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.
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 McCravy, 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.