing its recommendations and priorities in the 4th meeting. The final report will be distributed electronically via email and will be available on the public web site. He also discussed the invitations sent out to Native American Tribes.

Meeting Plan

Continuing with the overall approach, the Committee members had been asked to do “pre-work” as preparation for the Committee meeting on November 14, as shown in the diagram below. They had been asked to read the 2010-2015 CWD Response Plan, and to identify their comments on the current six Objectives and associated Action Items using Template A, as well as to identify new Action Items they would like to suggest using Template B (copies of both provided later in these notes).

The morning session focused on identifying new Action Items suggested by the participating organizations, and the afternoon session focused on comments on the current Action Items. This sequencing facilitated alignment of the new Action Items with the current Action Items.
Each participating organization was asked to offer up to 2 new Action Items per Objective. The diagram below shows how the input from Templates A and B was sought from each participating organization during the meetings, and how it would be incorporated in the final report.

Process for 2nd & 3rd Meetings

Meeting #1
- Pre-work

Meeting #2
- Introductions, Process steps
  - Submit filled Template B
  - Up to 2 new Action Items per Objective per Organization

Template B
- Arrange NEW Action Items
  - Arrange new Action Items (AI) in the 6 Objectives
  - Parking lot for any remaining

Template B
- Discuss new Action Items
  - Organization by organization: Each presents all its new AI (up to 5 minutes total per Organization)
  - Rearrange new AI in 6 Objectives as needed

Template A
- Discuss Comments on CURRENT Action Items
  - Objective by objective
  - Each organization presents its comments (up to 2 minutes per Objective)
  - Continue in Meeting #3

Meeting #3
- PRE-Work
  - Details to be announced

Template A
- CONTINUE... Discuss Comments on Current Action Items
  - Objective by objective
  - Each organization presents its comments (up to 2 minutes per Objective)

Review & prioritize ALL input
- Objective by objective
- Prioritize Current + new Action Items
- No AI will be removed at this stage

CDAC input
- Finalize and prioritize Objectives & Action Items

Meeting #4
- Final Report

Committee
- Template A
- Template B

Template B
- Template A
- Template B

CDAC input
New Action Items Suggested

The following participating organizations suggested new Action Items using Template B:

1. ATA = Archery Trade Association
2. DATCP = Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection
3. DHS = Wisconsin Department of Health Services
4. DT = Wisconsin Department of Tourism
5. SHC = Sporting Heritage Council
6. WBHA = Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
7. WCC = Wisconsin Conservation Congress
8. WCDEFA = Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
9. WRAC = Wildlife Rehabilitation Advisory Council
10. WU = Whitetails Unlimited
11. WVDL = Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
12. WVMA = Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
13. WW = Whitetails of Wisconsin
14. WWF = Wisconsin Wildlife Federation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>New Action Item Suggested</th>
<th>By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No new Action Items proposed</td>
<td>DATCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No new Action Items proposed</td>
<td>WBHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No new Action Items proposed</td>
<td>WVDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No new Action Items proposed</td>
<td>WW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>Consider funding from more reliable sources – additional fees for hunting licenses, wildlife management vehicle registration, taxes on outdoor activities, etc.</td>
<td>DHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>Increase funding</td>
<td>WBHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>Increase funding, explore new sources such as taxes on outdoor equipment, licenses, grants from NGOs and other national groups</td>
<td>WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING</td>
<td>Increase funding for monitoring and testing</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regulate the use of cervid urine-based scent products for hunting to only those products for which documented evidence exists that they have met industry best management practices designed to reduce the potential for those products contributing to the spread of CWD</td>
<td>ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trigger automatic response plan when CWD is detected in a captive cervid operation, including electric fences, addressing escapes; establish a timeline from when detections occur and when actions are taken;</td>
<td>WCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Double fencing of farms to prevent nose to nose contact; place high priority on limiting disease spread in the state</td>
<td>WRAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Place double fencing at all cervid farms where CWD has been detected, and maintain until DNR and others confirm the land is clean</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decide which is more appropriate - localized or state-wide monitoring</td>
<td>ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ban rehabilitation of deer with unknown CWD status</td>
<td>DHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Add elks to monitoring and surveillance programs – elk reintroduction plans do</td>
<td>WCDEFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>New Action Item Suggested</td>
<td>By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase sampling efforts and research funding, even through increased license fees</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Engage farmers in this discussion – agriculture is a very large and important industry in the state</td>
<td>WVMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create new hunting regulations in neighboring counties (exterior boundaries)</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The DNR and DATCP will maintain and report every three years all related costs associated with CWD management including surveillance, monitoring, research, implementation and enforcement costs as well as sources of funds used and partner inputs.</td>
<td>ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calculate ROI (return on investment) from expenses related to CWD monitoring</td>
<td>ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Focus on what needs to be done before placing limitations on actions due to budget</td>
<td>ATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase communication with public by messaging via electronic registration, adding more messages about not consuming CWD infected deer</td>
<td>DHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Take a marketing / PR perspective – inform public about the hunting season, the associated revenue and size of the industry, dispel the notion that CWD only exists in Wisconsin</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DNR should increase transparency in giving information to the public about CWD</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve food pantry program by designing a method to facilitate deer donation directly from hunter to recipients.</td>
<td>SHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide a tax reduction or monetary incentives to private land owners to improve access to hunting land, since most hunting land in the state is privately owned</td>
<td>SHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Create pilot programs for CWD test kids for hunters; involve vendors in giving out sampling kits</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide a better and more specific action plan based on science for detection to support the $1 billion industry</td>
<td>WCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conduct endemic zone research re: how deer density affects counties, nutrition changes and CWD prevalence, particularly around the Wisconsin river basins</td>
<td>WDEFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conduct an economic study on the value of the deer herd to the State of Wisconsin to obtain increased funding from the Legislature to manage CWD</td>
<td>WWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee members also discussed the following items:

1. Comment from WCC – It does not believe there is a good or effective action plan to address CWD in the state. It recommends reorganizing the plan from 6 Objectives to 3 and focusing on how to Prevent, React, and Research.
2. Dan Barr from the Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory answered many technical questions related to how lymph nodes were tested, whether it was a snap test, cost and accuracy of Elisa and IHC tests, USDA regulations about who can test. It was clarified that the state pays for all hunter testing currently.
Reflections

Following the above discussion of new Action Items, the facilitator asked the Committee members to reflect on what stood out to them from the morning’s discussion, including any observations, new information, questions, ideas, etc. The reflections are summarized below in no particular order:

1. Currently, weighted surveillance methods are used to monitor CWD across the state, and the current protocols are the best way in the nation to get information on CWD spread.

2. Deer farms are highly regulated. Need to focus on farms that have tested positive, and not on farms where CWD has not been detected. Need to have a better plan for controlling the spread, and not just testing.

3. CWD is a state-wide issue, and not limited just to farms. Need to communicate positive messages about how everyone has contributed ideas in a collaborative manner. Need to be careful about how any “fee increases to solve a problem” are communicated.

4. Need more funding and need to communicate that cervid farms are not a vector for diseases, that it is not a “farm” issue.

5. Improve funding, and encourage more testing sites / self-sampling kits to improve research data.

6. Hunters need more information on how to get animals tested, and how to donate to food pantries

7. Fencing improvements and maintenance are important but double fencing is not necessarily important.

8. Need to obtain input from representative farmers through CDAC, and share findings with this Committee.

9. Need more aggressive goals – there seems to be a disconnect between the goals and what is possible. How can public support for funding be increased? Goals should be more realistic and achievable.

10. Double or electric fencing for positive captive farms makes sense but not for all farms in the state where CWD has not been detected.

11. Utilize cervid farms as a resource for research data since they are highly regulated.

12. Utilize SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic, Time-related) and be realistic about funding

13. Focus on the big picture and not just on the farms

14. The elk reintroduced in WI should be tested before introduction, even if they come from CWD free states. Current plan does not mention CWD testing for elks.

Comment from another member – USDA regulations need to be met, and CWD testing is not required currently; there are no validated tests for live animals, only for post-mortem tests.

15. Website maps should reinforce the positive messages about hunting. Current maps designate counties as CWD affected even if they do not have CWD, due to bans on baiting and feeding. The map should differentiate counties with CWD in wild deer, CWD in captive herd(s), and baiting and feeding ban. “CWD affected counties” is too general and gives the false impression that all of these counties have had CWD positive deer. CWD has been around since 1960s, and there is no evidence of transmission to humans or livestock, though the speculative language since 2002 has increased fear.
16. Use social media / apps to help hunters find private land to hunt and those who want to donate deer.

17. Do not let the current budget drive the plan. First identify what is needed, and then determine how much funding is needed.

18. Understand the efficacy of current weighted surveillance. Do not assume that the deer farms caused the spread outside the farm.

19. Currently, there is deficiency in marketing to hunters and the community. The industry affects everyone, not just the hunters.

20. Erecting fences does not solve the problem. We need increased inspection of deer farms, and mandatory inspected of fences. Require “open gate” alarms.

21. Need research on deer/predator relationships and the uptake of prions in forage, since it could spread CWD in Wisconsin and outside.

22. What is the revenue from antler-less surcharge?
   Answer: last year, there were over 58,000 bonus tags generating about $295,000.

23. We need to stop finger pointing to cervid farms. When a positive test is confirmed in a non-CWD area, fences should go up. We need to use best practices in managing captive cervids.

24. We need to take action when captives endanger wild herds – we need to manage the “escape” issue. Let the farmers manage their herds, which are already highly regulated.

25. We need to be careful about positive messaging – the public needs to know that the risks from CWD are not zero.

26. Tie testing requirements to actionable plans – focus on the boundary, and not on the center if testing is not going to change the action plans. This disease will stay for a while.

27. Treat the industry like the $1 billion industry it is, and use social media to make public aware of it.

28. Make venison donation easy for hunters.

29. If wildlife rehabilitators who are concerned about CWD and its spread are not allowed to rehabilitate deer, the public could do so itself. If that happens, it will be difficult to regulate the potential spread of CWD through such fawns. Need more specific plan for new detections – when a county tests positive, there is no specific plan and timeframe.

30. A key challenge is – how to engage hunters across the state in this conversation?

**Comments on Current Objectives & Action Items**

The afternoon session focused on soliciting comments from the Committee members on the current 2010-2015 CWD Response Plan. Committee members were asked to refer to Template A, which they completed as part of the pre-work. The comments summarized below comprise a comprehensive list provided by the Committee members and represent committee consensus.

Even though the initial meeting plan scope included only Objectives #4 and 5 for this meeting, the Committee worked efficiently and covered Objectives #4, 5 and 6.

Objectives #1, 2 and 3 will be covered in the 3rd meeting.
Objective #4: Increase Public Recognition and Understanding of CWD Risks and Public Participation in Disease Control Efforts

(a) Human dimension of CWD management

Action Item:
Working with a professional communication firm, the DNR will use group interviews and survey data to better understand public opinions about CWD management and to develop, test, and refine messages and delivery mechanisms that enhance public understanding about CWD and the long-term threat the disease poses to Wisconsin. The DNR will utilize this information to develop communication strategies that attempt to overcome the barriers to deer herd reduction and accessibility to land for deer removal.

Committee comments:
1. This is a key to success, though it has been under-prioritized and under-budgeted to date. We need to work on this item.
2. Under-prioritization is related to the aggressive approach used initially, which the public did not like and which had legislative push back. There is increased interest today, and we must take advantage of it. We must provide current status updates and research updates to engage the public, and use social media and press releases when CWD is newly detected in counties. DNR needs to tell the hunters what needs to be done, to prevent further spread of CWD.
3. We need to clearly define “Public” – it should include every citizen regardless of whether they hunt or not.
4. In 2010, DNR hired a marketing firm, though CWD was in its infancy at that time and it was difficult to engage the public. This complex disease is hard to understand for general public, and we need public group engagement at the grass roots level, which goes beyond marketing.
5. Messaging should be collaborative, with the state and private organizations working together. Different audience groups will need customized messages, all part of a consistent overall narrative.
6. Recommend the Committee watch “truth about CWD” on Youtube. We need something similar.
7. Consider rephrasing the action item to make them more updated. For example, rephrase the last sentence of the Action Item as “The DNR will use this information to support the implementation of this response plan.”

(b) Monitoring changes in public opinion

Action Item:
To assess the impacts of outreach and education efforts, the DNR will conduct scientific behavioral and attitudinal studies of hunters, landowners, and Wisconsin residents in general on a regular basis, especially in response to a change in management strategy.

Committee comments:
1. Current Action Item is too broadly stated. We need to think about how the public perception will be sampled, to ensure that the sample is representative of our population, and that we
understand our population segments and audience. We also need to define how the impact of
the plan will be measured and quantified?
2. We need to balance public opinion with actual impact of management changes, especially when
unpopular management changes bring desired results. That might require engaging the public
even more.
3. Ensure that the target populations for Action Items (a) and (b) are defined consistently.
4. Deer are a public resource, on private land, and managing them is complex. We need to get
support from the private land owners and the general public, and the legislators.
5. We need to get the press to report accurately about the status, actions, etc., and balance the
positive and negative messages.
6. This issue is beyond just DNR – we need to engage other agencies. There may be some
statutory limitations that affect what actions can be taken.
7. We need to clarify how agencies beyond DNR would be involved in Action Items or
recommendations whose scope goes beyond DNR.
8. We need to emphasize the message that the public should not consumer CWD positive deer,
and should encourage testing before consumption. It was noted that persuasive messages are
sent out currently done in counties affected by CWD.

Objective #5: Address the Needs of Our Customers

(a) Hunter service testing

Action Item:
The DNR will insure that hunters have continued access to CWD testing in areas with the highest
prevalence of CWD. The DNR will explore alternative strategies for reducing or recovering costs and/or
privatizing this program such as developing programs that would allow hunters to collect their own
samples or charging testing fees to partially cover costs of sample collection and testing. The DNR also
will support efforts to develop quicker and less expensive sampling and testing procedures.

Committee comments:
1. Testing should be optional and free in areas known to be CWD positive, but in surveillance
   areas, testing should be random and mandatory because CWD designation has consequences.
   In areas with no surveillance, and which have not tested CWD positive, testing should be
   optional with payment by consumers.
2. We need to consider if having separate criteria for mandatory and voluntary testing would
   influence where hunters go to hunt.
   Some Committee members responded that hunters typically stay in their hunting grounds and
do not move around.
3. Requiring random testing can delay meat processing for deer sent for testing. Rendering has to
   be delayed till results come in.
   Committee members discussed various aspects of testing associated with meat processing.
(b) Donation of venison to food pantries

Action Item:
The DNR, through the Wildlife Damage Abatement and Claims Program, and in conjunction with local and community organizations, will cooperate with food pantries and meat processors in the CWD Management Zone to provide hunters an avenue for donation of harvested deer in excess of their personal needs. The DNR will actively market the pantry program to encourage an increase in hunter harvest. The DNR will partner with others to seek funding from nongovernmental organizations to help offset the costs of processing and storing donated venison.

There were no substantial comments from the Committee for this Action Item.

(c) Deer carcass disposal assistance

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to work with local governments, landfill operators, and municipal wastewater treatment facilities to increase their understanding of the safety and cost-effectiveness of landfilling deer in order to increase the availability of landfills for carcass disposal. The DNR will continue to offer indemnification to landfills that accept CWD positive carcasses and waste.

Committee comments:
1. Landfilling was a big issue initially, and it still continues to be a big issue. Haulers are still concerned about it.
2. Landfill is a less expensive option; incineration and chemical digestion are too expensive.
3. Municipalities have more responsibilities now for collection of car-killed deer. There is an option to leave the deer where it died, especially if the county already has tested CWD positive.
4. Leachate from landfills has to be managed. Waste water treatment facilities are more concerned about leachate from the waste stream.
5. Car-kill carcasses in surveillance areas should be tested to increase random sampling for detection of new/expanding infections. Providing hotline for reporting car-killed deer in targeted surveillance areas can also help.

(d) Monitoring for human prion diseases

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to cooperate with DHS to maintain the registry of persons known to have consumed venison from CWD-positive deer. The DNR will monitor and support research to better assess the risks that CWD may pose to humans. The DNR will continue to provide hunters with information on ways to reduce risks when field dressing and butchering deer.

Committee comments:
1. Is there enough information to date to get correlation between human and CWD?
2. DHS’ plans to continue surveillance among humans go beyond 2025, since prion diseases are slow to develop and manifest.
3. There is a federally funded project at Fort Sam Houston University to study CWD and its effects on humans.
4. Some statistics exist, though no correlation has been shown between consumption of infected deer and CJD.
5. CWD is a “young” disease, and it has very high concentration in Wisconsin. While the risk to humans might be low based on historical data, it is not zero.

**(e) Investigating potential risk to livestock**

**Action Item:**
The DNR will support and cooperate with research to better assess the risks that CWD may pose over time to livestock, including farmed cervids.

**Committee comments:**
1. Currently, tissue banks from tests exist and DNR is willing to cooperate as opportunities come up. DNR has not been approached by the livestock industry. The Farm Bureau had been invited to the Committee, but did not respond.
2. Whitetails Unlimited is supporting a study in Spring Green, WI and elsewhere in the US.

**Objective #6: Enhance the scientific information about CWD**

**Action Item:**
The DNR will continue to cooperate with outside researchers by sharing tissues and data and may initiate research when appropriate. The DNR will continue to: develop methods for assessing the progression of CWD; seek funding to support applied, management-focused research on CWD; and promote research into prion biology that may, in time lead to effective procedures for prevention and/or treatment of CWD in deer and decontamination of environments.

**Committee comments:**
1. Dr. Haley, one of the experts who presented his research in the 1st meeting, mentioned that he had reached out to DNR but had not received tissue and data.
2. Not all research is good or the same – we need to keep in mind whether the research has been peer-reviewed and repeated, and need to pay attention to the “discussion” portion of research publications.
3. We need to check if the research might be flawed and if the source can be trusted.
4. Does the DNR have a game plan about research re: CWD? Is the DNR willing to consider different alternatives?
   Response: DNR is always looking ahead, identifying funding and partners, and focused on increasing research capacity.
5. Does the DNR have new search to help the Committee?
   Response from another member: The new SE study is good, and will provide valuable information. We should consider more genetic reporting, and external oversight beyond DNR to increase credibility of the research results.
6. More research into forage uptake and scavenger uptake is needed.
7. DNR should maintain a database of all research that has been done, along with summaries and evaluation of such research.
8. Evaluate the financial / economic impact of the Wisconsin deer herd on the state economy.
9. Need more research collaboration; a lot of research has already been done in the cervid industry.

Feedback on the Day
The Committee members provided the following feedback on how they thought the day went:

1. It was hard to hear the conversation at the back of the room, so a microphone would be helpful.
2. The openness of the group is very helpful
3. Sharing of different expertise in the room is interesting and beneficial
4. The system with the templates worked well
5. Very well organized, and good job, different opinions have been well managed
6. Why did we not start with Objective #1?
   Response: the planning team chose to start with #4, which is relatively easier than others. This would allow everyone on the Committee to become familiar with the process, before getting into complex items.
7. Happy that there was not any finger pointing
8. Time management has been great
9. Email a presentation or brief on monitoring across the state, to the Committee.

Follow-up Items
The Committee discussed some follow-up items / suggestions during the day:

1. Clarify if monitoring goals are feasible. Is the whole state being covered via monitoring? Could DNR make a brief presentation or share some information? (assigned to DNR)
2. Provide more background on food safety procedures (assigned to DATCP)
3. More details on the Food Pantry program (assigned to DHS)
4. Involvement with radio-collared testing of deer in endemic areas (assigned to DNR)

Citizen Input
Following the discussion above, citizens present at the meeting had an opportunity to provide input; they were asked to follow specific guidelines, which were read aloud by the facilitator (included in the notes from the 1st meeting). One citizen provided input:

- Thanks to the committee. This is very important work. My family owns land in southern Sauk County, and has a stake in what comes out of committee’s work.
- We have two requests:
  - We would like a well-documented study of the economic benefits of deer and deer hunting, which should be shared with the legislators. The state invested money into the Milwaukee Bucks and we need to the same for real bucks;
Research indicates that the frequency of contact between deer is important for contracting the disease. What incentives exist for removing CWD positive deer from the land? Removal of 40% of CWD population can have a good effect and we need to figure how to make that happen.

List of meeting attendees and participants

The November 14, 2016 meeting was attended by the following primary Committee members (by first name):

1. Amanda Falch, Wildlife Rehabilitation Advisory Council
2. Bill McCrary, Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
3. Bruce Krueger, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
4. Dan Barr, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
5. Drew Nussbaum, Wisconsin Department of Tourism
7. Harry Mattox, Safari Club International – Wisconsin Chapter
8. James Lanier, Quality Deer Management Association
9. Kim Pokorny, Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
10. Larry Bonde, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
11. Mike Riggle, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
12. Mike Spors, Whitetails Unlimited
13. Mitch King, Archery Trade Association
15. Rebecca Osborne, Wisconsin Department of Health Services
16. Rick Vojtik, Whitetails of Wisconsin
17. Tony Grabski, Sporting Heritage Council
18. Tami Ryan, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Secondary Committee members that were in attendance

- Al Shook, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
- Amy Horn-Delzer, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
- Ben Johnson, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
- Dan Forester, Archery Trade Association
- Jerome Donohoe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
- Joel Espe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
- Ralph Fritsch, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation

Stakeholder groups that were not in attendance:

- Wisconsin Association of Meat Processors
- Chippewa tribes/GLIFWC
The DNR staff who attended the meeting included:

- Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief
- Kevin Wallenfang, Deer & Elk Ecologist
- Maggie Stewart, Assistant Big Game Ecologist
- Ben Beardmore, Social Scientist
- Peter Dunn, Captive Wildlife Administrative Warden

Natural Resource Board members in attendance:

- Greg Kazmierski

The following citizens signed in for the meeting:

- Tom Hague
- Melissa Tedrowe

Independent facilitation support for the meeting was provided by Credens LLC.
Templates A and B

2010-2025 CWD Response Plan Review Committee Meeting #2

Dear Committee Member,

We request your input on two things:

1. Comments on or suggested changes to the current Action Items for the six Objectives in the 2010-2025 CWD Response Plan (see list below) – Please use Template A for your comments; and,

2. Any new Action Items you’d like to suggest (no more than 2 new Action Items per Objective) – Please use Template B for your suggestions and submit it at the start of the Nov 14 meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010-2025 Plan OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objective 1: Prevent new introductions of CWD | •Carcass Movement  
•Wild Deer Herds  
•Baiting & Feeding of Deer  
•Farmed Cervid Regulations  
•Farmed Cervid Escapes  
•Farmed Cervid Testing and Depopulation of Infected Farms |
| Objective 2: Monitor for & respond to new CWD disease foci | •Statewide Surveillance  
•Surveillance Response to New Foci  
•Management Response to New Foci |
| Objective 3: Control distribution & intensity of CWD | •Hunting Season Structure  
•Landowner Permits  
•Sharpshooting  
•Monitoring Disease Trends & Patterns  
•CWD Zone Deer Population Monitoring  
•Collaborate with Illinois  
•Conduct Reviews after the 2015, 2020, & 2025 Deer Hunting Seasons  
•Additional Days of Gun-Hunting Opportunity  
•AdditionalFocusedSharpshooting  
•Additional Tools |
| Objective 4: Increase public recognition & understanding of CWD risks and public participation in disease control efforts | •Human Dimensions of CWD Management  
•Monitoring Changes in Public Opinion |
| Objective 5: Address the needs of our customers | •Hunter Service Testing  
•Donation of Venison to Food Pantries  
•Deer Carcass Disposal Assistance  
•Monitoring for Human Prion Diseases  
•Investigating Potential Risk to Livestock |
| Objective 6: Enhance the scientific information about CWD | •Collaborative research and funding |
Committee Member Input:

Template A (for comments on CURRENT Action Items)

Your name: ________________________________

Organization: ________________________________

Please use this template to write your organization’s comments on the Current Action Items in the 2010-2015 Plan. You will be asked to share them during the Nov 14, 2016 meeting. Please use the Objectives and Action Items listed on the previous page for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010-2025 Plan Objective #</th>
<th>Current Action Item</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Member Input:

Template B (for suggesting NEW Action Items)

Your name: ________________________________________________________________

Organization: ______________________________________________________________

Check the gray box on the right if you think the 2010-2025 Plan does NOT need any NEW Action Items. Your work for this Template is complete!

Otherwise, please use this template to identify up to two NEW Action Items (if any) your organization would like to recommend in each of the 6 Objectives of the 2010-2025 Plan. Given the size of the Committee, the number of Objectives, and the limited time frame, each organization should focus on no more than 2 new Action Items per Objective. (If you identify more, you’ll need to pick your top two).

Please make copies of this template – each NEW proposed Action Item should be on a different sheet.

Please check the identified Objective for which you are submitting a new Action Item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check below</th>
<th>2010-2025 Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevent new introductions (Objective 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor for and respond to new disease foci (Objective 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control distribution and intensity of CWD (Objective 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase public recognition and understanding of CWD risks and public participation in disease control effort (Objective 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing the needs of our customers (Objective 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance the scientific information about CWD (Objective 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write brief specific language for your suggested new Action Item, and the reason supporting your input:

NEW Action Item: ________________________________________________________________

Reason: _______________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Please submit this template at the start of Meeting #2
Appendix C: Notes - Meeting #3

Meeting #3 Agenda (Dec 12, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>Introductions; Follow-up items; Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Discuss comments on Objective 1 <em>(Template A)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss comments on Objective 2 <em>(Template A)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 12:30</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 1:30</td>
<td>Continue … Objective 2 <em>(Template A)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 2:45</td>
<td>Discuss comments on Objective 3 <em>(Template A)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:00</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 3:30</td>
<td>Citizen input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 – 4:00</td>
<td>Reflections; Next steps; Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction and Meeting Plan

The third meeting of the Wisconsin CWD Response Plan Review Committee was held on December 12, 2016 at the Lussier Family Heritage Center in Madison, Wisconsin. A list of attendees and the agenda are also provided in these notes.

Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief, with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) opened the meeting and provided an overview of the day’s agenda.

Continuing with the overall approach, the Committee members had been asked to do “pre-work” as preparation for the Committee meeting on December 12, as shown in the diagram below. They had been asked to read and provide comments on the notes from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} meeting (held on November 14, 2016) and be prepared to discuss their comments for Objectives #1, 2 and 3 using Template A, on December 12.
Bob Nack from the DNR discussed the steps for the Committee between December and March 2017, as shown in the diagram below.

### Steps

**Meeting #2**
- New Action Items (Obj. 1 – 6)

**Meeting #3**
- Comments (Obj. 1, 2, 3)
  - Updated Draft Table
  - Objectives
    - Original & new Action Items + Comments

**Meeting #4**
- Final Table: Objectives & Action Items
  - Prioritized

**Final Report**
Following up on questions from the second meeting, staff from DNR and DATCP provided information on regulations regarding meat handling at deer processing establishments (they need to be licensed), and on the use of DNR guidelines by Food Pantries. An email response on the topic was read by DATCP staff; the email will be shared with the Committee.

Comments on Current Objectives & Action Items

The afternoon session focused on soliciting comments from the Committee members on Objectives #1, 2 and 3 of the current 2010-2015 CWD Response Plan.

Objective #1: Prevent new introductions of CWD

(a) Carcass movement

Action Item:
The DNR will seek to prevent the movement of whole wild-cervid carcasses and potentially infectious tissues from within the CWD Management Zone into the rest of the state as well as into Wisconsin from other states and provinces that have CWD in wild cervids.

Committee comments:
1. Noted that the CWD Management Zone did not exist currently. This comment is applicable to all references to CWD Management Zone in the current version of the Response Plan.
2. Current DATCP rules pertain to farmed cervids, and there are no current DATCP rules re: movement of wild deer carcass.
3. DNR has rules about carcass movement, including when the deer has been processed enough to move. However, the rules are generally not well known, and the hunters need to be better informed about them. The DNR staff informed the Committee that these rules are very hard to enforce.
4. Hunters could be informed via better outreach, e.g., using prompts during telecheck. However, out of state hunters could still move deer out of state, without knowing the rules.
5. A Committee member suggested that the rules should be clarified further. DNR staff informed the Committee that there were proposed rules re: carcass movement, and the DNR staff had put them on hold for the time being because of the work being done by the Committee.

(b) Wild cervid herds

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to recommend annual statewide deer quotas and seasons designed to keep deer populations at the established population goals for Wisconsin’s deer management units. When deer population goals are reevaluated as part of the statewide unit review process (currently every three years), disease control will be a primary consideration in those units adjacent to the CWD Management Zone.
Committee comments:

1. DNR staff recommended that in the counties that had CWD, the CDAC should be restricted to only recommending maintaining the deer population or decreasing it, and not an increase. The Committee discussed this recommendation, and noted the need to obtain backing from hunters about the “population decrease” goals, and the need to craft the message carefully so as not to hurt hunting in the state. In addition, an objective focused on maintaining or decreasing the deer population would not seem appropriate if only a few CWD positive deer were found in the wild herd.

2. Disease management should be a required discussion item at all CDAC meetings. Expressed a desire to see CDACs engage more actively in deer herd health conversations.

3. In response to a question about how the population goals were set, DNR staff explained the CDAC process that used a variety of metrics, which resulted in recommendations going to DNR and the NRB.

4. Recommended re-evaluating the CWD county model and the definition of “affected” counties. It noted that the research was not definitively clear on whether CWD was frequency dependent or density dependent.

(c) Baiting and feeding of wild cervids

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to encourage the legislature to pursue a statewide ban on the baiting and feeding of all wild cervids to reduce the risk of disease transmission and establishment of CWD and other serious cervid diseases in new areas.

Committee comments:

1. Currently, different rules exist for different counties, causing confusion for hunters and residents, and making it difficult to enforce. The Committee recommended making a state-wide decision re: baiting and feeding, instead of the current patchwork or rules.

2. Some Committee members supported a state-wide ban on baiting and feeding, while some members opposed the ban, citing their support for private property rights. The opponents said that a state-wide ban could lead to deaths in the cold season, particularly in the northern part of the state.

3. Committee members recommended that the ban should not be driven by detection of CWD in farmed cervids.

(d) Farmed cervid regulation

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to build on our cooperative working relationship with DATCP. This will include efforts to work jointly for federal and state funding and to update a Memorandum of Understanding that clearly identifies each agency’s responsibilities and roles.
Committee comments:

1. Recommended updating the MOU based on new research information and input from the Committee.
2. Members commented that farmed cervids are not a threat to the wild herds, unless CWD is detected in the farmed cervids. Once CWD is detected in the farmed cervids, fencing should be improved.

(e) Farmed cervid escapes

Action Item:
The DNR will work to reduce the number of animals escaping from cervid farms by seeking legislative authority for the regulation of all cervid-farm fencing.

Committee comments:

1. When CWD is detected at a farm (and when the rest of the county is not CWD positive), farmers should be required to use double fencing or electric fencing (farmers’ discretion).
2. Currently, DNR has authority of fencing only white tailed deer; while DNR investigates all escapes, it can act only on white tailed deer. Data show that the most common cause of escapes is “unknown” with no damage found to the fence; the second most common cause is “gate left open.” DATCP does not have control over fencing.
3. Members noted that many farms with single fence have not tested CWD positive, though the best practice is to have a double fence.
4. A Committee Member recommended expanding DNR authority for all cervids. DNR bears all expenses related to investigation of escapes.
5. A Committee Member recommended incentives and penalties for farmers to minimize escapes. This would be a joint action item for DNR and DATCP.
6. There is no legal requirement to maintain fence after depopulation of a farm. A Committee Member recommended having double fencing till the depopulation farm was certified CWD-free.
7. While the best form of fencing might be open to debate, the focus should be on separating animals inside and outside the fence.
8. Farmers are willing to work to reduce escapes. Some Committee members recommended seeking more secure gating system, though there was resistance to requiring double gates all around the property.

(f) Farmed cervid testing and depopulation of infected farms

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to work with DATCP and the farmed cervid industry to: increase the compliance with monitoring, testing, record keeping and cervid movement regulations; expedite the depopulation of farms with CWD-positive animals; and minimize the future risk of those depopulated farms to wild and farmed herds by seeking legislative authority to regulate fences of depopulated farms.
Committee comments:
1. Only when farmed cervids test CWD positive should the above recommendations be implemented.
2. Elks pose a very low risk; only 1 farmed elk tested positive in 2003, and it was in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin. Since then, after testing 10,800+ farmed elk (2003-2017), farmed elk in Wisconsin are still at CWD negative status.

Objective #2: Monitor for and Respond to New CWD Disease Foci

(a) Statewide surveillance

Action Item:
The DNR will develop and implement surveillance strategies to detect new foci of CWD outside of the current CWD Management Zone. These strategies will take advantage of the greater surveillance value of clinical suspect deer by encouraging people statewide to report adult deer that exhibit signs consistent with CWD. The approach will also include statewide hunter-harvest based surveillance using weighted approaches that balance efficiency and efficacy.

Committee comments:
1. The comment re: roadkill should apply to areas of surveillance only, and not to all areas.
2. Action item should be driven by what is needed, and not by the available budget.

(b) Surveillance response to new foci

Action Item:
After the detection of a free-ranging CWD positive wild cervids outside of the current CWD Management Zone there will be intensive sampling and testing of wild cervids in at least a ten-mile radius surrounding the new positive to assess the spatial extent and intensity of the outbreak.

Committee comments:
1. When a new detection occurs, action items should require a written response within a specific time frame (e.g., immediately, within 7 days, 30 days, etc.) with very specific tasks and recommendations, engaging CDACs. The timeline and dates should be tightly enforced. The responsibility for this action item should lie with the DNR.
2. All free ranging elk should be included in the surveillance, in addition to deer.

(c) Management response to new foci

Action Item:
If the new focus is in a deer management unit adjacent to the existing CWD Management Zone, then the new focus will be included in a new Management Zone boundary. If the initial assessment outlined in (b) above indicates that an aggressive course of action is warranted for disease management efforts, the DNR will employ localized herd reduction to control the new focus. When local culling is implemented, it will need to be intensive and implemented over a period of many years until the effects and efficacy
can be assessed. Additional existent rules and regulations will go into effect as required by statute and code (deer rehabilitation, baiting and feeding) or as deemed necessary. Ojibwe tribes must be consulted before any action is taken in the ceded territory or on (or adjacent to) reservations that reasonably impacts the Ojibwe harvest right.

Committee comments:
1. A recommendation was made to redefine the “endemic” CWD zone and affected counties.
2. The Committee recommended further defining the terms “aggressive” and “intensive” in the management plan.
3. A recommendation was made to review the Illinois study, since generalized herd reduction or culling might not be the best solution. New research suggests looking at focused culling, instead. Colorado experience suggests that generalized culling could be wasteful.
4. The duration of a CWD designation should be defined, along with criteria that will remove the CWD designation for a county. Surveillance and management response could be used as metrics as input to the criteria discussed above.
5. A recommendation was made to continue surveillance even if no positives were found in an area.
6. Consider rehabilitators as the first line of defense. Rehabilitation of deer was banned till 2014, and the ban has been lifted now. Rehabilitation can help prevent movement of sick deer.
7. DNR should seek additional funding in general for research and monitoring.

Objective #3: Control Distribution and Intensity of CWD

(a) Hunting season structure

Action Item:
The DNR recommends that the 2008 season structure (as described in Appendix A of the Response Plan) be the basic season structure for all units in the CWD Management Zone through 2015. The effectiveness of this structure to at least reach the interim population goals will be assessed at five-year increments and will be modified if results indicate it is insufficient to contribute to population or disease management goals.

Committee comments:
1. The hunting season structure above has not been used. The DNR team identified new tools that could be considered now.
2. Majority of deer are on private land, and not much can be done to make people shoot more deer.
3. A recommendation was made to maintain current structure, and determine changes through CDACs. Instead of forcing solutions on residents, seek local input.
4. Educate CDACs about new research regarding frequency dependent harvest.
5. More tools are needed to encourage buck harvest in CWD counties.
6. Provide incentives (monetary and other) to help hunters focus on mature deer since they have a greater likelihood of being CWD positive. However, incentives for mature bucks could discourage regular hunters since there will be less mature bucks available.

7. DNR should specific population goals to address density and frequency. Then, DNR should work with hunters, landowners and sharpshooters to attain those goals.

**b) Landowner permits**

**Action Item:**
Issue post-season landowner hunting permits in the CWD Management Zone.

**Committee comments:**
1. Landowners already have permits available in the DMAP program. DNR staff provided additional information about the # of tags available to landowners in counties with high prevalence of CWD.
2. Extended seasons might cause hunting fatigue. There are specific protocols already in place related to extended hunting by private landowners.
3. Landowners are the biggest allies in managing herd health, and this potentially useful tool should remain available.

**c) Sharpshooting**

**Action Item:**
The DNR will conduct focused sharpshooting on public lands and on private lands where permission can be obtained in areas of disease clusters in the periphery of the known CWD distribution (e.g. Devil’s Lake State Park) or in the areas of newly identified CWD foci where assessments deem such activities strategically advantageous. Sharpshooting efforts will need to be intensive and sustained over a period of many years before the impact on disease progression can be assessed and control can be documented.

**Committee comments:**
1. Sharpshooting was not liked by people, was divisive, expensive and not effective. It seemed like a waste of money to hire people to shoot deer.
2. Remove “sustained over a period of many years” and let the duration be decided at the local level by the local response team, based on goals determined at the local level.
3. Sharpshooting is still a useful tool and should remain available.
4. Apply scientific methods to setting targets, since randomized removal of deer will lead to removal of good deer with the bad ones. Consider targeting sick or older deer.
5. Ban on baiting does not go well with sharpshooting since sharpshooters use bait at night.
6. The DNR staff clarified that sharpshooting has not been used since 2006, and now they want to work closely with communities and include volunteers.
(d) Monitoring disease trends and patterns

Action Item:
The DNR will conduct sampling and CWD testing that is sufficient to monitor trends in prevalence and disease pattern within the western core monitoring area in Dane and Iowa counties, the eastern monitoring area in Rock and Walworth counties, and in the Baraboo monitoring area. In addition, the DNR will monitor spatial and prevalence patterns at selected higher prevalence areas along the periphery of the currently known CWD geographic distribution.

Committee comments:
1. Maintain monitoring in the core areas, and identify where else to monitor, regardless of budget.
2. Continue sampling in core areas for research to identify what is working and what is not working.
3. The Committee asked and the DNR staff clarified that current maps reflect a trend of CWD spreading along waterways.
4. Update the Plan language to reflect that monitoring should be across the state and not just in select areas. Monitoring should be expanded to all 43 counties with baiting and feeding bans.

(e) CWD Zone Deer Population Monitoring

Action Item:
Trends in the size of the deer population in the CWD Management Zone will be monitored using a combination of helicopter and fixed-wing aircraft surveys and population modeling. Deer population monitoring will likely be conducted annually over the duration of the plan.

Committee comments:
1. The DNR has stopped monitoring by helicopter, though fixed-wing aircraft are still used for monitoring in southwestern Wisconsin.
2. The Committee recommended deleting the reference to helicopters, and replacing it with generic air and field monitoring rather than specifying the types of machines that would be used.
3. The Committee also suggested referencing the deer predator study which is currently being performed.

(f) Collaborate with Illinois

Action Item:
The DNR will continue to work cooperatively with the Illinois DNR on CWD management, as outlined in the MOU.

Committee comments:
1. Broaden to include all adjacent states in the MOU, and not limit it just to Illinois.
(g) **Conduct reviews after the 2015, 2020, and 2025 deer hunting seasons.**

**Action Item:**
The DNR will conduct program reviews of our progress toward meeting the goal and objectives of this plan after the 2015, 2020, and 2025 deer seasons and, based on these reviews, make any needed modifications, some of which are outlined in actions (h), (i), and (j) below.

**Committee comments:**
1. Remove 2015 from the above action item since the review is being currently undertaken.
2. Remove “CWD Management Zone” from sub-item 3 of this Action Item.

(h) **Additional days of gun-hunting opportunity**

**Action Item:**
Based on the results of the review, add more days of gun-hunting opportunity.

**Committee comments:**
1. Use the tool to recruit new hunters or get inactive hunters more engaged. For example, increasing the age limit for youth hunting could help engage more hunters.
2. Modify the Action Item to say hunting in general, rather than “gun-hunting.”

(i) **Additional focused sharpshooting**

**Action Item:**
Consider the use of sharpshooting on public and private lands, where permission can be obtained, in areas of high disease prevalence.

**Committee comments:**
1. Some Committee members suggested removing this Action Item, while others suggested not removing it from the list of available tools since it could still be useful in high prevalence areas though not in the peripheral areas.

(j) **Additional tools**

**Action Item:**
Conduct and support research to develop and evaluate additional tools that have management applications and implement those that meet efficacy and acceptability criteria as needed to enhance progress towards CWD control objectives.

**Committee comments:**
1. No additional tools were suggested by the Committee during the meeting, though it recommended keeping the Action Item.
Feedback on the Day

The Committee members provided the following feedback on how they thought the day went:

1. Liked the discussion on the CWD model regarding endemic and affected counties.
2. When a farm tests CWD positive in a county that has not tested positive, double or electric fencing should be implemented, unless the farm is depopulated.
3. Some good revisions to the plan were discussed but there is not too much that is new. We need to learn from past mistakes and not repeat them.
4. CDACs should be engaged more; they were missing from the previous planning efforts. Engage CDACs to encourage people to sample more, and to enhance public awareness.
5. The DNR should prepare detailed response plans with specific short-term items in addition to the longer-term items, when new CWD detection occurs. Prepare a written and time-bound plan for both, wild and farmed populations. Add more specificity to the plan objectives and action items.
6. Balance the specificity of the response plan with any disincentives to report CWD.
7. Increase surveillance, but also have a thorough response plan.
8. Infected farms should be required to have double or electric fence until the farm has been certified CWD free.
9. The current plan seems to have fragmented objectives and action plans. Consider trimming the plan to 3 objectives, and avoid duplication.
10. Test more mature bucks, and require sampling for certain size of animals.
11. Antler restrictions could encourage hunters to be more engaged.
12. State agencies must work within their legislative authority; some suggestions could be outside the authority.
13. Plan requirements should follow scientific evidence and knowledge. For example, there are no current soil tests that are fully reliable.
14. Some decisions should be made statewide, e.g., carcass control, baiting, etc. Some other decisions and specific actions should be determined at the local level.
15. Cervid farmers are raising livestock, not wildlife. Double fencing requirements could damage farms financially. The DNR should consider paying for such additional requirements.
16. The discussion still seems focused on culling, which does not work. Let nature resolve the issue. CWD is still being used to ban baiting, to regulate farmers, and to control deer population. Predators are reducing the herds in significant numbers, and culling will chase hunters away.
17. Non-hunters are not represented enough in such discussions; they should have a voice.
18. Need more public support among hunters to combat CWD. We need more trust in the DNR, and the state should be willing to invest the time and money to address CWD.
19. Expand testing across the state.
20. Hunters are the most important ally for deer management, and they need to be engaged through CDACs.
21. Frequency dependence and density dependence are hard to separate. Contaminated landscape makes a difference even apart from frequency.
22. Develop incentives for landowners and hunters.
23. CDACs should be more involved in the plan, and more localized strategies are needed.
24. Create best practices and recommendations for hunters for areas that have and have not tested positive for CWD. Some information is already available on the DNR website, but consider alternative ways to promote this information and make people more aware, e.g., through pamphlets and the internet.

**Citizen Input**

Following the discussion above, citizens present at the meeting had an opportunity to provide input; they were asked to follow specific guidelines, which were read aloud by the facilitator (included in the notes from the 1st meeting). One citizen provided input:

- CWD is bigger than any one state, and the federal plan needs to be revamped. Wisconsin is in a perfect place to conduct research on genetic resistance to CWD.
- Incentivize hunting and focus on areas with CWD positive animals, allowing hunters to take extra bucks.

**List of meeting attendees and participants**

The December 12, 2016 meeting was attended by the following primary Committee members (by first name):

1. Amanda Falch, Wildlife Rehabilitation Advisory Council
2. Ben Johnson, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
3. Bill McCrary, Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
4. Bruce Krueger, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
5. Dan Barr, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
6. Drew Nussbaum, Wisconsin Department of Tourism
7. George Meyer, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
8. Harry Mattox, Safari Club International-Wisconsin Chapter
9. James Kazmierczak, Wisconsin Department of Health Services
10. James Lanier, Quality Deer Management Association
11. Kim Pokorny, Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
12. Larry Bonde, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
13. Laurie Seale, Whitetails of Wisconsin
14. Mike Riggle, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
15. Mike Spors, Whitetails Unlimited
16. Mitch King, Archery Trade Association
17. Paul McGraw, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
18. Tony Grabski, Sporting Heritage Council
19. Tami Ryan, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Secondary Committee members that were in attendance

- Al Shook, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
• Amy Horn-Delzer, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
• Dan Forester, Archery Trade Association
• Joel Epse, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
• Jerome Donohoe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
• Kim Zuhlke, Quality Deer Management Association
• Rebecca Osborne, Wisconsin Department of Health Services

Stakeholder groups that were not in attendance:
• Wisconsin Association of Meat Processors

The DNR staff who attended the meeting included:
• Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief
• Kevin Wallenfang, Deer & Elk Ecologist
• Maggie Stewart, Assistant Big Game Ecologist
• Ben Beardmore, Social Scientist
• Peter Dunn, Captive Wildlife Administrative Warden

Natural Resource Board members in attendance:
• Greg Kazmierski

The following citizens signed in for the meeting:
• Steve Gehrke
• Dale Schluter
• Patrick Durkin
• Tom Hauge

Independent facilitation support for the meeting was provided by Credens LLC.
Appendix D: Notes - Meeting #4

Meeting #4 Agenda (Feb 1, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>Meeting goal and plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:45</td>
<td>Committee &amp; public input results review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 12:15</td>
<td>Discussion Items &amp; new Action Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 - 12:45</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 – 1:15</td>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:30</td>
<td>Overview of the voting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 3:45</td>
<td>Vote and prioritize Action Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:00</td>
<td>Concluding remarks &amp; Next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction and Meeting Plan

The fourth and final meeting of the Wisconsin CWD Response Plan Review Committee was held on February 1, 2017 at the Lussier Family Heritage Center in Madison, Wisconsin. A list of attendees and the agenda for this meeting are provided at the end of these notes.

Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief, with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) opened the meeting and provided an overview of the day’s agenda.

Continuing with the overall approach, the Committee members had been asked to do “pre-work” as preparation for the Committee meeting on February 1, as shown in the diagram below. The Action Items identified by the Review Committee during the third meeting were sent out for input from the public and the CDACs across the state. The planning team had provided a summary of the public input to the Review Committee and had asked them to review it before the fourth meeting.
Bob Nack then discussed the next steps between February and March 2017, as shown in the diagram below. Based on the work of the Review Committee, the planning team had created “Table #1” which contained all the preliminary Action Items reviewed, modified and added by the Review Committee through mid-December, 2016. The CDAC input provided additional potential Action Items for consideration by the Review Committee, which the planning team combined in “Table #2”. During the 4th meeting, the Review Committee was tasked to discuss, prepare and prioritize a combined list of Action Items, including those from the original plan that the Committee wanted to bring to the future, and any new ones from CDAC input.

By February 10, the facilitator will provide a draft of the combined, prioritized Action Items to the Committee for review. The Committee will provide its feedback to the planning team by February 13. The planning team will review the document with the Sponsor Team executives on February 14. The
facilitator will provide a final report by February 23, which will be reviewed with the Natural Resources Board (NRB) on March 1.

**Summary input from the Committee and CDACs**

Ben Beardmore from the DNR presented summary results from the survey taken by the Review Committee, and the results of the CDAC input provided by 68 counties. He highlighted areas of similarities and differences between the importance placed by the Review Committee on various Action Items, and the support or opposition from the CDACs. The CDAC input was broken down by different groups of counties.

Slides from that presentation are incorporated herein via reference, but have not been appended to this document.

**Updated Action Items**

The Committee members reviewed and discussed the CDAC input, and identified new Action Items to add to “Table #1” and modified some of the original Action Items. After considerable discussion and taking the CDAC input into account, the Review Committee settled on a final version of the language and composition of Action Items across all six Objectives.

The original 2010-2025 CWD Plan contained 6 Objectives and 27 Action Items. The Review Committee did not modify the total number of Objectives, or their reference numbers. However, the addition of new Action Items, modification of some of the original ones and prioritization of all Action Items resulted in changes to the reference numbers for Action Items within each Objective from the 2010-2025 Plan.

**Citizen Input**

Following the discussion above, citizens present at the meeting had an opportunity to provide input; they were asked to follow specific guidelines, which were read aloud by the facilitator (included in the notes from the 1st meeting).

One citizen provided input personally, requesting the Committee to consider working with landowners, particularly those who are well educated, have high incomes and hold / manage land for hunting, as partners in managing CWD. He urged the Committee to help improve relations with landowners, build better trust, and try to depoliticize deer management in Wisconsin.

One Committee member read aloud emails he had received from two other citizens, one a landowner and retired UW professor. The citizens conveyed that due to past efforts and methods, tradition and heritage were damaged. Now, the plan has moved beyond extreme measures so the Committee should not consider revisiting techniques that failed in the past.

Another Committee member spoke as a citizen, and suggested considering antler restrictions and applying scientific information.
Greg Kazmierski from the NRB thanked the Committee members for their work.

**Prioritized Action Items**

After the citizen input, the facilitator discussed the process of voting and prioritizing the Action Items. The Review Committee was composed of representatives from many stakeholders, each of whom brought its own unique perspective to the table. To identify the collective priorities of the Review Committee, the facilitator asked each Review Committee member to mark his/her individual top priority Action Items.

Please see “Objectives and Recommended Action Items” section of this report for the final, prioritized recommendations of the Review Committee.

**Reflections**

The facilitator asked for feedback and reflections from the Committee members on the whole process, and the responses are presented below:

1. We are grateful for opportunity, impressed with the timeline, a lot was accomplished.
2. The process was very good, and the planning team made sure all voices were heard.
3. The right people were at the table – DATCP, industry, DNR, others; there were people from outside the normal silos, turned a corner from “he-said-she-said” and were able to move forward by focusing on real issues.
4. Learned a lot about complex issues and, private and public sector cooperation; appreciated open discussions.
5. The process was very reasonable.
6. Appreciated the chance to educate others about key business issues from a different perspective; the benefit of such education is reflected in how some Action Items were modified.
7. Opportunity was great, got all the issues on the table, had experts to help with background on CWD; the team did a good job, worked efficiently, got the issues out and had diverse stakeholders to have good interactions.
8. Great conversations, rare to get good conversations and disagreements. Always felt a time crunch but it was handled well by the planning team. Wished had more time to discuss a response plan for new detections.
9. Had been on multiple CWD committees in the past; the process was organized and constructive; methods used early after detection had a lot of opposition and if they had used this current method it may have helped.
10. Thanked the planning team for their work.
11. Appreciated representing farmers, so that the Committee heard from more than just hunters.
   The process was collaborative, and every one listened well.
12. Impressed with consensus in a diverse group. A lot of people care a lot about this issue, and we need funding and to put in the effort to see good outcomes.
13. Learned a lot and impressed with how everything ran, and with the level of knowledge everyone brought.
14. Agreed to disagree, which helped us get to where we are today.
15. Agency’s goal is to keep the number of people who consume CWD at a minimum, seemed hopeful that people were open to new information.
16. Grateful to be included, great how much information was shared across the table.
17. Thanked the whole Review Committee.

Next Steps and Concluding Remarks

Following the discussion above, Bob Nack discussed the timeline (described above), and thanked the Committee members for their hard work. He highlighted the team effort and that the process and the Committee worked well, and that he hopes the Committee will meet again to continue its work, to see this through. The time spent was put to good use for the current and future stakeholders.

List of meeting attendees and participants

The February 1, 2017 meeting was attended by the following primary Committee members (by first name):

1. Amanda Falch, Wildlife Rehabilitation Advisory Council
2. Ben Johnson, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
3. Bill McCrery, Wisconsin Bowhunters Association
4. Bruce Krueger, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
5. Drew Nussbaum, Department of Tourism
7. Harry Mattox, Safari Club International- WI Chapter
8. Julie Widholm, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
9. Kim Pokorny, Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
10. Laurie Seale, Whitetails of Wisconsin
11. Mike Riggle, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
12. Mike Spors, Whitetails Unlimited
13. Mitch King, Archery Trade Association
14. Paul McGraw, Wisconsin Department of Ag, Trade and Consumer Protection
15. Rebecca Osborne, Wisconsin Department of Health Services
16. Tony Grabski, Sporting Heritage Council
17. Kim Zuhlke, Quality Deer Management Association

Secondary Committee members that were in attendance
- Al Shook, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
- Amy Horn-Delzer, Department of Ag, Trade and Consumer Protection
- Dan Forester, Archery Trade Association
- Jerome Donohoe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
- Joel Espe, Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association
- Tami Ryan, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (via Skype)
Stakeholder groups that were not in attendance:
- Wisconsin Association of Meat Processors

The DNR staff who attended the meeting included:
- Bob Nack, Big Game Section Chief
- Kevin Wallenfang, Deer & Elk Ecologist
- Maggie Stewart, Assistant Big Game Ecologist
- Ben Beardmore, Social Scientist

Natural Resource Board members in attendance:
- Greg Kazmierski

The following citizens signed in for the meeting:
- Christian Rosenstock

Independent facilitation support for the meeting was provided by Credens LLC.