

21 APRIL 2011

WYOMING BRUCELLOSIS COORDINATION TEAM

CODY, WY (HOLIDAY INN)

TEAM CHAIRMAN:

---

Francis D. Galey, Dean, University of Wyoming College of Agriculture

TEAM MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

---

Walt Cook, University of Wyoming Brucellosis Coordinator  
Scott Talbott, Director, Wyoming Game and Fish Dept.  
Rob Hendry, Rancher, Natrona County Commissioner  
John Hines, Wyoming Legislator (Senator)  
John Keck, National Park Service  
Terry Kreeger, Wyoming Game and Fish Department (Chief Wildlife Veterinarian)  
Kari Gray, Chief of Staff, Wyoming Governors Office  
Mike Healy, Wyoming Game and Fish Commission  
Jim Logan, Wyoming Livestock Board (State Veterinarian)  
Deborah Dufficy for Michael McDole, United States Department of Agriculture/Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (WY Area Veterinarian In Charge)  
Karl Musgrave, Public Health Veterinarian, Wyoming Department of Health  
Eric M. Peterson, University of Wyoming Cooperative Extension Service  
Fred McDonald, Bureau of Land Management  
Cathy Purves, Trout Unlimited  
Joe Thomas, Park County Rancher, Wyoming Livestock Board  
Scott Werbelow, Wyoming Game and Fish Department  
Bill Williams, DVM, Veterinarian and Former Wyoming Game & Fish Department Commissioner  
Bill Lambert, Rancher  
Bob Wharf, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife  
Jason Fearnelyhough, Director, Wyoming Dept of Ag.  
Brad Mead, Rancher, UW Board of Trustees  
Don Montgomery, Director, Wyoming State Vet. Lab.  
Ken Mills, Microbiologist, Wyoming State Vet. Lab.

**I. Welcome and Introductions.** Frank Galey (FG) welcomed everyone and asked folks to introduce themselves. Notable guests included Representative Pat Childers and Marty Zaluski, Eric Lister, and Christian McKay of the Montana Department of Livestock. Frank noted that the plane was unable to land in Pinedale, so that contingent could not attend.

**II. Recent Brucellosis Cases.** Jim Logan (JL) reviewed the two cattle and single (private) bison herd from Park county that were found to be infected within a 3-4 month time frame. The three herds had no epidemiologic link and DNA evidence suggests that elk are the likely source of the infection. All 3 herds have had *Brucella abortus* cultured out of at least one animal. All contact herds (4,000 animals) have tested negative and have been released from quarantine. The 1<sup>st</sup> herd (300 head) originally had 5 reactors

which were removed. Subsequent testing found no new reactors and the quarantine was released (a fall assurance test will be conducted). The 2<sup>nd</sup> herd (bison) is still under quarantine. After the first test, 25 reactors were removed. This herd remains behind a 5 strand electric fence, so it poses no threat to other livestock herds (however, elk can jump in and out). The 3<sup>rd</sup> herd had 5 reactors removed after the first test. The next test did not show any new reactors. The herd was tested Tuesday (results pending) and will have another test after calving. If both tests reveal no new infection, the quarantine will be lifted (with condition of a fall assurance test).

Finally, there was a singleton slaughter reactor traced back to a herd in Sublette County. The source herd was tested and all animals were negative. Since *Brucella* was not confirmed in this herd, the quarantine was released.

**III. APHIS Brucellosis Program.** Deb Dufficy (DD) explained that the Interim Rule is now in place. This removes the potential for downgrading a state's status if two or more brucellosis affected herds are found or if a single affected herd is not depopulated. The entire USA was declared "free" and states will not lose that status as long as they make steps to prevent the spread of any brucellosis cases which are found. Due to limitations on funding and other reasons, depopulation of affected herds will no longer be the first choice of action but will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, the age for test eligible animals on a whole herd test has been reduced to 6 months as Strain 19 vaccination (which often caused false positive blood tests in younger animals) is no longer used. States which are Class Free with a wildlife source must develop a brucellosis management MOU concerning mitigations (i.e. Vaccination, Surveillance, Separation etc). The Wyoming Livestock Board (WLSB) and Wyoming Game and Fish Dept (WGFD) are in the process of doing this. The WGFD is developing shape files (maps) showing elk seroprevalence on a county basis for those counties within the Designated Surveillance Area (DSA) and adjacent counties.

JL: In addition, the new rules permit adult vaccination to occur without a test and without the addition of a new (AV) tattoo. There is more flexibility and common sense allowed now. For example, the 1<sup>st</sup> affected herd from Park County was able to be released from quarantine within 6 months. In the past it always took a minimum of 12 months (usually longer) for an affected herd to go through the testing to be released from quarantine. However, it remains to be seen how much federal funding will be dedicated toward the brucellosis program.

Scott Talbott (ST): WGFD is working closely with WLSB to provide the historical data needed. One issue is that we manage on a herd unit basis, not a county basis, so we are trying to convert this data.

FG: In Idaho Springs John Clifford (Chief Veterinary Officer of APHIS) made a verbal commitment to provide financial support for the Brucellosis Program. Do we know if those funds have been committed?

DD: The problem with GYIBC funding is that it is considered an earmark and there is a strong legislative commitment to end earmarks.

FG: The commitment was that the surveillance funding that was being saved (via the new program and reduced testing nation-wide) would be redirected to the GYA states.

DD: Yes, APHIS is trying to redirect some to make up for the loss of GYIBC funds. She can't speak to the rest of the funding commitment.

Bob Wharff (BW): Regarding the MOU between the state and APHIS: What about the Park Service? Shouldn't they be involved? How are they addressing the reservoir?

JL: At the Idaho Springs meeting we said that we wanted the US Dept of Interior (DOI) involved, and we repeated this request during the comment period. John Clifford is trying to engage them.

FG: APHIS cannot compel DOI to get involved, but they are trying to get them to cooperate.

Ken Mills: I appreciate the value of flexibility, on the other hand, we need the producers to be treated the same.

JL: When we find an affected herd, we meet with the owners and conduct an epidemiologic investigation and base our actions upon it. We try to be consistent.

Pat Childers (PC): DOI needs to be pushed How active is DOI in Montana?

John Keck (JH): The National Park Service (NPS) has an agreement with the state. The quarantine facility at Steven's Creek is an example where they identified land where bison can go without co-mingling with cattle. The problem now is: What to do with those bison. Vaccine delivery will be the focus in the future; today it is quarantine and hazing etc.

Christian McKay (CM): All elk are managed by MT Fish Wildlife and Parks, DOI is only involved when the bison leave the Park. We have an agreement on how to manage the bison when they leave the Park. There are no large year-round cattle herds where the bison go; our focus is on spatial and temporal separation. We vaccinate captured bison, but only a small percentage is vaccinated. When considering vaccination, 4 alternatives were modeled; the most aggressive of these reduced bison seroprevalence to 15% over 20 years. There is a new Superintendent of YNP (Dan Wenk) that may be willing to address the situation differently.

Marty Zaluski (MZ): There are 2 issues regarding bison: 1. The need to reduce prevalence. 2. Population control. MT has been working on these for decades with limited success.

FG: One concern with the Brucellosis Rule from the Pinedale region is the reduction of “Test Eligible” age to 6 months.

JL: We share that concern. The way the interim rule was written has caused confusion. The Western Region of APHIS interpreted the rule to mean that when a regulatory (Whole Herd) test was conducted, all sexually intact 6 months and above would be tested, but on a movement test, the age limit could be determined by the state. However, the National APHIS staff stated that the original intent was for the 6 month age to apply to ALL tests. So far, we have not received a reaction from our comment that this is overly burdensome and unwarranted.

FG: When will we know what the age limit will be?

DD: Soon.

Rob Hendry (RH): Six years ago when the GYIBC was meeting we had the same issue with NPS; there has been no change. The front page of today’s paper reads the same as 10 years ago.

**IV. WLSBoard Orders/ Other states’ requirements** Jim Logan passed out several documents: Letters regarding Identification requirements from SD, NE and CO and WLSB Orders and maps showing the new boundaries of the Designated Surveillance Area (DSA; see attached). He then explained that the DSA was expanded after discussions with WGFD, Brand Inspectors, and ranchers on where infected elk are and may co-mingle with cattle. The data suggest that elk seroprevalence in Lincoln County is very low, but there is lots of concern about the elk including those using the National Bird Refuge. In meeting with producers, most understand the reasons for the expansion. It is important that the DSA incorporate our entire risk area; if WY had a case outside our DSA, other states may respond by requiring pre importation tests of all sexually intact WY cattle. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Board Order was on identification and was a result from the letters received as mentioned above. The concern is that so-called “feeder” cattle may occasionally be diverted back into breeding channels. Thus, all sexually intact animals from the DSA must be officially identified before leaving regardless of age.

ST: what happens in other states if they have a positive?

JL: Just as it was handled in TX. They use a Brucellosis emergency action plan. The affected herd and all its contact herds are quarantined and tested. In most cases the preference is that the affected herd is depopulated (as this one was); but that decision will be based on the size of the herd and prevalence. There will be no impact on state status.

BW: Was there federal indemnity to the TX herd?

DD: Yes.

Brad Mead (BM): Are Bang’s Vaccination Tags considered Official ID?

JL: Yes. The Order specifies which tags are approved.

Jason Fearneyhough (JF): Albert Sommers wanted to state that 1% seroprevalence or less is not enough to justify expanding the DSA down to Southern Lincoln County.

JL: The WLSB requested WGFD to increase surveillance in the new areas of the DSA and areas adjacent to them. We also took informal public comment before issuing the Board Orders and will take informal and formal public comment before incorporating the board orders into our Chapter 2 (Brucellosis) rules.

Bob Meyer (BM): Education and communication are very important. We have developed a Brochure and FAQ sheet on the orders including which tags are approved.

Bill Williams (Bill W): Will Brand Inspectors enforce these Board Orders?

JL: Yes. Commuter cattle will also need identification.

KM: Is testing more elk an option for WGFD?

ST: We'll address this later. WGFD has changed surveillance priorities in the past after discussions with the BCT.

RH: The board orders and other state requirements are starting to impact commerce. If Brucellosis slips into another state it will have a huge impact on the price WY producers get.

JL: So far all states accept WY cattle.

Mike Healy (MH): If enforcement is through Brand Inspectors, how do you enforce requirements on those with Range Permits?

JL: We are contacting those producers and directly informing them about the requirements.

**V. USAHA Brucellosis committee updates** JL: Marty Z (MT State Vet who was in attendance) is the chairman of the GYA subcommittee. We had resolutions on: Depopulation Design Matrix, Indemnity (and an Appropriation for it), the Select Agent Rule, Feral Swine and Nation wide surveillance. All have passed through the parent committee and the Association.

Cathy Purves (CP): Regarding the DSA map: two years ago we asked for elk surveillance on tribal lands. Do we have any results?

ST: We only got one usable sample from the reservation.

JL: We don't have jurisdiction on the reservation, but we do when livestock come off it (we can treat them like imports into WY). Historical data indicated that elk seroprevalence was very low on the reservation. We don't know if that is still true. Since WY originally received Class Free status, there has not been a single confirmed brucellosis case in Reservation cattle. The tribes have adopted our Chapter 2 brucellosis rules, we will ask them to do the same with our board orders.

John Hines (JH): Have other states put restrictions on reservation cattle?

JL: Not yet.

Don Montgomery (DM): Haven't they documented *Brucella abortus* in feral swine?

JL: Yes.

**Public comment was taken at this time:**

Eric Barlow: Regarding the Parks, MT's issue is bison, for WY it is elk. We need to address the Wildlife Reservoir. We need the Governors to get together to address it jointly.

Jim Schwartz: A Heart Mountain operator has decided to subdivide the ranch due to issues with grizzly bears, wolves and now, brucellosis. There are huge concerns that APHIS is pulling out and leaving the states to deal with brucellosis. Some Hobby Ranchers like having lots of elk on their ranches and won't allow them to be managed. We need to address bison and elk and forge better relationships with MT & ID.

**FG:** (to the team): Should we discuss this with our Governor and ask him to reach out to MT & ID?

RH: Yes

JF: Yes.

BL: Yes, but also include the congressional delegations. We need to push them. The DSA is 25% of WY today; will it be 50% in 10 years? Elk movement is changing across the state, not just where wolves are.

Bill W: States won't move the Park Service. We need all 3 states' congressional delegations to apply pressure.

FG: We could draft a letter asking the 3 Governors and delegations to pressure DOI.

CP: We need the Forest Service too!

JK: NPS would need this pressure.

FG: We can draft them all a letter reminding them of the BCT recommendations.

PC: NPS and DOI do not take care of the Reservation. Feds want to be Brucellosis free, but little is being done by NPS and DOI; perhaps the 3 Governors can build a fire.

BW: We can't eradicate it without NPS/DOI. The two federal agencies do not have the same goal.

## **VI. Update on Consortium for the Advancement of Brucellosis Science (CABS)**

FG: Governor Mead asked us to continue to try developing a new vaccine and diagnostic tests. The Laramie Agenda estimated that it will take \$20-50 Million over 10 years to develop a better diagnostic test and a new vaccine and suggested a forum like CABS to get it done. CABS has two arms: a "Stakeholders" team that reviews the brucellosis research needs and a "Scientific" team that reviews the science behind the research. The state of Wyoming has fronted seed money for CABS and brucellosis research (\$400,000).

Frank has been to DC on multiple occasions; All GYA Senators and Representatives agreed to support funding CABS under the Farm Bill. Montana Senators Tester and Baucus are working on the language to do that. USDA/NIFA (National Institute for Food and Agriculture) can also choose to fund CABS but it appears that they are not interested in doing so. NIFA said they ask national organizations (National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Stockgrowers Association etc.) what they should be seeking research proposals on.

RH: The 2011 NCBA president (Bill Donald) ranches in Montana; we should encourage him to promote brucellosis research.

*(Editor's note: Cody, WY dairy farmer Scott George is the NCBA Vice President, Casper rancher Dave True is the Treasurer and several other WY ranchers are on the Executive Committee).*

JF: I will ask The Western Association of State Departments of Agriculture (WASDA) and the National Association (NASDA) for resolutions supporting CABS.

FG: When NIFA asks for input I will notify everyone.

BL: Our recent outbreaks led to 6,000 cattle being tested. That represents about \$9 million worth of cattle that were involved.

FG: We've also approached the Turner Foundation and the Gates Foundation. Gates only support research outside the USA.

ST: What about the Russian brucellosis vaccine?

FG: Not very effective. We're also looking at Super RB51 and oral vaccines in Ames.

WC: Additionally, regulatory issues prevent us from bringing the Russian vaccine into USA.

JL: Russian scientists came to the 2009 USAHA meeting. Their vaccine does not look very promising for the USA.

FG: Gerry Andrews at UW has developed a lateral flow device (similar to a human pregnancy test) for chute-side brucellosis diagnosis. He is ready to start testing it on mice using the BSL-3 facilities.

## **VII. RB51 Adult/Booster Vaccination Field Trials**

BS: There is concern from some producers about RB51 induced abortion when adult cattle are vaccinated. Brant has designed a safety study which will contain 3 groups of cattle: One group (controls) that are just calfhooed vaccinated, a second group which is calfhooed vaccinated and booster vaccinated as open yearlings and then adult vaccinated when pregnant, and the third group which is calfhooed vaccinated and adult vaccinated as pregnant adults. He will then compare the abortion rate of the three groups. His hypothesis is that the booster vaccination of open yearlings will protect the group from vaccine-induced abortion when they are subsequently vaccinated as pregnant adults. We are looking for producers to join in the trial (producers will be compensated for confirm vaccine-induced abortions); if you are interested, please contact Brant Schumaker, Walt Cook or Jim Logan.

## **VII. Indemnity: State or Federal**

JL: We've removed 36 head from infected herds in the last few months. Most affected producers prefer to test out if possible, but sometimes whole herd depopulation is the only realistic option. But even if just individual positive animals are removed it can become a major financial burden to the producer. The current USDA policy is to pay \$250 for the 1<sup>st</sup> animal removed plus \$50 for each additional animal and the owner gets any salvage value. This leaves the producer losing \$300-600 per animal removed. State statute authorizes the Wyoming Livestock Board to indemnify producers whose animals are destroyed due to disease concerns; however there is no funding for the program. Dr. Logan has tried multiple times over the last 15 years to indemnify producers and each time was told that no money was available. This last session Senator Geis sponsored a bill which would have required WGFD to pay indemnity to producers when livestock were removed due to a wildlife disease (it did not pass). We still need some indemnity funds. Also during the session, \$500,000 was put under the control of the state auditor to pay for brucellosis testing and control. We've asked the AG: Does indemnity qualify as control? We are awaiting an answer. The Livestock Board needs about \$100,000 for indemnity purposes. We would use USDA funds 1<sup>st</sup> and only pay producers for what that didn't cover and we would limit it to individual animal removals, not whole-herd depopulation.

PC: The state auditor got \$500,000 but you say you only need \$100,000. Why the discrepancy?

JL: Most of the money the state auditor got is for other purposes (testing, vaccination etc). \$100,000 per biennium should suffice for indemnity alone as we would only be talking about \$300-600 per animal removed.

PC: The state does pay ranchers for grizzly bear losses and will with wolves too.

JH: When whole herd depopulation is needed, then what?

JL: In the past it has been picked up by APHIS. If this happened again I hope APHIS would step up and cover the indemnity.

BM: Is this an insurable risk for the state?

JL: We've asked that, no answer yet. Any unused \$ would revert.

DM: What is the indemnity for Tuberculosis?

BM: With TB, APHIS can pay up to \$3,000 per animal.

DD: Part of the difference is because TB infected carcasses cannot be slaughtered.

BM: But today some markets won't accept meat from animals infected with brucellosis either and some slaughter plants refuse to process them. The value of these carcasses has gone way down.

BW: The indemnity should be equated with tuberculosis. I'm frustrated that APHIS is not stepping up. The feral swine situation in Texas proves that this is not just a GYA issue.

RH: TB is analogous to brucellosis.

JH: The states are taking over many federal programs, not just brucellosis. Every cause that gets cut by the feds wants the state to step in. We can't afford to do them all. This (indemnity) bill may be tough to pass the state legislature.

JL: Wildlife are publically owned by the state. Thus, a general fund appropriation from the state seems fair.

SW: Asked for further clarification of what the \$500,000 is intended for.

JL: Testing and Containment. Our view is that removal of a cow to culture its tissues (e.g. for DNA matching) is part of further testing (as well as containing the disease if the cow is infected).

JH: I'm not worried about the payment to individuals; we already do it for other causes.

PC: Is DNA testing statistically valid?

JL: Yes, we have lots of elk samples. When we get a match it is statistically significant.

BM: When all adjacent livestock herds are negative as well it provides additional epidemiologic evidence that the disease originated in elk.

CP: Interested in Risk and Premium insurance. Also, the Public Value and Benefit from paying indemnity.

FG: Does it matter if indemnity comes from WLSB or another source?

ST: WGFD routinely pays livestock producers for damages and for landowner coupons, some businesses, some individuals.

BW & JH: But the source of the \$ is different.

RH: As the cattle come out of state and go to slaughter can the state use the meat (as USDA inspected meat) and then pay for it?

**Public comment was taken at this time:**

Jim Magagna: The Depopulation Matrix must include the viability of keeping a given herd under quarantine. The Wyoming Stockgrowers did not support state indemnity because we felt it was letting APHIS off the hook. Any legislation must include language that the state will only pay what APHIS didn't pay. This is not the state giving \$ to individuals, this is repaying the individual for the harm caused by the state.

Eric Barlow: The state vet has an obligation to evaluate indemnity. But, the means to pay it are not there.

Christian Mackay: MT had \$, the Governor declared an emergency; state wanted to pay for costs above what APHIS would. But then APHIS refused to pay at all.

JL: That is true, APHIS will not allow for payments above the appraised value. Anything the state paid would be deducted from the appraised value. When the ID herd was depopulated the state had to pay \$100,000 of the indemnity.

DD: We know it isn't adequate. Thus, we can pay \$250/ animal if culture to get DNA samples. *Brucella abortus* mutates, thus we need a lot of samples.

**Lunch** was taken.

Upon reconvening FG asked the group what specifically we wanted the Governors/Delegation to ask DOI to do.

TK: Steve Torbitt is rekindling the GYIBC; this may get DOI involved in the issue.

***JL, RH, & ST offered to help draft the letter.***

**VIII. WGFD efforts in Jackson/Pinedale.** See Brandon Scurlock Power Point. BMAPs are undergoing internal review- when that is complete they will send it to the team and/or post it on the website.

KM: Did the VIT (Vaginal Implant Transmitter) study go as far south as Kemmerer (southern DSA)?

BS: No.

**IX. WGFD Efforts in the Meeteetse area.** See Brian Nesvik Power Point.

JT: What are the elk numbers in Carter Mountain?

BN: The objective is 5600, 5700 were counted and we estimate there are 6500.

RH: Will you collar elk?

BN: WGFD is trying to get the \$ to do that. Carter Mt. study in the 90s gave migratory data; things may have changed since. Cameras on migratory route documented 1300 elk.

**X. Surveillance Update.** See Hank Edward's Power Point.

RH: Area 63 was lower in the past.

DM: 2009 numbers?

HE: Twice those of 2010.

## **XI BMAPs**

BN: WGFD reviewed BMAPs (i.e. Best Management Practices- things we do to minimize risk of transmission). First we reviewed them for Sublette and Teton counties. There we have lots of options. In Park County we have few options. Do we still do BMAPs there? Yes, but what can go into them. See Power Point.

FG: Having BMAPs in Park County still makes sense. Anything to add?

CP: Work with land managers. E.G. radio collaring include DOI & NPS.

BN: Not partnered yet on #s- but have on calf numbers.

DM: Since public not supporting January hunt, are you still going to try it?

BN: Trying not to have to.

RH: Partnerships can cause problems. E.G. National Elk Refuge fought elk vaccination. This could limit what you can do.

FG: They need to be involved in initial discussions. Also producers and state vets.

MH: ID requirements from other states indicate that they don't know what we are doing. The Range Beef Council meeting would be a good place to present this.

DM: Do Park county producers adult vaccinate?

JL: They are very receptive. AV must be part of a herd plan.

JT: We AV right after cows calve and turn out in groups of 30. WGFD has been good. Need to collect VITs.

ST: We may not be able to get it done this year.

## **XII. Test and Slaughter.**

ST: Gave an overview. This was 1 of 28 recommendations. Did it on Muddy for 5 years; Scab and Fall for two. 197 elk slaughtered, 106 were culture positive (54%). Muddy went from 37% seropositive to 5% (at least in the 50% we caught). This may be a tool we can use especially if we're moving elk to native winter range. Cost and time are the major issues.

FG: This was an experiment; only half the elk were captured.

WC: It was the Pinedale folks that asked to have this on the agenda. Since they were unable to attend this meeting, I suggest we reserve the bulk of the discussion for the next meeting.

JL: Will you continue to monitor elk seroprevalence?

ST: Yes.

CP: Are you acquiring or improving habitat?

ST: The initial reason for feedgrounds was habitat loss. We continue to do large-scale habitat work (burns etc).

JL: USAHA brucellosis committee passed a resolution encouraging phasing out feedgrounds and banning new ones.

**Public comment was taken at this time.**

Gary Lundvall: I adult vaccinated 40 cows, all calved successfully. I encourage this practice.

Jim Schwartz: What is the value of Strain 19 vaccination of elk? Would WGFD consider booster vaccinating elk?

ST: We will continue to vaccinate with Strain 19. We have not had any discussion on booster vaccination.

Curt Bales: There are no feedgrounds here and our elk have brucellosis almost as bad; feedgrounds are not the main cause. Hunting limitations by land owners are a big part of the problem. BLM & USFS are talking about delaying turn out until June 15; this makes no sense because elk are calving on private ground. If ranchers sell out the land goes into small hobby ranches and we all lose. We want check stations reopened and tissue samples collected.

Jim Magagna: Being in the DSA is a burden (due to testing, tagging, marketing issues). We need to make sure the lines are drawn correctly. The only data we have is elk surveillance, and this is lacking in some places (or the numbers are low, or surveillance was conducted long ago). When only 1/6 of elk sampling kits distributed to hunters are returned it indicates a problem. How can we improve it?

Marty Zaluski: What is the believed efficacy of Strain 19 in elk?

TK: It protects 25-30% of elk from abortion. We don't know about booster/adult vaccination. With the select agent rule we can't do the studies to find it out.

**XIII. Epidemiology and Economic Research Priorities Workshop.** See Mandy Kauffman's Power Point.

FG: This is follow-up on a BCT recommendation.

JL: The Powell questions on economic impact (related to cost of expansion of DSA) are of great importance.

**XIV. Wyoming Wildlife-Livestock Disease Research Partnership.**

JF: Since 2008, \$278,000 from this program has gone to brucellosis research (the partnership also funds other research). The partnership had been getting \$250,000 per biennium for all disease research; after Governor Freudenthal's cuts it was reduced to \$125,000. This year Senator Hicks added \$125,000 back but stipulated it go to research

other than brucellosis (mainly bighorn pneumonia). Proposals are due May16. There will be up to \$125,000 for Brucellosis and \$125,000 for other issues. The next partnership meeting to review them will be June 1. Partnership includes: Director of Ag, Director of WGFD, UW VP for Research, State Vet, Director of the State Vet Lab.

#### **XV. Legislative Initiatives.**

JH: The legislature dedicated \$500,000 for brucellosis testing and containment and additional brucellosis research funds directly to UW. Previously we'd dedicated \$1.25 Million to WLSB for testing (\$860,000 is still available). For indemnity, I would first want to see the AG's opinion on possible use of current funds; then Brad's idea on insurance should be explored before additional funds are sought. The state does pay insurance on child health programs.

#### **Public Comment was taken at this time.**

Fred McDonald (BLM Cody Field Manger): BLM requires permittees to meet state requirements. Re: Turn out dates, want to be flexible; if permittee has concerns and wants to adjust it, we work with him. We DO NOT want to stop permit grazing. We are interested in BMAPs and willing to assist. We need to get projects into the system ASAP for 2013. We are willing to help with collars etc. BLM took an \$18 Million cut; don't know where it will come from yet.

Joe Hixon: Rangeland Management staff on the Shoshone should be on BCT; we need better coordination. Due to grizzly issues, turning out earlier reduces cattle losses.

ST: WGFD would like to increase surveillance in "new" areas of the DSA; to do so requires \$.

CP: Perhaps partnering with BLM and NPS can help get the surveillance.

RH: It s important to get this data in the expanded area, particularly hunt area 63.

BW: Regarding the poor return rate for hunter blood samples: in many areas only 30% of hunters are successful; this means we have a 50% return rate. That's really not bad.

JL: How much \$ would be needed for WGFD to expand surveillance to new areas?

ST: If we shift from current surveillance plans to new areas, none; but to do it in addition would require about \$100,000. We use a combination of hunter kill samples and other targeted samples.

JL: APHIS will probably require increased surveillance. We will ask them to assist with funding for it.

ST: The state funds (\$500,000) for testing, could that be used for testing elk?

JL: We are awaiting an AG opinion on how much flexibility we have with those funds.

FG: Meeting is adjourned. Please travel safely

**Appendix 1**  
**Guest Attendees**

Name	Affiliation	Address the Team?
John Lund	WGFD	No
Eric Keszler	WGFD	No
Deb Dufficy	USDA/APHIS	No
Bob Meyer	WLSB (ASV)	No
Todd Stevenson	Wyo. State Parks and Cultural Resources	No
Pam Buline	Senator Barraso's Office	No
Trent Roberts	UW	No
Bryan Wilson	UW	No
John Duncan	USDA/APHIS	No
Lloyd Dorsey	Greater Yellowstone Coalition	Yes
Lewis Graves	Retired	No
Scott Talbott	WGFD	No
Brian Nesvik	WGFD	No
Brandon Scurlock	Game & Fish	No
Jim Magagna	WSGA	No
Dwayne Oldham	Veterinarian	Yes
Dan Dockstador	Senate District 16	No
Eli Bebout	Senate District 26	No
Doug Minmoto	Assistant Director, Wyoming Dept. of Ag	No