

Meeting Minutes: First Public Listening Session Farmed Cervidae Rulemaking

Date: 08/27/2020 from 5:00p.m. – 7:00p.m.
Minutes prepared by: Addie Evans
Location: Virtual via Microsoft Teams

Attendance

Board of Animal Health (Board or BAH) staff: Annie Balghiti, Dr. Linda Glaser, Dr. Courtney Wheeler, Michael Crusan, Addie Evans

Members of public whose name showed up as a participant:

Denis Quarberg

Brenda Hartkopf

Michael Robokoff

Peggy Anne Hawkins

John Zanmiller

There were around 5-6 other participants but as they called into the meeting from their telephones rather using Microsoft Teams, only their phone number showed up in the participant list. These callers did not make comments or state their name or affiliation.

Meeting Notes

Dr. Linda Glaser started by going through each rule change with an explanation for each of the Board's proposed amendments. Most comments were given at the end of her presenting these changes. Commenters were asked to state their name and their affiliation before providing their comment. Some comments/questions were verbal, and some were written in the comments section of the Microsoft Teams chat feature, which are noted below when those occurred.

1721.0370 DEFINITIONS

Subp. 5. CWD certified/state level 6

There was a question about this from Denis Quarberg regarding what makes a state level 6 herd. Dr. Glaser responded to this question but there were no further questions or follow-up comments on this.

1721.0380 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Subp. 4. Herd Inventory.

Mr. Quarberg asked about the word, “new.” Is this any location that a herd is moved to? What if the farmer wants to move or add more acres? Dr. Wheeler answered the question. No added language suggestions or follow-up comments were made.

Michael Robokoff asked if this changes once every 3-year requirement. Dr. Courtney Wheeler answered the question. No added suggestions or follow-up comments were made.

1721.0390 ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION

1721.0400 IMPORTATION OF FARMED CERVIDAE

1721.0410 INTRASTATE MOVEMENT OF FARMED CERVIDAE

1721.0420 CWD

Subp. 3. Determining boundaries of CWD management zones in the state.

Mr. Quarberg asked, “How are you comingling?” Dr. Wheeler replied. No added suggestions or follow-up comments were made.

By 6:00 p.m., all the Board’s current proposed rules amendments had been reviewed by Dr. Glaser.

John Zanmiller, a deer hunter and three decades government corrections employee from rural Minnesota, had a several questions and asked for clarification on the following:

Language change in the rules, what was the reasoning? Dr. Glaser replied. He specified the question, endemic vs. management. He asked about enforcement between DNR and the Board. What is the Board’s role in managing outside the management zone? Has the Board ever enforced these rules?

Ear tagging – how would the average person identify that deer’s ownership? Who does the deer belong to if a hunter or person who kills a tagged deer with their deer, who does that deer belong to, the producer? He asked about confidentiality with naming the owner of the animal to a hunter who calls in the board. He commented on how difficult it would be for when a hunter kills a tagged deer, all the hoops and hurdles he/she would have to go through. He suggests law enforcement have a list of these tags for easier availability of ownership. This should be added to the rules within the language with the ID tags.

“The section on movements—there is a word.... Reported.” Mr. Zanmiller suggested we should change that to, ‘approved’. He would like to see the phrase, ‘Movements from or to must be approved by the Board prior to movement’.

1721.0370 Subp. 5 - Mr. Zanmiller suggested including the USDA’s federal certification definition. “we rely on this for a management tool for movements so there should be something that references the

federal certification.” He was thinking of a consumer. There was clarification and discussion on the department of Agriculture’s role in this.

Terminal hunting facility – Mr. Zanmiller wanted clarification, so he asked if the animal is dispatched on the farm, there is no inspection required on that farm (referring to slaughter plant inspections).

Are permit fees part of the rulemaking process? Mr. Zanmiller says that the BAH has had a huge financial burden with managing the farmed cervid program. He believes fees should be reflective of actual cost. He encourages the Board to approach the legislature for the fees needed to fund the administration. He does not want to see the Board’s budget blown all over the state.

There were no other comments in the comment section (of the chat) or spoken by participants. No new members of the public had joined. Meeting adjourned at 6:42 pm.