

Meeting Minutes: Advisory Committee for Farmed Cervidae Rule Amendments

Date: 10/08/2020, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Minutes prepared by: Dr. Courtney Wheeler
Location: Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Attendance

Farmed Cervid Advisory Committee Members

- Michelle Carstensen, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Kelly Anderson, Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA)
- Dr. Joni Scheftel, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH)
- Dr. Jerry Torrison, Minnesota Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory (MVDL)
- Dr. Stephan Schaeffbauer, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA-APHIS VS)
- Rich Meech, Minnesota Deer Farmers Association
- Brenda Hartkopf, Minnesota Elk Breeders Association
- Daryl Simon, Non-native Minnesota Cervidae species producers
- Miles Falk, Minnesota Tribal Members
- Amy Cordry, Member of the public
- Dan Miller, Livestock producer

Minnesota Board of Animal Health staff

- Dr. Linda Glaser, Farmed Cervidae Program Director
- Dr. Courtney Wheeler, Farmed Cervidae Program Director
- Annie Balghiti, JD, Rules Coordinator

Welcome

Annie Balghiti, Rules Coordinator for the Board of Animal Health (Board), welcomed members of the advisory committee and thanked them for their participation and valuable input related to the Board's proposed rule amendments. Ms. Balghiti reminded everyone that members of the committee were chosen for their expertise and knowledge needed by the Board to amend their rules in the most effective way possible. She stated that the role of the advisory committee is to influence the Board adding that Board members do not write rules, do not vote on rules, and do not have final say on rules adopted by the Board [the Board has final say]. Annie encouraged all committee members to contact their constituents to request input on the Board's rule amendments to bring forward to the group during these meetings.

Ms. Balghiti reminded those in attendance that comments can be made by selecting the e-comments link on the Board's website through the end of October and that members of the public would have an opportunity to and were welcome to comment during the last 15 minutes of the meeting.

Ms. Balghiti outlined the goals for this advisory committee meeting which were to: discuss proposed rules and rules currently in effect, receive input from committee members regarding these specific rules, and hear comments from committee members based on input from their constituents. She let everyone know that if time allowed, the Board would post the definitions portion of their most recently updated rules draft for review by committee members.

Dr. Courtney Wheeler introduced herself, stating that she is a Senior Veterinarian with the Board and assists Dr. Glaser with the Farmed Cervidae Program.

Dr. Linda Glaser introduced herself as the Assistant Executive Director for the Board and Director of the Farmed Cervidae Program.

Annie Balghiti informed the group that the Board would like to hear from committee members that had submitted written suggestions for amendments, starting with Brenda Hartkopf, Minnesota Elk Breeders Association.

Proposed Rules Draft Review

Brenda Hartkopf began by introducing the Minnesota Elk Breeders Association (MNEBA) suggested amendment to section 1721.0410, intrastate movement of farmed Cervidae. The MNEBA introduced language that would require all producers to obtain a permit from the Board prior to movement of live Cervidae and the Board would be able to "deny permits for up to 14 calendar days in order to restrict the movement of animals during a disease investigation". Ms. Hartkopf commented that requiring a permit number would allow the board to be notified prior to movements and requested comments from the committee.

Dr. Linda Glaser commented that issuing permits ahead of every movement would require a significant increase in Board staffing and resources.

Ms. Hartkopf commented that MNEBA understood that this requirement would present challenges for the Board but felt that it would be an effective method to "stop problems" before they occurred.

Ms. Hartkopf continued her presentation of MNEBA's proposed amendments, referring to section 1721.0410, Supb. 3, movement requirements stating that MNEBA agreed that any herd wishing to move animals should

have achieved a status level 6 in the state's Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) herd certification program, adding that anyone that has not achieved a level 6, likely isn't following the rules.

Ms. Hartkopf then addressed the Board's proposed amendment to this section of the rule in which the Board proposed adding language: "if moving to another registered farmed Cervidae premises, the herd must have at least one cervid in the herd tested for CWD within the previous 12 months". MNEPBA proposed alternative language that would allow a status level 6 herd to move animals if "the number of animals from the herd tested for CWD in the previous 12 months is equal to or greater than four percent (4%) of the current herd inventory". She added that MNEBA would only support this proposed language if live testing was recognized for surveillance purposes.

Ms. Hartkopf commented that Texas recognizes live animal CWD testing to fulfill surveillance requirements. Dr. Linda Glaser responded that the Texas Animal Health Commission only recognizes live animal testing in the form of rectal or tonsil biopsy. Jerry Torrison confirmed the accuracy of Dr. Glaser's statement.

Rich Meech commented on MNEBA's proposal for requiring movement permits, asking Mr. Hartkopf to clarify her objective. Specifically, Mr. Meech asked, "Why do we need permits prior to moving. Please clarify how issuing permits would improve disease investigations that happened in the past as infected herds did not violate any laws regulating animal movement?"

Ms. Hartkopf responded that as she doesn't work for the Board, she could not comment on how many animals are moved outside the parameters of law. She added that she felt that permitting would allow the Board to verify that a herd is level 6 prior to movement, rather than catching an illegal movement "after the fact".

Rich Meech pointed out again that historically, CWD infected herds that moved animals did so legally. He commented that "the current system is working and making producers that move a lot of animals obtain a permit prior to movement presents an additional, unnecessary burden".

Ms. Hartkopf commented that, last year, Dr. [Beth] Thompson [Executive Director of the Board] proposed a blanket control zone over the whole state which impacted hundreds of people who were not directly involved in the Board's disease investigation. She stated that she felt this would give the Board more latitude to regulate movement for specific high risk herds.

Rich Meech commented that when a herd is identified as CWD positive, all herds involved are quarantined and those animals don't move.

Amy Cordry commended Brenda [Hartkopf] for her "incredible problem solving attitude". Ms. Cordry commented that, as a representative of the public, she thanked producers like Brenda from preventing the disease [CWD] from expanding, adding that if cervids as an asset are so valuable, Brenda has the correct attitude, "to do everything to keep the animals healthy and safe". Ms. Cordry added that, as stated by the Board of Animal Health, the level program is flawed".

Daryl Simon commented that he was opposed to the Board's amendment that would require a producer wishing to sell an animal in Minnesota to test an animal within the previous 12 months. He suggested that the Board might want to consider making this requirement species specific or business dependent. Mr. Simon explained that he works with producers that will buy one cow and a year later have one calf that they want to sell. Under this proposed rule amendment, the producer in this scenario would have to kill one of their other few animals to

move that calf. Mr. Simon commented, "I know a lot of people around the country that have a reindeer bull and two to three cows. This rule would require those that are fortunate enough to not have any of these animals die, to sacrifice a healthy animal, which is concerning".

Rich Meech commented again on MNEBA's proposed amendment that would require producers to obtain a permit prior to movement. Mr. Meech stated that a producer might be 500 miles from anything that is happening [a CWD investigation] and the Board could restrict movement of animals from the producer's herd for 14 days, which is a significant amount of time.

Brenda Hartkopf responded that the alternative might be to call the entire state a "control zone" and not allow any producers to move animals. With a permit system, the Board would have discretion to not allow movement for certain herds. She added that the 14 days would allow the Board time to conduct a more detailed investigation and determine which herds may be involved. Ms. Hartkopf asked Mr. Meech to present an alternate suggestion.

Rich Meech stated that the current system of quarantining herds involved in a CWD disease investigation is already adequate, commenting that while waiting for CWD test results from the National Veterinary Services Laboratory (NVSL), the Board has adequate time to assess and quarantine.

Amy Cordry asked Mr. Meech if he was a member of the Board as he appeared to seem so confident that the Board would know immediately which animals were moved, but the "Board may not know that". Mr. Cordry also asked Mr. Meech if he would deny that CWD has moved between cervid farms.

Rich Meech responded that the Board would have issued a permit to any herd that was a level 4-6 and issuing permits would not have changed anything.

Daryl Simon commented that denying reindeer owners movement for up to 14 days in response to a disease investigation during November and December, a time at which most of these [CWD positive] herds are being identified, would significantly impact their business which largely revolves around holiday displays.

Ms. Hartkopf commented that the intent of the amended language is to target specific herds in a disease investigation. Those herds unrelated would still be allowed to move and this would avoid a control zone being placed over the entire state. Requiring permits would allow the Board to evaluate which herds are involved, safeguarding movements for those herds not involved in an investigation.

Rich Meech pointed out that the proposed language doesn't specifically state that herds not involved in an investigation would not be subject to the 14 day movement restriction.

Ms. Hartkopf clarified that this was the intent of the proposed language and asked for additional comments on MNEBA's proposed changes to the section outlining intrastate movement requirements.

No committee members offered additional comments. Ms. Hartkopf moved on to the next MNEBA proposed amendment to strike the language under 1721.0410, subp. 6, A and B, which states a permit must be obtained from the board prior to movement of farmed Cervidae from a premises located within a CWD endemic or into a CWD endemic area. Ms. Hartkopf pointed out that this language would no longer be necessary if producers required a permit prior to every movement.

Ms. Hartkopf informed the committee that MNEBA proposed striking language in section 1721.0420, chronic wasting disease (CWD) (lines 45-59), in response to the aforementioned proposed amendments requiring all herd to achieve a status level 6 and obtain a permit prior to moving animals.

Ms. Hartkopf then moved on to present MNEBA's suggestions for reducing surveillance status in the case of a missed [CWD] test. She stated that "we [MNEBA] think the Board's current proposal for program standards is too complicated and that MNEBA's proposal will give status reduction some statistical strength". Specifically, the proposed amendment reads: "The CWD status level of a herd must be suspended each time an animal over 12 months of age dies, is slaughtered or is lost and is not tested for CWD unless the total number of animals from the herd tested for CWD during the previous 60 months meets the requirements for a statistical sample 95/5, or the total number of animals from the herd tested for CWD in the subsequent 12 months plus the number of animals tested for CWD within the previous 48 months meets the requirements for a statistical sample 95/5 conducted within a 60 month period of time. CWD tests conducted to fulfill this requirement may include testing of dead animals and testing of live animals using rectal biopsy, tonsil biopsy, saliva, blood or other tissue approved by the board".

Ms. Hartkopf emphasized that MNEBA would not promote these amendments to program surveillance status language unless an option for live animal testing was included. She further explained that over a five year period a producer would have to show that they tested at this [95/5] confidence interval. For example, a herd of three animals that lost one animal and missed a test, would have to live test all remaining animals.

Dr. Glaser commented on statistical sampling, stating that for CWD we don't look at statistics in the same way as other diseases because samples are not randomly selected but rather targeted towards the oldest animals in the herd, animals that are sick, or animals that have died; a random selection doesn't represent those animals that are at highest risk. Dr. Glaser added that if the Board was to look at the number of animals tested over a five year period, the denominator for each year would have to be known (i.e. the total number of animals over 12 months of age that spent any amount of time in the herd). Dr. Glaser used the following example, if a herd has 160 animals and each year 20 [animals] come and 20 go, the Board would have to calculate the total number of animals that had been in the herd each year [200] for the denominator.

Ms. Hartkopf thanked Dr. Glaser for her comments and added that MNEBA's proposed system could not be applied to a one year period; and was looking at an average of the number of animals in the herd over five years. She added that this proposal would put more confidence in a herd that tested 25% of test eligible animals that died than a herd that did not have any mortalities over the five year period.

Dr. Glaser commented that she would be concerned if the sampling was weighted into the first two years of the five year period and no testing was conducted in the last three years. She pointed out that when reviewing the epidemiology for the last couple of herds infected with CWD, the disease appears to have been introduced within the two years prior to finding infection, so CWD might be missed if there is a recent introduction and all of the program surveillance testing was performed more than two years ago. Dr. Glaser added that "biased samples provide a better opportunity to find a potential recent introduction of CWD".

Brenda Hartkopf stated, "we [MNEBA] will consider those comments".

Rich Meech inquired, "How is the current system not working correctly? We are finding CWD".

D. Glaser responded that the Board is concerned about animals that are not tested for CWD or samples that do not have successful test results. The smaller the herd, the more critical it is to take every opportunity to detect

CWD early and at as low a detection rate as possible. She explained that our current program does not employ useful consequences for missing samples, adding that if you are a herd at a level 6, and have been for quite some time, you can miss a significant number of samples without consequence.

Mr. Meech stated that we do not appear to have an egregious problem, quoting Dr. Tracy Nichols [USDA/APHIS Cervid Health Specialist] as saying “this is not a problem”. Mr. Meech went on to say, “It comes down to compliance. If a herd is missing a lot of testing they should be held accountable, but a person who misses a sample or two should not be condemned”.

Linda Glaser commented that we [the Board] have addressed compliance for herds with egregious testing problems, and we also need to have a system for reasonable surveillance and consequences for missing samples.

Rich Meech stated that the Board is condemning all producers, adding that “when it comes to enforcement and compliance, you know the bad actors. Producers have no control over samples once they leave our hands”.

Brenda Hartkopf reminded the group that a lot of good people have been impacted by CWD.

Rich Meech implored the Board not to apply what he referred to as Draconian laws as this will “put people out of business”. He used the example that if the movement of animals out of a herd is restricted at the time of year when they are moving bucks, they could be severely economically impacted.

Brenda Hartkopf addressed Mr. Meech’s comments reminding him that movement restrictions would only apply to those who fail to submit substitute animals adding that MNEBA would only support substitution if live animal testing was an option.

Rich Meech asked Brenda Hartkopf where the caveat for live animal testing was stated.

Ms. Hartkopf referenced the following proposed language from MNEBA, “CWD tests conducted to fulfill this requirement may include testing of dead animals and testing of live animals using rectal biopsy, tonsil biopsy, saliva, blood or other tissue approved by the board”.

Mr. Meech agreed that we [the Board] need to recognize live animal testing.

Amy Cordry requested that someone knowledgeable comment on live animal testing, specifically requesting comments from someone with MNPRO (Minnesota Center for Prion Research and Outreach). She then recognized that there is not a representative from MNPRO on the committee.

Jerry Torrison commented that new live animal testing platforms are not done and approved at this point, adding that we look forward to the time when live animal testing can be performed more efficiently and with less invasive methods. Dr. Torrison reminded the group that work is under way, but it is not ready at this point. Furthermore, regulations must be written in the event a new test is developed, and there is no way of knowing if other states would accept a Minnesota approved test.

Linda Glaser commented that under current CWD program standards, rectal and tonsil biopsy are not approved for routine surveillance in farmed cervid herds. She also added that these live animal samples are not easy to collect, require sedation, and a limited number of lymph follicles are required for pathologist review. Dr. Glaser

stated that there appears to be variability on when tonsil or rectal tissue can be reliably used to detect CWD when compared to CWD in lymph nodes and obex.

Brenda Hartkopf commented that their [MNEBA's] point is not to certify herds with live animals testing, but that this testing would give us more information and could be used as a reliable detection tool.

Daryl Simon posed the question, "is the concern with submitting poor samples of lymph nodes and obex or just totally missing [failing to submit] samples"?

Linda Glaser responded that cervid producers have done a great job submitting quality samples, and the number of successful samples in the last three to four years has decreased from about 25% not tested in 2016-17 to about 2% now. The requirement to submit two tissues has greatly contributed to this improvement, however we still have a component of animals that are missed for testing.

Daryl Simon commented that he knows of two producers in other states that took their animals [carcasses] to the university for sample collection and then were told that the samples were "not good". He pointed out that in these instances, obtaining satisfactory CWD results was "out of the producer's control".

Rich Meech corroborated Mr. Simon's comments adding that "once the sample leaves our hand we have no control, but the results may affect us".

Brenda Hartkopf asked for clarification: "A test is successful if one tissue is successfully tested, correct?"

Linda Glaser verified that this was correct.

Dr. Glaser asked Jerry Torrison to describe how samples are handled at the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, adding that, "taking it out of your hands doesn't mean that sample handling isn't controlled or is inadequate".

Rich Meech pointed out that producers need to be treated like the laboratory and "given more leniencies".

Jerry Torrison said that there are "several flaws with the test", namely the correct anatomical site is needed to read the test accurately. Dr. Torrison pointed out that the industry has improved greatly in submitting samples with the correct location. The current challenge has been—and this was identified from samples collected during the Crow Wing county herd depopulation—has nothing to do with the correct anatomical site, but with the level of tissue decomposition. Several factors are at play; it is not possible to catch the deer right when it dies and depending on the environment tissues may degrade rather quickly. Dr. Torrison suggested that Mr. Simon's example might have had more to do with sample preservation than with lab personnel.

Brenda Hartkopf stated that current USDA APHIS CWD program standards do allow states to develop their own risk based surveillance standards in consultation with APHIS. APHIS will work with a state to "think outside the box" to come to a solution that does not involve sacrificing a healthy animal and she looks forward to revising Minnesota's standards with this in mind. Ms. Hartkopf added that there are a lot of people that harvest a significant number of animals and won't care as much about sacrificing a healthy animal because another animal may be harvested within a month; "another one will always follow".

Brenda Hartkopf continued her explanation of proposed amendments from MNEBA, pointing out their proposal to update 1721.0 420, Subp. 2, C (lines 52-55), to include language for federal indemnification. This language reads: *The owner of a farmed Cervidae herd where chronic wasting disease is detected must depopulate the herd*

after the appraisal process for federal indemnification has been completed. If an indemnification application is not submitted, the herd must be depopulated within a reasonable time determined by the board in consultation with the commissioner of natural resources.

Brenda Hartkopf presented MNEBA's comments on proposed changes to 1721.0 420, Subp. 3, determining boundaries of CWD endemic areas in the state. She proposed the following language be added after "The board shall designate larger geographic areas of the state as part of a CWD endemic area if necessary to prevent the spread of CWD": *This action shall be taken only on the affirmative vote of all five board members at a regularly scheduled meeting of the board.* Ms. Hartkopf commented that this would allow opportunity for public comment and discussion and the board would not be given the unfettered ability to expand an endemic area.

Ms. Hartkopf added that she believed that when the board increased the endemic area from 10 to 15 miles she believed that the board had consulted with their board members.

Linda Glaser confirmed that this statement was accurate.

Brenda Hartkopf reiterated that they [MNEBA] would like to see this spelled out in rule.

Ms. Hartkopf continued presenting MNEBA's proposed amendments stating that they would implore the Board not to strike the language: *Individual farmed Cervidae herds where animals are kept on premises within a designated CWD endemic area shall be excluded from and not considered to be a part of a CWD endemic area for the first 180 days following the initial designation of the area as CWD endemic and shall continue to be excluded.* She pointed out that a herd could have been successfully testing for 20 years and never missed a test and would still be subject to this restriction, adding that the 180 day window would give us [producers] time to adjust.

Daryl Simon posed the question, "Of the number of deer farms in Minnesota with CWD, in how many cases has it been proven that CWD came through the fence, from a wild deer?"

Linda Glaser commented on herds identified as CWD positive since 2007, stating that we have not identified a definitive source for any of them. In herds identified as CWD positive between 2007 and 2016, there was no evidence of recurring infection in wild cervids based on CWD surveillance, i.e. CWD was not known to be around infected herds until 2016.

Daryl Simon questioned, "in other words, no new animals came into those herds, or you couldn't show that new [farmed] animals introduced CWD into the herd"?

Dr. Glaser replied that if an animal had come from a known CWD infected herd from another state, we would have quarantined the herd. We know that CWD infected animals were transferred from the Pine County to Douglas County herd, but we have not confirmed this as a mechanism for infection for any other herds identified as CWD positive since 2007.

Daryl Simon stated, "so what we end up with is herds of farmed deer with CWD and no one knows how they got it. I find it concerning that science can't determine how CWD was introduced into a particular herd. Has anyone proven that if wild deer and farmed deer are nose to nose, that CWD can be transmitted through that fence? Back to the 180 days, I am opposed to not having the ability to double fence to get out of the containment area and continue business. The area is declared through no fault of my own, based on the assumption that if 1 positive deer in 1,000s is infected, my animals have been exposed or infected".

Linda Glaser referenced epidemiologic reports from Wisconsin and New York. She stated that in the highly endemic area in Wisconsin, a herd that was established in 2009, was double fenced and closed and got CWD. Wisconsin's investigation reported that disease introduction was possibly related to feed, specifically pumpkin waste, or hay as no other link or explanation could be made. New York reported a case where a CWD positive farmed herd was identified, and two wild cervids in the area tested positive with no other potential routes of exposure identified. Dr. Glaser pointed out that we know as the contamination becomes higher in the wild [i.e. more infected deer are present] there is an increased risk of CWD getting through the fence. There is also risk of exposure not just from wild deer, but scavengers and plants. Our concern is that once you confirm CWD outside of an enclosure there is still potential for it to get in even with double fencing.

Daryl Simon stated that this regulation assumes that the only mode of transmission is nose to nose contact. Mr. Simon commented that he doesn't see the need to spend money on double fencing right now, illustrating that if he were to double fence today and a wild deer was identified, he would be "locked down for three years", putting him out of business. With the 180 days, at least deer farms in the endemic area will double fence after the fact.

Dr. Glaser pointed out that double and exclusionary fencing does not impact interstate movement.

Daryl Simon responded that his primary business involves movement within the state, so he would lose the majority of his income if he could not move animals for up to three years.

Miles Falk acknowledged the uncertainty in CWD science both in spread and detection, stating that research needs to be a priority. Mr. Falk commented that uncertainty should not be an excuse to promote lax regulations that put a public resource at risk. He added that he thought uncertainty should promulgate more conservative rulemaking.

Amy Cordry stated that she recognizes the pain that producers feel as it pertains to financial burden. Ms. Cordry commented that she thought Dr. Glaser's comments on multiple routes of [CWD] spread and Mr. Falk's comments on uncertain science should drive this rulemaking process. She added that "this is the Board of Animal Health, not the Board of Animal Commerce". Ms. Cordry went on to say that as hard as it is for those [producers] that may be facing financial issues, in this instance these rules are also protecting human health. Ms. Cordry referenced the DNR's [Department of Natural Resources] movement study stating that it elucidates why those herd 14 miles from a CWD infected animal should be quarantined.

Dr. Glaser clarified that CWD is not a zoonotic disease.

Amy Cordry asked about BSE (bovine spongiform encephalopathy).

Dr. Glaser commented that BSE can be spread to people. However, another prion disease, Scrapie, has never been proven to infect people and CWD prions have not been proven to infect people.

Rich Meech referenced the rule outlining an endemic area and the Board's current requirement for 15 miles, stating, "I believe we should follow the USDA's recommendations on declaring an endemic area. As Linda [Glaser] pointed out, we have not found CWD in wild deer around the farms. Producers are the canary in the coal mine. The DNR is not conducting surveillance in those areas until it has been identified in a farmed animal. We shouldn't use the DNR's rule to determine an endemic area."

Miles Falk stated that he disagreed with the statement that this is not a human health issue citing that the CDC (Centers for Disease Control) recommends that no CWD positive deer should be consumed. Tribes consume a significant amount of deer so this is especially important to tribal members.

Michelle Carstensen commented that “we need to look at risk, including deer movement”. She stated that the 15 miles is not “a rule of the DNR” but is based on our [the DNR’s] deer movement study. Ms. Carstensen added that we can’t afford to conduct surveillance across the state, and on every deer that has been shot throughout the year we assess risk factors to determine where to conduct surveillance, and a positive farmed deer is a significant risk factor.

Brenda Hartkopf commented that the 180 day allowance combined with a permitting system would allow the Board time to assess the risk of animals in a management area and control movements out of specific herds considered high risk.

Dr. Glaser shared and outlined the updated definitions in our second rules amendment draft, also available on the Board’s website: https://www.bah.state.mn.us/media/Public-Rulemaking_BAH-10.08.20-DRAFT-incorporating-comments_updated-definitions.pdf.

Amy Cordry posed a question in response to Dr. Glaser’s explanation of definition of CWD test (Subp. 10: “CWD test means any test for the diagnosis of CWD approved by the board. A list of CWD tests approved by the board is available through the Internet on the board’s website or by calling the board office”): “when referring to ‘a test approved by the board’, are there any parameters for test approval? The board faces a lot of pressure in relation to animal commerce and I think a system that doesn’t have specific criteria could be faulty.”

Annie Balghiti reminded all in attendance that the time had come to open the meeting for public comment.

Public Comments

John Zanmiller, Bluffland Whitetails Association, commented in response to MNEBA’s suggestion requiring all five members of the Board to approve an endemic area. He specifically stated, “So ONE board member can derail an expansion of the endemic area? My organization finds this language unacceptable. Bluffland Whitetails is vehemently opposed to this language and feels that a simple majority is all it should take to make this decision.”

Michelle Carstensen (committee member) commented that the DNR would not support animals being allowed to leave a management zone and go to a shooting pen in a different part of the state, stating that “We [the DNR] don’t want carcasses removed, maybe some additional language to specify what we can do with carcasses specifically”.

Rich Meech (committee member) asked, “where do we see this coming into effect; is this only in an endemic area, or in the entire state? Will regulating the removal of carcasses after an animal has been shot be applied to wild cervids as well, or is this biased?” Mr. Meech further commented that he found it offensive to call it a “shooting pen”.

Michelle Carstensen responded that the DNR already places restrictions in management zones, “you are not allowed to take carcasses out of the zone”.

Rich Meech further inquired, “Can someone in the zone leave a carcass on the landscape?”

Michelle Carstensen responded that, if someone lives in the area, it is not illegal for them to let a carcass “go back to nature”.

Rich Meech asked if the same rules apply to roadkill.

Michelle Carstensen responded that they do.

Linda Glaser explained that if a terminal hunt facility is allowed to move animals as outlined in the proposed rules, the facility would have to meet the definition.

Rich Meech asked if the definition only applies to facilities in the endemic area.

Linda Glaser responded that a terminal hunt facility does not have to be in the endemic area; any hunt facility can elect to meet this definition.

Rich Meech inquired “what is the benefit to producers?”

Dr. Glaser responded that the benefit would be that the facility could accept animals from an endemic area for hunting.

Annie Balghiti asked if there were any additional comments from the public. None were noted. Ms. Balghiti then stated that the advisory committee could continue to comment.

Rich Meech commented that we need to consider animal movements from CWD endemic areas in Wisconsin.

Annie Balghiti asked Amy Cordry if she would like her written comments addressed at this time.

Amy Cordry commented that she felt that her comments had been addressed and that she had an appropriate chance to speak up. She added that the overarching opinion from the public of the state of the Minnesota is that this [CWD] is an issue that affects public health. Avoiding additional regulations is not the solution. “If more producers would be more solution oriented, rather than anti-solution, I think we could make more progress together.”

Rich Meech asked representatives of the Board, “When do you think your revised copy will get out?”

Annie Balghiti replied, “Optimistically, next week”.

Rich Meech inquired if the comment period would be moved back.

Ms. Balghiti responded that we [the Board] are not moving our public comment period back (i.e. extend it further). Regarding the advisory committee, we had initially said we would hold a maximum of 5 meetings, we have held 4 and will likely need more than 5. She inquired if the committee would be willing to hold a sixth meeting.

Rich Meech commented that “this is an issue that is important to everyone, so I want to make sure we get to where we need to be”.

Adjournment

Annie Balghiti adjourned the meeting, letting committee members know that she would be e-mailing them a survey to select a time for the next meeting and also the proposed current draft of amendments to the rules definitions. She added that the amended proposed rules draft would be sent to all members when finished.

Next Meeting

Date: October 28, 2020

Time: 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Location: Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams