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Executive Summary

A Chronic Wasting Disease Working Group was established in response to a charge by Michigan’s Natural Resources Commission (Page 4) to develop recommendations on further steps and actions to substantially mitigate or eliminate CWD in Michigan. The Working Group met on three separate occasions to accomplish this charge and they should be commended for their time and thoughtful contributions to this report.

There are four major areas identified by the Working Group that should be the focus for CWD efforts in Michigan: Communication, Research Consortium, Farmed Cervidae, and Harvest and Removal. From these four thematic areas came five key recommendations, outlined below.

Due to the complexity of CWD, and the importance of communications, the Working Group recommends:

1. **The Natural Resources Commission should pursue the help of an outside marketing agency in development of messaging Michigan’s vision for CWD Surveillance and Management.**

   This messaging should place emphasis on the importance of herd health and Michigan’s commitment to sustainable, healthy deer populations across the state.

The lack of funding is a significant detriment to the fight against CWD, and research is needed to develop new tools and improve epidemiologic understanding of the disease. Therefore,

2. **The Natural Resources Commission should take the lead in forming a consortium of states and provinces to seek federal, state and private funding and share research on CWD surveillance methods, diagnostic tools, transmission pathways and management practices.**

CWD is a disease that can affect both wild and captive deer in Michigan. Therefore,

3. **The Natural Resources Commission should work cooperatively with the Agriculture and Rural Development Commission to assess the effectiveness and direction of the farmed cervidae program, with a focus on biosecurity and CWD risk factors.**

Regulations for disease mitigation should proactively address risk with the best available science. Therefore,

4. **The Natural Resources Commission should continue to employ science-based strategy for the regulatory framework of CWD management.**

Finally, CWD surveillance and management plans should be grounded in science, and consider social, economic, and recreational interests. Therefore,

5. **The Natural Resources Commission should develop statewide, science-based management plans based on regional prevalences of CWD.**

   Hunters and cervid producers should be engaged in the development of the plans.
RESOLUTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION

WHEREAS, Michigan has now identified 9 cases of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has implemented its CWD Management Plan;

WHEREAS, through 2016 CWD had spread to 24 states and two Canadian provinces;

WHEREAS, there is no known cure for CWD and it is resilient, persistent, and contagious and presents a significant risk to Michigan’s Whitetail deer population, our hunting culture, heritage, and economy;

WHEREAS, the NRC has exclusive jurisdiction over certain aspects of Michigan's management of wildlife and works cooperatively with the DNR with respect to such matters;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved:

1. The NRC, in conjunction with the DNR, will establish a scientific panel of experts, selected by the Chairman of the NRC, the Director of the DNR, and the Director Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, or such other officials as the Chairman of the NRC and the Director of the DNR deem appropriate for the purposes of advising the NRC, DNR or other applicable Agencies on further steps and actions which could be implemented to substantially mitigate or eliminate CWD in Michigan. Such recommendations may include matters or subjects that would require legislative action or which jurisdiction for such action resides in other agencies.

2. The Chairman of the NRC and the Director of the DNR shall appoint a chair or co-chairs of the panel who shall be responsible for all of the administrative organization of the panel and who shall schedule all meetings of the panel. The DNR is requested to provide support to the panel.

3. The panel shall deliver to the NRC and DNR its recommendations by December 31, 2017 and shall hold at least one meeting where it will provide information on CWD and its risks.

4. Upon receiving such recommendations, the NRC and DNR will establish an appropriate process to receive input from the public on such recommendations.

This resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of those present at the regular meeting of the Natural Resources Commission on April 13, 2017 at the MSU Diagnostic Center for Population and Animal Health in Lansing.
Process

The CWD Working Group was established in response to a charge by Michigan’s Natural Resources Commission (Page 4) to develop recommendations on further steps and actions to substantially mitigate or eliminate CWD in Michigan. The Working Group met on three separate occasions to accomplish this charge. Summary notes (Page 10-17) were provided to each Working Group member in preparation for the subsequent discussion.

Meeting #1 – October 5, 2017 Kellogg Center, Lansing

Focus

The focus of this first meeting was to introduce the charge, promote relationships between working group members, and develop focus areas for the recommendations.

Outcomes

- Director Keith Creagh provided an overview of the charge.
- Working group members agreed subject matter experts would not vote on recommendations.
- The Working Group agreed not to discuss the recommendations with other organizations and individuals between meetings.

Meeting #2 – November 6, 2017 MSU Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, East Lansing

Focus

The focus of the second meeting was to establish a draft set of considerations in response to the charge.

Outcomes

- Four major focus areas for recommendations were solidified.
- A decision-making model was agreed upon with majority consensus of 5 votes of Working Group members present with opportunity for minority comment.

Meeting #3 – December 12, 2017 MSU Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory, East Lansing

Focus

The focus of the final Working Group meeting was to clarify and finalize recommendations.

Outcomes

- Established final recommendations to bring to the Natural Resources Commission.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the knowledge shared at Michigan’s 2017 Chronic Wasting Disease Symposium, efforts of the CWD Working Group, and perspectives of subject matter experts.

Communication

Following the CWD Symposium, there was one highlight that the CWD Working Group felt warranted special attention. The importance of education, outreach and messaging about Chronic Wasting Disease was a reoccurring theme from every state in attendance. The social science aspects of chronic diseases such as CWD necessitate the involvement of outreach professionals keenly aware of information overload and disease fatigue.

The Natural Resources Commission should pursue the help of an outside marketing agency in developing the messaging of Michigan’s vision for CWD Surveillance and Management.

This messaging should place emphasis on the importance of herd health and Michigan’s commitment to sustainable, healthy deer populations across the state. In alignment with the other recommendations included in this document, messaging should:

- Build direct partnerships between the DNR and hunting organizations
- Educate hunters on the importance of doe harvest for population management and the movement/disposal of carcasses
- Develop public education for CWD
- Help people understand management steps
- Learn from other state experiences (i.e. Wisconsin)

Research Consortium

The Natural Resources Commission should take the lead in forming a consortium of states and provinces to seek federal, state and private funding and share research on CWD surveillance methods, diagnostic tools, transmission pathways and management practices.

Research priorities for the consortium should include:

- Development of a live animal test,
- Improved high throughput diagnostics,
Recommendations

Research Consortium (continued)

- Disinfectant development and techniques,
- Mitigation and management of infected sites,
- Management techniques to remove disease from landscape,
- Human dimension studies for prevention and management,
- Advanced techniques for surveillance, and
- Transmission pathways, including evaluating possible vectors of disease

Farmed Cervidae

*The Natural Resources Commission should work cooperatively with the Agriculture and Rural Development Commission to assess the effectiveness and direction of the Farmed Cervidae Program, with a focus on biosecurity and CWD risk factors.*

This assessment should consider, but not be limited to, the following:

- Mandatory participation in the Herd Certification Program for all facilities (with exemptions for Class III facilities)*
- A review of program requirements for infrastructure of facilities
- The creation of a standard manifest for the movement of live cervids*
- A reduction on the reliance of Fish and Game funds

There was an acknowledgement by the Working Group and attending subject matter experts that amendments to PA 466 may be required to implement the changes denoted with an asterisk (*) above.

Harvest and Removal

*The Natural Resources Commission should continue to employ science-based strategy for the regulatory framework of CWD management.*

This strategy should include, but not be limited to:

- Reinstatement of 2002 CWD response plan statewide ban on the feeding and baiting of deer
  - Although the CWD Working Group passed this recommendation, a minority report is required. One member of the Working Group could not support the reinstatement of a statewide feeding and baiting ban.
- Consideration of a statewide ban on the sale of agricultural commodities for deer bait
  - One member of the Working Group could not support a statewide ban on sales.
Recommendations

Harvest and Removal (continued)

The Working Group also concluded that the Natural Resources Commission should continue to rely on the Natural Resources Department and provide the Department with needed tools for CWD surveillance and management.

_The Natural Resources Commission should develop statewide, science-based management plans based on regional prevalences of CWD._

These plans will be specific for areas where the disease is prevalent, areas where it may be emerging, and for the remainder of the state. Management objectives should be designed for the disease, not the cervid population, and may differ based on established versus emerging infections.

These management plans should include:

1. Best management practices for carcass handling and disposal
2. A mechanism to expand CWD sampling protocol statewide
3. Harvest considerations:
   a. Clear deer surveillance goals where disease risk warrants. If these goals are not achieved through traditional hunting season and practices, other non-traditional methods should be considered and implemented
   b. All deer management and regulatory tools for hunting seasons, including season timing, length, antler point restrictions (APRs), etc., should be considered through the lens of science-based CWD management.
   c. Continue aggressive surveillance in prevalent and emerging disease areas, with optional surveillance in other areas.
   d. Metrics for deer population management for disease transmission and risk reduction.

The success of these recommendations is dependent on stakeholder engagement and support, partnerships, clear messaging, transparency, and appropriate funding.
CWD Working Group Members

Thank you to the members of Michigan’s CWD Working Group (bios on page 10). They committed their time, energy, and knowledge to develop the recommendations contained in this document. In addition to the Working Group members, several subject matter experts from the Michigan Departments of Natural Resources and Agriculture and Rural Development attended the meetings to serve as informational resources. The subject matter experts did not participate in the decisions to pass recommendations.

CWD Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Averill, co-chair</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Straka, co-chair</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Ettenhofer</td>
<td>U.P. Whitetails and U.P. Sportsmen Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Porter</td>
<td>Boone and Crockett Quantitative Wildlife Research Center, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Rose</td>
<td>Michigan United Conservation Club (past-president)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Rustem</td>
<td>Natural Resources Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Smith</td>
<td>Michigan State University AgBioResearch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Syers</td>
<td>United Deer Farmers of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Thelen</td>
<td>Quality Deer Management Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitator: JoAnne Trieweiler, JT Consulting

Subject Matter Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Collins</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Hanna</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Soulard</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Stewart</td>
<td>Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CWD WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

James Averill, DVM PhD
James Averill, DVM, PhD received his doctorate of veterinary medicine in 2001 from Michigan State University. Upon graduation he went to work for USDA-Veterinary Services, Michigan office as a Veterinary Medical Officer for bovine TB. James returned to Michigan State in 2002 to pursue a PhD in Epidemiology, which was completed in February 2009. From 2006 to 2008 Dr. Averill worked for the Michigan Department of Community Health as Deputy Coordinator for Pandemic Influenza. In August of 2009 Dr. Averill joined Michigan Department of Agriculture, Animal Industry Division as the Bovine TB Eradication Program Coordinator. In June of 2011 he became the Animal Industry Division Director. Then in June 2013 Dr. Averill assumed the role of State Veterinarian while maintaining Division Director responsibilities. Dr. James Averill resides in Webberville, MI with his wife Donna.

Al Ettenhofer
Biography is currently unavailable.

William Porter
Dr. William Porter is the first Boone and Crockett Chair of Wildlife Conservation in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife at Michigan State University. He leads the Boone and Crockett Quantitative Wildlife Center, which is dedicated to developing innovative analytical tools that are used by wildlife managers to inform decision-making processes. His research focuses on the game-changing issues currently reshaping wildlife conservation: land-use change affecting habitats, emerging diseases in wildlife, shifting patterns in weather and climate, and changing conservation policy. His teaching includes courses in leadership and wildlife policy. Dr. Porter came to Michigan State after a long career at the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry in Syracuse, where he was Professor of Wildlife Ecology and Director of the Adirondack Ecological Center.

Paul Rose
Paul Rose is a past-President of Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC) where he held a variety of offices and Board positions for nearly 20 years. He also represented the Great Lakes region as a Board member of the National Wildlife Federation. Paul has previously served on Michigan Department of Natural Resources advisory committees including the Elk Management, Bovine Tb Eradication, strategic planning and the Pigeon River Country Advisory Council. Professionally, he is a State Certified General Appraiser whose practice specializes in commercial real estate and forestry/recreational land valuation throughout northern Michigan.

Bill Rustem
Bill Rustem received his B.S. in Social Science and his M.S in Resource Development, both from Michigan State University. He has many years of professional experience, serving in everything from the Director of Strategy for Governor Rick Snyder to the Executive Director of the Center for the Great Lakes. Most importantly, he loves to hunt and fish.
George W. Smith
George Smith is the Associate Director of MSU AgBioResearch and Associate Dean for Research for the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources. In his role as Associate Director, George Smith has leadership responsibilities for the animal and veterinary science research portfolio, serves as a liaison to the animal agriculture stakeholder groups, provides oversight of the Office of Research Support, and contributes to the overall leadership and operation of the organization. As Associate Dean for Research, he also provides strategic vision, leadership and administrative oversight for the CANR research portfolio. Smith obtained his doctoral and master's degrees in Animal Science from the University of Missouri-Columbia in the area of reproductive physiology, and his bachelor of science in animal science from the University of Idaho. As a Professor in the Department of Animal Science, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) or the National Institutes of Health (NIH) have continuously funded his research since 1998. To date, Smith has been the lead or co-lead on grants totaling over $9 million and published 111 peer-reviewed research articles and 18 invited reviews, and his research group has also filed two patents. He has also served on grant review panels for USDA, NIH and National Science Foundation competitive grant programs and on the editorial boards of several prominent reproductive biology and endocrinology journals.

Kelly Straka, DVM MPH
Kelly Straka is the state wildlife veterinarian and the Wildlife Health Section Supervisor for the Michigan Department of Natural Resources. She received her Doctorate of Veterinary Medicine and a Master’s in Public Health from the University of Minnesota. Kelly was the first wildlife veterinarian for the Missouri Department of Conservation, where she started a wildlife health program for the state. She is happy to be back in the north country where Winter is a real thing.

Kent Syers
Kent is a life-long resident of Michigan and he has enjoyed hunting and fishing throughout his life. Fourteen years ago Kent began working with his brother Rod’s farm, All Out Whitetails, in Muskegon County. This venture launched his devotion and interest into the health and preservation of Whitetail deer. Kent has volunteered as a board member of the United Deermers of Michigan for the last ten years and currently serves as the President of that organization. He actively promotes cervid issues at the state level and as a volunteer with the North American Deer and Elk Farmers Association has worked in Washington DC to help promote funding for cervid programs and research at the national level. After many years of raising deer, Kent has accumulated considerable hands on knowledge of those incredible Whitetails. He is still amazed to see their incredible ability to adapt to any situation. Kent is an avid Red Wings fan and when he is not attending to his wife, Sue’s, “honey do” list he is likely to be found enjoying the lake shore, Hiking, swimming, and skiing in the winter. Kent can be contacted by phone at 616-893-2397 or by email at kwsyers@comcast.net.

Chad Thelen
Chad was born and raised on a family farm in Clinton County. Chad started hunting at a very young age and has been in the woods and fields ever since. Chad graduated from Western Michigan University and was a Police Officer for 10 years before starting Stoney Creek Outdoor Properties in the early 2000’s. Stoney Creek specializes in wildlife habitat creation and maintenance and is a licensed Realtor specializing in the sales and marketing of hunting and farmland. Chad joined the Quality Deer Management Association in 2005 and started the Clinton/Ionia Branch of the QDMA that year. Chad is currently the branch president and has held that position since 2005. In 2009 the branch was awarded the national branch of the year for outstanding efforts in fundraising, military and youth programs, and public education of deer management and wildlife habitat. In 2016 Chad was awarded the QDMA national branch president of the year at its annual national convention in Louisville, Kentucky for his longevity with the QDMA, for implementing many hunting outreach programs, and leading many other volunteer events. Chad is a Deer Steward Level I and II graduate. Chad is married with 3 children and lives in St. Johns.
Meeting 1 Summary and Notes

Michigan’s CWD Working Group: PRIORITIZED COMMENTS

Prepared for 11/6/2017 meeting at the VDL
East Lansing, MI

Background

Michigan’s CWD Symposium was held October 3-4, 2017, at the Kellogg Center in Lansing, Michigan. Following the symposium, a CWD Work Group comprised of nine members selected by the NRC and DNR Director met to discuss recommendations for surveillance and response to CWD in Michigan. That meeting was held from 8-12 on October 5th, 2017.

Members in attendance included:

Dr. James Averill, MDARD (co-chair)  Bill Rustem
Dr. Kelly Straka, MDNR (co-chair)  Dr. George Smith
Al Ettenhofer  Kent Syers
Bill Porter  Chad Thelen
Paul Rose

The meeting was facilitated by JoAnne Trieweiler with JT Consulting. In addition, the following subject matter experts were invited to serve as a resource for the discussion:

Dr. Cherie Collins, MDARD  Ryan Soulard, MDNR
Shannon Hanna, MDNR  Chad Stewart, MDNR
Bill O’Neill, MDNR

Biographies of working group members and the subject matter experts are attached to this document.

CWD Symposium: “What struck you?”

- Wisconsin’s “6 categories” approach
- Precision of how NY looked where CWD was found-based on risk
- Importance of communication and education
  - Challenges associated with reaching rural residents
- Role of carcass disposal-may come down to resolve, individuals and processors
- Lack of state/federal attention and involvement
- Upcoming research on genetic resistance
  - Deer farmers should focus on this
- Syncing of all aspects of management
Following the CWD Symposium, there was one highlight that the CWD Work Group felt warranted special attention. The importance of education, outreach and messaging about Chronic Wasting Disease was a reoccurring theme from every state in attendance. The social science aspects of chronic diseases such as CWD necessitate the involvement of outreach professionals keenly aware of information overload and disease fatigue. Therefore, the following recommendation had unanimous support from the CWD Work Group:

**Recommendation:**

The NRC should enlist the help of an outside marketing agency to develop the messaging of Michigan’s vision for CWD surveillance and management. This messaging should place emphasis on the importance of herd health and Michigan’s commitment to sustainable, healthy deer populations across the state.

Chronic wasting disease is a problem facing every state in the nation; however, Michigan is one of the only states currently receiving General Funds for its control. The lack of funding is a significant detriment to the fight against CWD. Research is needed to develop new tools for managers and cervid producers alike; live animal tests, vaccines and improved diagnostics would lead to significant decreases in risk of disease transmission and spread. Therefore, the following recommendation had unanimous support from the CWD Work Group.

**Recommendation:**

The NRC should take the lead in forming a consortium of states to seek state and federal dollars and share research to further our knowledge and understanding of CWD.

It is the opinion of the CWD Work Group that this strategy will advance advocacy within Michigan, and allow us to identify critical areas of research.

The following areas of emphasis were identified during the first meeting of Michigan’s CWD Work Group. Recommendations from the work group, with the exception of two described in this section, will fall under one of these categories:

1. Testing and Research
2. Hunting Practices
3. Harvest and Removal
5. Enforcement

Within each of the above categories, there are the following three essential elements:
Elements a-c will be addressed in every recommendation coming from the CWD Working Group related to the following areas of emphasis.

1. Testing and Research

Discussion points:

- Alternative transmission pathways
- Genetics (resistance, diagnostics to inform epidemiologic investigations, etc.)
  - Can we estimate population change and the time needed for genetic shift
- Modeling disease transmission
- Live animal testing
- Efficacy of management strategies (is what we are doing working?)
- Human dimensions/social science
  - Can we estimate the economic impacts of CWD?
- Improving testing/surveillance methods (focusing on high-risk areas)
- Understanding deer populations
- Estimating where disease will move from existing cases (understanding spread)
- Determine where and how many deer to harvest/remove
- Decontaminate environment (do we have a plan for contaminated areas?)
  - Can we determine risk associated with contamination?

2. Hunting Practices

Discussion points:

- A ban on baiting and feeding and a ban on the sale of deer bait/food
  - What is the best size for the ban?
  - A full ban may be too extreme, especially in the UP
  - Would bait/food just be remarketed for another purpose?
- Increase deer harvest where necessary
- A ban on deer attractants (urine, minerals, etc)
- Hunter PPE/biosecurity
- Carcass movement/disposal
- Expanded opportunities (changes in seasons or licenses)
- Out of state hunters returning to MI
- When do you bring in sharpshooters?
3. Harvest and Removal

We need more controlled cervid populations in the Lower Peninsula and better communication with hunters. Hunters do not understand how deer counts are developed. We need to get hunters to meet targeted numbers as a way of limiting the role of sharpshooters.

Discussion points:

- Create biologically relevant disease zones (may be different in UP vs LP)
- Focused/intensive removal near CWD+ locations
  - Duration and cycle? In same location as sharpshooting? What does data show?
- How to handle wandering elk/moose
- Access to private property affected locally
  - How can you incentivize access?
- Incorporation of sharpshooters where hunter harvest is unlikely to meet objectives
  - Communication with public and awareness is essential
- Deer hunting regulations-bucks vs. antlerless
- Disease control permits
- How to generate good will in the hunting community (venison donation program?)
  - Could we trade access for sharpshooters and processed venison? Reduced taxes?
- Quick reaction to targeted removal
  - Need to use science to better influence removal

4. Best Management Practices for Privately-Owned Cervids (POCs)

These best management practices will be designed to reduce the occurrence of new outbreaks and will minimize the shared risk to the farmed cervid industry as well as free-ranging cervids.

Discussion points:

- Escapes: Complete revamp of the POC escape protocol.
- Make all facilities mandatory in the Herd Certification Program (HCP)
  - May require legislative action for amending PA466
- Require a tag on all dead animals (wild and captive) for tracking and disposal
- Movement notification and tracking by MDARD for live cervids
  - Possibility of manifest
  - Exhibition and sale
- Stricter enforcement capability for violating regulations
- Establish regulations regarding fencing after depopulation in positive herds
- Moratorium of new POC facilities
  - In disease management areas?
  - Con: Not science based, new people are coming in under current BMPs and are investing in success
- Consider supplemental fencing options such as electric or phased in secondary fencing
  - Not for all-use risk-based approach
- Review permit fee structure
  - Could money be used for better compliance/biosecurity?
  - Where will money come from?
Currently: 30% from captive cervid industry, 70% fish and game (should this continue?), MDARD only General Fund $

- Live animal movement (need to review current policy)
- Improve fencing maintenance and standards
  - Prohibit common fence lines between farms and facilities
- The industry does not want over regulation

5. **Enforcement:** This area of emphasis may be removed; however, we don’t want to lose sight of prioritizing risks associated with carcasses.
Meeting 2 Summary and Notes

Michigan’s CWD Working Group:

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Prepared for 12/12/2017 meeting at the VDL

East Lansing, MI

Background

Michigan’s CWD Symposium was held October 3-4, 2017, at the Kellogg Center in Lansing, Michigan. Following the symposium, a CWD Work Group comprised of nine members selected by the NRC and DNR Director met to discuss recommendations for surveillance and response to CWD in Michigan. That meeting was held from 8-12 on October 5th, 2017. A second meeting was held from 1-4 pm on November 6th, 2017.

Members in attendance at the November 6th meeting included:

- Dr. James Averill, MDARD (co-chair)
- Dr. Kelly Straka, MDNR (co-chair)
- Al Ettenhofer
- Bill Porter
- Paul Rose
- Bill Rustem
- Dr. George Smith (via phone)
- Kent Syers
- Chad Thelen

The meeting was facilitated by JoAnne Trieweiler with JT Consulting. In addition, the following subject matter experts were present to serve as a resource for the discussion:

- Dr. Cherie Collins, MDARD
- Shannon Hanna, MDNR
- Ryan Soulard, MDNR
- Chad Stewart, MDNR

Biographies of working group members and the subject matter experts are available.

Previously Discussed Recommendations:

Recommendation:

The NRC should enlist the help of an outside marketing agency to develop the messaging of Michigan’s vision for CWD surveillance and management. This messaging should place emphasis on the importance of herd health and Michigan’s commitment to sustainable, healthy deer populations across the state.

Recommendation:

The NRC should take the lead in forming a consortium of states to seek state and federal dollars and share research to further our knowledge and understanding of CWD.
Notes-11/6/2017 Meeting:

Decision Model

- Can you live with it and not oppose it?
  - Consent: Voting majority is 5 votes of members present with opportunity for minority comment

Testing and Research

Recommendation: The NRC should take the lead in forming a consortium of states to seek state and federal dollars and share research to further our knowledge and understanding of CWD.

- Priorities for the Consortium:
  - Live animal test
    - (NRC should work with MDARD to promote development and implementation)
  - Mitigation and management of infected sites
  - Vectors of transmission and spread
  - Management and surveillance techniques

- Top Priorities:
  - NRC should promote study of how best to remove disease from the landscape (for both free-ranging and captive cervids)
  - NRC should promote study of human dimensions of preventing and managing CWD
  - NRC should look for opportunities to collaborate nationally on new ideas for decontaminating sites

- NRC should promote use of most advanced techniques for surveillance of free-ranging and captive cervids
- E: Reword to place emphasis on getting public “buy-in” in testing and preventing. This is included in the first overall recommendation on the outreach campaign.
- C: Measure MI overall impact of existing surveillance in detecting disease and management in limiting the disease.
- NRC at beginning of recommendations = Fish and Game $. We want to emphasize state and federal funds
- “Should promote” – how will this be funded and who would be doing this?
- Surveillance testing:
  - Address credibility gap in current deer population estimates
  - Recommend mandatory harvest reporting

Hunting Practices

- A ban on feed and bait in the Lower Peninsula (for now).
  - Use
  - Sales

- Urge the NRC and state decision-makers to investigate the feasibility of banning the sale of bait and feed (seeing bait sold sends mixed messages to hunters)
Harvest and Removal

- Expand “Fish and Game” compact interstate-IWPC to manage carcass movement regulations
- B: Allow for additional harvest of cervids in UP using Disease Control Permits
- B: No baiting and feeding in townships where there is a CWD-positive animal
- B: Consider increased hunting opportunities in CWD areas of Moose and Elk
- B: Improve communication and outreach on CWD management techniques
- P: The DNR should establish clear, deer harvest objectives*.
- P: Focus on improving relationships between hunters and DNR by identifying ways to budge relationships (i.e. placing APRs in hot zones)  -typed as written-
- P: In the UP, the NRC should promote disease management based on seasonal migration patterns, where present
- P: Increase the number of drop sites statewide
- P: Eliminate elk and moose in CWD areas/disease zones who wander into areas
- *M: If these goals are not achieved through traditional hunting seasons and practices, other non-traditional methods should be considered and implemented. Non-traditional measures may include DCPs, APEs, extended seasons, sharp shooters, etc.)
- M: Engage hunters in removal in hot zones
- M: Develop clear guidance on proper disposal of animals (cervids) taken by sharpshooters
- P+M: Adopt enhanced biosecurity measures related to carcass movement and disposal

Best Management Practices for Privately-Owned Cervids

**Recommendation:** The NRC should work cooperatively with the Agriculture Commission to evaluate the biosecurity and associated disease risks of the privately-owned cervid industry. This evaluation should include a review of the existing funding structure for permitting and enforcement of POCs to strike a balance between General Fund, Permit Fees and a decreasing reliance on Fish and Game dollars.

- Require depopulation of CWD-positive facilities
- Establish regulations regarding fences after depopulation
  - This may not be legally feasible
  - This was removed then relisted for further discussion
- Conditional permitting in known disease areas
- Supplemental fencing-electric or double
  - For new facilities, in disease zones, all facilities
- Double gate requirements
  - Goal: to decrease escapes

**Enforcement**

- Stronger enforcement of out of state carcasses/emphasis on proper disposal