CWD Response Plan Review Committee Meeting #2
- Notes from November 14, 2016

This document provides notes from the second meeting of the CWD Response Plan Review Committee, held on November 14, 2016, and is organized as:
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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 is provided in Appendix I of these notes, and the agenda in Appendix II.

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 and their continued engagement after the four meetings.

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 in Appendix III).

The morning session focused on identifying new Action Items suggested by the participating organizations/agencies, 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.
CWD Facilitation Plan

Each participating organization/agency 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 2\textsuperscript{nd} & 3\textsuperscript{rd} Meetings
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. WBH = Wisconsin Bow Hunters
7. WCC = Wisconsin Conservation Congress
8. WCEFA = 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. WOW = 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>WBH</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>WOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No new action items proposed</td>
<td>DNR</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>WBH</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 that can document 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 in CWD affected areas</td>
<td>DHS</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>Add elk to monitoring and surveillance programs – elk reintroduction plans do not mention CWD. Per NR 10.41(1) Wildlife Disease Management.</td>
<td>WCDEFA</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 kits 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>WCDEFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conduct an economic study on the value of the deer herd to the State of Wisconsin in order 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.

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.
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 summarized below are a comprehensive list provided by Committee members and do represent a committee consensus.

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 elk.
   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 don’t 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.

16. 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.

17. Use social media / apps to help hunters find private land to hunt and those who want to donate deer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

24. 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.

25. 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.

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

27. 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.

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

29. Make venison donation easy for hunters.

30. If wildlife rehabilitators who are concerned about CWD and limiting its spread are not allowed to rehabilitate deer the public will. When this happens any hope of managing the potential spread of CWD through these fawns will not be able to be regulated.

31. Need more specific plan for new detections – when a county tests positive, there is no specific plan and timeframe.

32. 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 are a comprehensive list provided by Committee members and do represent a committee consensus.

Even though the initial meeting plan scope included only Objectives #4 and 5 for this meeting, the Committee worked efficiently and was able to cover 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 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 to that.
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 consume CWD positive deer, and should encourage testing before consumption. It was noted that persuasive messages asking hunters to provide a CWD sample are 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 make a 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 of Wisconsin 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 testing of radio-collared 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.
Appendix I: List of meeting attendees and participants

The November 14, 2016 meeting was attended by the following 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 Deer and Elk Farmers Association
5. Dan Barr, Wisconsin Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory
7. George Meyer, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
8. James Lanier, Quality Deer Management Association
9. Kim Pokorny, Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
10. Larry Bonde, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
11. Laurie Seale, Whitetails of Wisconsin
12. Mike Riggle, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
13. Mike Spors, Whitetails Unlimited
14. Mitch King, Archery Trade Association
15. Rebecca Osborne, Wisconsin Department of Health Services
16. Tony Grabski, Sporting Heritage Council
17. Drew Nussbaum, Wisconsin Department of Tourism
18. Al Shook, Wisconsin Conservation Congress
19. Ralph Fritsch, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
20. Dan Forster, Archery Trade Association
21. Harry Mattox, Safari Club International- Wisconsin Chapter
22. Joel Espe, Wisconsin Deer and Elk Farmers Association
23. Jerome Donohoe, Wisconsin Deer and Elk Farmers Association
24. Rick Vojtik, Whitetails of Wisconsin
25. Amy Horn-Deltzer, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
26. Peter Dunn, Law Enforcement
27. Tami Ryan, DNR Wildlife Management

Stakeholder groups that were not in attendance:

1. Wisconsin Association of Meat Processors
2. 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
- Tami Ryan, Wildlife Health Section Chief
Natural Resource Board members in attendance:
  • Greg Kazmierski

The following citizens signed in for the meeting:
  • Tom Hauge
  • Melissa Tedrowe (Humane Society)

Independent facilitation support for the meeting was provided by Credens LLC.
Appendix II: Committee Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Items</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 new Action Items 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>
Appendix III: 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.*

### 2010-2025 Plan OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: Prevent new introductions of CWD</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Carcass Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wild Deer Herds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Baiting &amp; Feeding of Deer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmed Cervid Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmed Cervid Escapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmed Cervid Testing and Depopulation of Infected Farms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2: Monitor for &amp; respond to new CWD disease foci</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Statewide Surveillance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surveillance Response to New Foci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management Response to New Foci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3: Control distribution &amp; intensity of CWD</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hunting Season Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landowner Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharpshooting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring Disease Trends &amp; Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CWD Zone Deer Population Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborate with Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct Reviews after the 2015, 2020, &amp; 2025 Deer Hunting Seasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional Days of Gun-Hunting Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional Focused Sharpshooting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4: Increase public recognition &amp; understanding of CWD risks and public participation in disease control efforts</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Human Dimensions of CWD Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring Changes in Public Opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 5: Address the needs of our customers</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hunter Service Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Donation of Venison to Food Pantries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deer Carcass Disposal Assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring for Human Prion Diseases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investigating Potential Risk to Livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 6: Enhance the scientific information about CWD</th>
<th>ACTION ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative research and funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please bring Template A to the Nov 14 meeting; you do NOT need to submit it.
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>Prevent new introductions (Objective 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor for and respond to new disease foci (Objective 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control distribution and intensity of CWD (Objective 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase public recognition and understanding of CWD risks and public participation in disease control effort (Objective 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the needs of our customers (Objective 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the scientific information about CWD (Objective 6)</td>
<td></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: __________________________________________

__________________________________________