

Vote Record

Senate - Committee on Environmental Resources

Date: 11/31/02

Bill Number: SB 307

Moved by: Baumgart

Seconded by: Schultz

Motion: Recommend for passage as amended

Committee Member

	Aye	No	Absent	Not Voting
Sen. Jim Baumgart, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. David Hansen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Robert Wirch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Robert Cowles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Dale Schultz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Totals: 5

Motion Carried

Motion Failed

Vote Record

Senate - Committee on Environmental Resources

Date: 1/31/02

Bill Number: SB 307

Moved by: Baumgart

Seconded by: Wirch

Motion: ^{Intro +} Adoption of SA 1 to SB 307

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Aye</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Not Voting</u>
Sen. Jim Baumgart, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. David Hansen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Robert Wirch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Robert Cowles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Dale Schultz	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Totals: 3 2 _____

*W Council
Rees +
Gale
Bash*

Motion Carried

Motion Failed



State of Wisconsin \ DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Scott McCallum, Governor
Darrell Bazzell, Secretary

101 S. Webster St.
Box 7921
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7921
Telephone 608-266-2621
FAX 608-267-3579
TTY 608-267-6897

January 31, 2002

CAPTIVE WILDLIFE LEGISLATION – SB 307 TESTIMONY

The Department of Natural Resources strongly supports this legislation.

For the past several years the department has been working with interested parties to recommend changes to our existing regulations. This process has generated considerable comment and controversy during the extensive public participation process. In the course of this public process we have held face to face discussions with 30 different industry groups and over 50 individuals, attended over 100 public meetings to discuss concerns and issues, and responded to more than 4,000 letters and telephone calls. We have also worked closely with the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to delineate clear areas of responsibility and to identify places where the two agencies can work together more closely.

The underlying themes of SB 307 are:

- To **require health certification** for captive wild animals moving in interstate commerce. This is a critically important issue for DNR, DATCP and the domestic livestock industry.
- To allow for the development of **clear standards for humane care and housing** of captive wild animals.
- To **minimize the privatization/commercialization** of the public resource by requiring that wild animals held under license be purchased from captive bred stock rather than taken from the wild.

The bill also **clarifies Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection's authority** under Chapters 93 and 95 to act to protect the health of animals in the state and to serve as the lead agency for receiving health certificates, issuing quarantine orders and interacting with the public on animal health issues. It **commits the agencies** (DATCP and DNR) to working together on captive wild animal health issues.

Some of the other aspects that are supported by the public and private industry groups are:

- The legislation continues to **allow the hunting of game birds on Hunting Preserves, transfers captive white-tailed deer to the list of Farm Raised Deer** regulated by DATCP and adds the authority for Farm Raised Deer farmers to **hunt farm raised deer** on their property.
- It authorizes wardens to act on **violations of Chapter 951, Crimes Against Animals**, when the animal is a captive wild animal.
- The 1999-2001 Budget Bill increased fees for existing licenses. This legislation will **reduce fees** from that level for many of the current licensees because it provides that a person with multiple licenses shall pay the full fee for the first license and then 50% of the fee for any additional licenses. In addition, the legislation would allow noncontiguous pieces of property in the same or adjacent counties to be licensed under one hunting preserve license, which will also reduce the costs to the licensee.
- Specifically, it **prohibits hunting of caged, penned or otherwise confined captive wild animals**, except for game birds and farm raised deer.

- **Local units of government** will continue to have some control through ordinances of the sale and possession of captive wild animals.
- The legislation would allow the DNR, DATCP and DHFS **to list, by rule, animals that are harmful**, so that special conditions for possessing them can be addressed. An amendment added during the last legislative session, which has been retained, requires that the department list cougars and ursidae as inherently dangerous animals. Examples of restrictions that might be required would be that mute swans be neutered and/or pinioned or that special pens be required for housing certain animals.

In light of recent national and world events such as the outbreak of TB in free-ranging Michigan white-tailed deer, foot and mouth disease in Europe, the spread of Chronic Wasting Disease from captive elk to free-ranging deer in Saskatchewan and the threat of bioterrorism in the form of devastating diseases carried by animals being shipped from all parts of the world, it has never been more critical that we work together to help keep Wisconsin's domestic livestock, captive and free-ranging wildlife healthy.

R-ZOO

MARK & ALICE
SCHOEBEL
W583 EAGLE RD.
NESHKORO, WI 54960



PH: (920) 295-3007

EMAIL: rzoo_wi@yahoo.com

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee;

My name is Mark Schoebel. My wife, Alice and I and our son Matthew represent our family's second and third generations of wildlife propagators and suppliers.

Our company; R-ZOO holds a Wisconsin Deer Farm License, Wisconsin Game Bird and Animal Farm License, Wisconsin Fur Farm License, Wisconsin Exhibitors License, and has held Wisconsin Endangered Species permits for Wolves and Lynx. In addition we also hold a United States Department of Agriculture Dealers License and a Wisconsin Commercial Deer Farm License.

Our licenses currently cover one of the broadest range of species in the state of Wisconsin. Although we have an extensive background in birds and reptiles our main area of interest is mammals.

My father Les Schoebel owned and operated the Fur And Feather Game Farm and was listed as an AAZPA dealer until his death in 1981. My wife and I took over the business, after his unexpected death; and incorporated it into our already existing business R-ZOO, which we established in 1978.

In 1989 we formed Animal Entertainment's Inc. whose first project was the building of Jr's Children's Zoo in Waupaca, Wisconsin. We operated the zoo until 1996. In 1990 we purchased Swinetime Pig Racing and began building one of the largest portable animal displays and petting zoos in the midwest. This company provides employment for 10 to 15 people annually, and contributes to the states economy.

R-Zoo propagates and supplies animals to wildlife exhibits, deer farms, game farms, fur farms and zoos throughout the midwest and the United States. For many years we have supplied animals for research. Harvard Medical College, Beth Israel Hospital, Boston Eye Institute, and the Southwest Research Foundation are some of the facilities we worked with. These research projects have benefited people suffering from gall stones, gastrointestinal ailments, and problems associated with aging of the eyes and other tissues. In addition we

supplied Opossum blood serum for protein studies which helped to lay the groundwork for today's DNA analysis techniques.

In the mid 1990s our company was hired to capture 25 Elk near Gaylord, Michigan. These Elk were safely captured and delivered to the quarantine facility by us in less than two weeks. After a 90 day quarantine we delivered the Elk to the Clam Lake area release site. It was years of experience with wildlife that allowed us to do a professional job. We are proud of the part we played in the reintroduction of Elk to the wilds of Wisconsin.

Operating a diverse wildlife company is a huge challenge. Background knowledge on many species takes years to acquire. Knowledge of feeding, medical care, animal husbandry practices, fencing, construction techniques, financing, business practices, and not to be forgotten, legal issues; are all part of a complicated high overhead business.

We have faced challenges on all of these issues. Today we face one of the biggest legal challenges we have ever faced; the complete rewriting of the laws that govern our business. The Captive Wildlife Bill deals with such diverse issues as hunting, propagating, buying, selling, killing, and bartering wildlife. SB 307 addresses complicated animal health issues, pen requirements and the classification of wildlife.

Years of experience have shown us how complicated all these issues are especially the legal questions. SB307 proposes the eradication of all of the existing Wisconsin Captive Wildlife law, and the implementation of a whole new framework of law.

As with all the other issues in the wildlife business there are no easy answers. We have made a decision to support SB307, knowing that unforeseen problems, as well as predictable problems will arise because of SB307. We anticipate that some of these problems will be addressed in the rule making process, but expect that some may have to be taken up with the legislature in the future.

Creating an entire chapter in the Wisconsin statutes has to be based on our constitution and its fundamental principals. Recent moves by outside interests to deny people the right to be involved with wildlife, represent an agenda we must not support. Our hopes are that SB307 will be the foundation for future wildlife propagators and that it will insure everyone's right to pursue wildlife propagation as a business while interacting with and enjoying their animals. We are willing to support SB307, despite our reservations, as it is currently written.

Thank you for your time;

Mark Schoebel

**Position Statement of
Whitetails of Wisconsin/Wisconsin Wildlife Coalition
To The Wisconsin Senate Environmental Resources Committee
Regarding SB307**

Wisconsin obviously has a rich and lengthy history of hunting and farming. Wisconsin has provided many decades of leadership in the dairy farming industry and annually ranks near the top in hunting participation on a national basis. Wisconsin also is a leader within the commercial deer industry. There are 500 to 600 families producing whitetails in Wisconsin today. We enjoy a national reputation for high quality stock and many of the leading breeders in the country are located right here.

Alternative agriculture has strong roots here and helps provide meaningful options for our rural citizens. Numerous attempts over the past several years to update our regulations addressing the captive wildlife industry have met with conflict and failure. So many species and so many issues have proven to be a difficult challenge.

Today, we once again find ourselves contemplating sweeping legislation to address the expanding alternative captive wildlife industry through Senate Bill 307 and Assembly Bill 614. Why should we expect success this time around after so many failures in years past? What is different?

This time, there is a broader general recognition that the captive wildlife industry is an important and legitimate option of alternative agriculture that supports many jobs here in Wisconsin. This bill will enable us to conduct business on a fair competitive basis. Our animals and products including live sales, venison sales, antler sales and other products or services will fall under the same regulations as other livestock industries.

This time, the two primary regulatory agencies, the Department of Natural Resources, and the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection are in full agreement on the merits and features proposed and contained in this version of the captive wildlife bill.

This time, the sponsors of the legislation have worked hard with state agencies and the industry to develop a bill that realistically recognizes regulatory issues, in a context with real world husbandry practices necessary for the industry. There is true appreciation for our end markets where animals are harvested, traded and shipped creating commerce. This commerce generates income for Wisconsin families and contributes to sales and income tax revenues for our state. Especially important now with the budget problems we are facing.

This time, there is concurrence on the need to not only protect traditional livestock from disease, but extend animal health issues to all commercial and captive species as well as publicly managed wildlife species. Recognition also exists for alternative health management practices that accomplish broad animal health protection.

This time, there is a broader and stronger organization and representation from within the industry to articulate and negotiate issues, strategies and solutions resulting in a better balanced piece of legislation.

Hopefully, this time, we can continue to work in this cooperative and constructive fashion to adopt the captive wildlife bill.

There are however, threats to this success that we need to recognize and guard against. Perhaps the greatest single threat to this success is any attempt that substantially modifies the content of this legislation. A great deal of effort (years worth) has been invested in bringing identical versions to both houses of the legislature at this time. Virtually every word, every sentence, and every paragraph has been carefully crafted to accurately represent the legislation, regulate the industry, and protect the public interest in a thorough and fair manner. Please to not jeopardize success this time by modifying this bill in any manner that renders broad support impossible.

We support and urge this committee to support this bill and vote to bring it to the full senate intact.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary L. Nelson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gary L. Nelson, President
Whitetails of Wisconsin
Board Member, North American Deer Farmer Association

**Public Hearing before the
Senate Committee on Environmental Resources
January 31, 2002**

Testimony by the

Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association

SB 307

This testimony is being given on behalf of the Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association, a professional organization representing close to 90 percent of Wisconsin's veterinarians. The WVMA supports several provisions of this draft legislation. These provisions pertain to animal health requirements for wild animals entering Wisconsin, housing and humane care of such animals, and other provisions related to disease control. Other provisions of the draft that WVMA supports include quarantine authority, disposal of diseased animals for the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection and rulemaking authority for both the Department of Natural Resources and Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection that will increase the agencies' capabilities to prevent the introduction of diseased wild animals into Wisconsin.

Events of the past several years, in Wisconsin and elsewhere, have shown very clearly the link among wildlife health, the health of domestic animals, and human health. Zoonotic diseases, which are those diseases transmittable from animals to humans, include such important livestock diseases as brucellosis and tuberculosis. Many of these diseases can and do infect wildlife species. This legislation is needed if Wisconsin is to protect the health of its citizens, safeguard its hard-won international status as a supplier of healthy livestock and genetics products, and protect native wild animals.

Wild animals are moving in interstate and international commerce as never before, and there have already been dramatic examples of the introduction of disease by this trade, as well as several near misses. Raccoon rabies was introduced into the eastern seaboard states by a shipment of infected animals from Georgia. Once introduced, epidemic rabies has spread among raccoons throughout New England, as far west as Ohio, and with a recent jump into Ontario. This epidemic, with associated human and pet exposures and livestock losses, has resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars of public and private funds. Ohio is presently struggling to contain the westward progression of raccoon rabies, something every state in the Midwest should be concerned about. In addition to this disaster, there was a near-miss in 1994, when rabies was introduced into kenneled dogs in Alabama through infected coyotes shipped from Texas.

Several years ago, a shipment of brushy-tailed possums was illegally imported into the United States from New Zealand, by use of deceptive documentation. These small mammals were sold and distributed as pets before the importation was discovered. USDA Veterinary Services had to trace down and dispose of the animals, including some in Wisconsin. Brushy tailed possums are proven spreaders of tuberculosis among cattle and farmed deer in New Zealand. This incident at least illustrates the value of health certificates in tracing animal movements.

While not known to be related to wildlife shipments, the catastrophic bovine tuberculosis infection of whitetail deer in our neighboring state of Michigan is a dramatic illustration of the linkage among public health, livestock health, and wildlife health. That situation has very seriously impacted the livestock industry, hunting, tourism, local economies and quality of life in the affected counties in northeastern Michigan.

Some may say that Wisconsin's regulation of entry of these animals with the associated health certificates and tests are burdensome, or may stifle alternative animal enterprises. The WVMA submits that this "burden" has served America's livestock producers well in tracing and eliminating important livestock diseases. It is foolish to jeopardize the large public and private investments in healthy livestock by leaving a door open for disease to enter through imported wildlife.

It should be pointed out that Wisconsin veterinarians cannot expect any new business if this legislation is enacted. The provisions of the proposed statutes fall on animals coming into Wisconsin from other states, and the required tests and examinations will be performed in the states of origin.

Wisconsin has important existing and developing businesses to protect. In today's international trade environment, regulators in customer countries do examine the precautions the US takes in its domestic interstate trade to prevent the spread of animal diseases. Because of its bovine tuberculosis situation in deer, Michigan must deal with severe restrictions on its producers' ability to ship cattle interstate. Wisconsin has maintained a very advantageous position relative to many states—we ship cattle, swine, semen and embryos all over the world. Genetics products alone are conservatively valued at \$150 million per year. In addition, at least three companies in Wisconsin are now attempting to develop new drugs, using the milk of transgenic dairy cows, creating the foundation for a new industry. This business is worth protecting.

Simply put, trade in exotic wildlife is a business that should be put on an equal regulatory animal health and humane care footing with Wisconsin's livestock industry. Otherwise, the back door will remain open to introduction of animal disease.

As small business people, veterinarians are as sensitive as anyone to regulatory burdens. No members of WVMA Executive Board or Legislative Committee raised that concern after studying previous drafts of this legislation. The legislation has been through a long

and thorough process of development, including public comments and review by the DNR Board. The WVMA recognizes this is a large, complex bill, but we urge you not to lose sight of the importance of its animal health provisions to Wisconsin animal agriculture and public health.



January 31, 2002

Mr. Chairman, Senators, Assemblymen and Attendees:

I am grateful for this opportunity to testify in favor of AB614/SB307 in their current form.

My name is Wesley Ramage and I raise over 400 elk in Oakfield, Wisconsin. As you can tell by my accent, I am a recent import to your great State and Nation; but the exchange rate hurt, trust me. Prior to coming here I farmed in Ontario, Canada, with my wife and three children. Those youngsters now attend public school in the Oakfield School District.

Making the move here came with great price and great risk; yet, we were willing to take that gamble and thus far we have absolutely no regrets. This is the greatest country in the World if one is willing to take responsibility and work hard.

This Bill too, is the result of hard work and sincere effort between the private and public sectors, between government agencies and between legislators. It has been a labor of more than 20 years I am told.

As the current economy has suffered, so too has ours in this niche of the agriculture sector. This Bill goes a long way to redressing that situation by potentially increasing the number of visitors to Wisconsin and aiding interstate trade, thereby benefiting one and all.

On behalf of the WCDEFA, I urge your vote on the passage of these Bills.

Respectfully submitted,

Wesley Ramage
Southeast Director

Steven P. Williams
Wern Valley Inc.
S36 W29657 Wern Way
Waukesha, WI 53189
262-968-2400

Comments on Captive Wildlife Legislation - January 31, 2002

Hello,

My name is Steve Williams. I'm from Waukesha where I own and operate Wern Valley Sportsmens Club, a 600 acre commercial hunting preserve with game bird rearing facilities for 35,000 pheasant, and one of the biggest sporting clays businesses in our state. My farm has been in my family since 1848, and sits less than 20 miles from where August Pabst released the first pheasants in Wisconsin. I also operate the McMiller Sports Center, a large shooting range complex near Eagle owned by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. I am a past president of our County Conservation Alliance and served for several years on the Conservation Congress. I am the current president of the Wisconsin Game Preserve Association.

Our association is primarily made up of hunting preserve *operators*, game bird *producers*, or people like myself who do *both* on the same property. With few exceptions, we are family run farms that vary in size from a few thousand to more than a million birds handled. Yet, our biggest operations are small compared to the large corporate farms of today. Almost all our members derive their main source of income from activities related to upland game birds.

We represent alternative and diversified agriculture in its purest form. Some of us have developed varied and niche markets besides just hunting, including birds for taxidermy, meat bird production for restaurants, game bird chick production, dog training and field trial activities, even the increasingly famous pheasant pot pie. We provide a broad spectrum of *hunter opportunity* in every corner of the state, and in every price range. We employ hundreds of people and represent a multi-million dollar industry in our state, and a two billion dollar industry nation wide. Wisconsin is one of if not the top pheasant producing state in the nation. Our markets are based solely on supply and demand- there are no federal subsidy programs here, and we whole heartedly support the state game farm and pheasant stocking programs.

Hunting on preserves is relatively inexpensive, especially when compared to the costs associated with out-of-state hunting. Many of us conduct hunter safety education programs, conservation fund raising activities, and numerous other events of benefit to the public and our communities.

Our concerns and involvement in captive wildlife legislation go back nearly two decades. Over that time, I have personally worked with half a dozen different Upland Game department heads in the DNR. In fact, a lot of us didn't have a grey hair on our heads when this first started!

The first rough drafts made many years ago caused quite a stir in our industry. Licensed game farms were popping up in record numbers, and there seemed to be a sense of urgency within the Department to stop, or at least slow down their growth. At the same time pheasant populations were declining rapidly due to hard winters, changing agricultural practices and other dramatic changes to the landscape. These first drafts were viewed as an out and out attack on our industry, as game farms were viewed by some in the Department as also contributing to the wild bird decline. The Pheasant Management Plan, put in to place by the Department a number of years ago addressed some of those concerns. This bill addresses most of the remaining concerns.

First, through permanent increased license fees. The old fees from the 1920's were woefully inadequate and did not cover the expenses incurred by the Department related to game farms. The new fees create positive revenue (about \$75,000 according to Dr. Hurley) for the Department, and help address the potential for wild bird and especially wild hen harvest abuse. It may be possible that the old renewal fee of just \$10 per year was so low that unethical individuals may have licensed prime winter cover and then shot off wild birds as they arrived there over winter. These fees, along with *minimum stocking requirements* will help address these concerns, as well as the frustration and negative image commercial hunting preserve operators resent about being painted with that same brush.

One of the most important aspects of the bill is the differentiation between commercial and non-commercial operations. It was a major concern that game bird producers not loose their smaller (and local) customers, or potential new business due to overly restrictive captive wildlife legislation. Those concerns can be put to rest as this bill will help insure the continued well being of our industry in the future. Issues related to law enforcement,

record keeping, and diseases are also addressed, but were not resolved without compromise and a renewed sense of trust between our association and the Department that took many years and countless meetings to build. It was a major concern of our membership that we wanted a bill that spelled out the rules to the greatest extent possible. While we still have concerns about how some of the details will be worked out under Administrative Rule, at 113 pages and 20 years, I think we have run this dog about as long and hard as anyone could have imagined.

I want to personally thank everyone involved from the Department for their genuine effort to bring as much to this bill as could be under the broad and varied interests of all the groups involved. I also would like to thank our lobbyist, Mr. Gary Goyke and our secretary Mr. Scott Goetzka, for their tremendous efforts, and this committee for its time. Thank you again.



HUNTING PRESERVE - SPORTING CLAYS

S36 W29657 Wern Way
Waukesha, WI 53189

262-968-2400

*Steve
Williams*

Fax: 262-968-3455

~~email: wern@wernvalley.com~~

www.wernvalley.com



Wisconsin Game Preserve Association

President

Steve Williams
Wern Valley Sportsman's Club
S36 W29657 Wern Way
Waukesha, WI 53188
(262) 968-2400

Vice-President

Carrie Wierzba
Lake Elaine Game Farm
3619 Alm Rd.
Amherst Junction, WI 54407
(715) 824-5191

Secretary/Treasurer

Scott Goetzka
Woods & Meadow
N4335 Potter Rd.
Warrens, WI 54666
(608) 378-4223

Directors

Tim Raddatz
Lake Elaine Game Farm
Box 92
Nelsonville, WI 54458
(715) 824-5191

Bruce Kapanke
Oak Knoll
W2513 Whitmore Rd.
Elkhorn, WI 53121
(262) 723-7363

Trent Rasmussen
Renegade Quail
5561 Reddin Rd.
WI Rapids, WI 54495
(715) 424-5561

Susan Krug
Krug's Northwoods
W11216 Rahmel Lane
Medford, WI 54451
(715) 785-7836

Dan Marks
Milford Hills Hunt Club
W5670 French Rd.
Johnson Creek, WI 53058
(920) 699-2249

Greg Wolff
Wolff's Bellefontaine Farms
6614 Henry Rd.
Belleville, WI 53508
(608) 424-3665

Scott Goetzka
Woods & Meadow Hunting Preserve
N4335 Potter Rd.
Warrens, WI 54666

Wisconsin Game Preserve Association Secretary/Treasurer

I have family run business in eastern Jackson County. My parents started this business in 1972 on a farm that has been in my family since the 1890's. We raise approximately 22,000 pheasants a year, run a hunting preserve on 1100 acres of land, sell pheasants to local sportsmen clubs for fall releasing, and have an 600-acre area under fence for Whitetail hunting. Along with the existing natural prairie grasses, our hunting areas are planted with sorghum, sudan grass, and millets for optimum pheasant habitat. We also farm over 100 acres of corn, soybeans etc., and operate a sporting clays range. I guess you could say we are truly diversified!

I am representing the members of the Wisconsin Game Preserve Association. The WGPA consists of members who raise pheasants for resale to hunting preserves, members who operate the hunting preserves but don't raise the pheasants, and members who both raise the pheasants and release them for hunting. Most of the members have a farm history a lot like mine. They are family businesses, passed on from generation to generation.

Our association stands in full support of the Captive Wildlife legislation (Senate Bill 307). The bill affects our producers and hunting preserve operators differently, but positively.

From the Producers standpoint:

- The transition from the Dept. of Natural Resources to the Dept. of Ag is a huge plus. These farms are raising birds for resale to hunting preserves, restaurants, dog trials, sportsmen clubs, etc. Most problems they encounter have to do with feed, medication, disease, or health certification issues. These questions are already being dealt with at the Dept. of Ag level, and it is only natural to have the producers go under them.
- All pheasants being sold to hunting preserves would have to come from a NPIP (National Poultry Improvement Plan) certified stock. This helps to set a higher standard of disease control and animal husbandry. Many producers are already a part of the NPIP program.
- Producers are being asked to fill out the same paperwork for the DNR that the hunting preserves have to do. Because they don't actually release the pheasants they raise for hunting on their land, there is no need for them to be filling out these papers.



Wisconsin Game Preserve Association

President

Steve Williams
Wern Valley Sportsman's Club
S36 W29657 Wern Way
Waukesha, WI 53188
(262) 968-2400

Vice-President

Carrie Wierzba
Lake Elaine Game Farm
3619 Alm Rd.
Amherst Junction, WI 54407
(715) 824-5191

Secretary/Treasurer

Scott Goetzka
Woods & Meadow
N4335 Potter Rd.
Warrens, WI 54666
(608) 378-4223

Directors

Tim Raddatz
Lake Elaine Game Farm
Box 92
Nelsonville, WI 54458
(715) 824-5191

Bruce Kapanke
Oak Knoll
W2513 Whitmore Rd.
Elkhorn, WI 53121
(262) 723-7363

Trent Rasmussen
Renegade Quail
5561 Reddin Rd.
WI Rapids, WI 54495
(715) 424-5561

Susan Krug
Krug's Northwoods
W11216 Rahmel Lane
Medford, WI 54451
(715) 785-7836

Dan Marks
Milford Hills Hunt Club
W5670 French Rd.
Johnson Creek, WI 53058
(920) 699-2249

Greg Wolff
Wolff's Bellefontaine Farms
6614 Henry Rd.
Belleville, WI 53508
(608) 424-3665

From the Hunting Preserve standpoint:

- Under current law a preserve needs a separate license for a parcel of land if the farm is not "contiguous acres". For many, this is unnecessary paperwork, leading to multiple license costs. This legislation takes out the word "contiguous", and allows one license. Not only does it lighten the burden for the preserve, but frees up DNR time in administering licenses, postage, etc.
- Hunting preserves will be classified by how many pheasants they release. 1,000 or more released will be Class A, under 1,000 released will be Class B. Class B preserves will not be allowed to hunt hen pheasants from mid-December through April. This helps protect the accidental shooting of wild hen pheasants in late winter. Class B preserves will also have a minimum stocking requirement of 1 bird per 4 licensed acres.
- Any pheasant purchased by, or raised by a hunting preserve will have to be NPIP certified. Again, this helps to set a higher standard of disease control.

As an association we have spent many hours working with the DNR, Dept. of Ag, and our individual legislators. Our goal all along has been to have legislation that promotes the propagation of a healthy bird; and allows us to continue to run our businesses productively. The WGPA feels that Senate Bill 307 meets our goals, and we ask you to vote in favor of this bill.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS**

Office of the County Executive

TO: State Senator James Baumgart, Chairman &
Members of the Environmental Resources Committee

FROM: Patti Bustle, Assistant Director, Intergovernmental Relations

DATE: January 31, 2001

SUBJECT: Senate Bill 307 – Possession of Wild Animals and Their Carcass Parts

Attached please find comments from Bruce Beehler, D.V.M, Deputy Zoo Director, Milwaukee County Zoo, supporting Senate Bill 307. As in previous legislative sessions, the Milwaukee County Zoo supports legislation that will enhance the conservation of wild animals and the well-being of captive animals, protect the public from animal related injury and disease, reduce the transmission of disease to domestic animals and prohibit the introduction of animals harmful to the environment.

Dr. Beehler has many comments regarding Senate Bill 307. Dr. Beehler's concerns outlined in his testimony have been resolved by the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection.

Again, the Milwaukee County Zoo respectfully urges your support of Senate Bill 307. Thank you for considering our comments.

Attachment.

**Milwaukee County Zoo comments regarding
Senate Bill 307
(Relating To Possession Of Wild Animals And Their Carcass Parts).**

Bruce A. Beehler, D.V.M.
Deputy Zoo Director, Animal Management and Health
Milwaukee County Zoo
January 28, 2002

The Milwaukee County Zoo supports Senate Bill 307. In keeping with the Zoo's mission, we support legislation that will enhance the conservation of wild animals and the well-being of captive animals, protect the public from animal related injury and disease, reduce the transmission of disease to domestic animals, and prohibit the introduction of animals harmful to the environment. With the authority granted by this bill to the Department of Natural Resources, and through the rule-making process, all of these goals can be achieved.

We have several comments and recommendations regarding this bill:

General Comment

This bill grants the DNR substantial regulatory powers with only general legislative guidelines. Safeguards are needed to ensure that subsequent regulations are appropriate to the intent of the legislation and are not too burdensome.

We urge that the DNR solicits and considers comments from interested parties during the rule-making process. In addition, we urge that a standing committee be formed from volunteer expert representatives of appropriate interest groups subject to these rules to assist the DNR in evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the proposed rules.

Section 206.95.71 (2)

The amendment as proposed will be a significant problem for maintaining our animal collection and our collaborative animal conservation efforts. Most truck shipments of animals to and from the Milwaukee County Zoo are interstate, and some are international. Because of the special needs of many of these animals, the Zoo only retains shippers with expertise and the unique equipment needed for the species being shipped. Most of these shippers are from other regions of the country.

For example, moving a giraffe requires a truck specifically built for that purpose. There are few shippers in the country with this equipment and the demonstrated expertise necessary to move this species safely. In the last 20 years our Zoo has shipped out a total of only seven giraffe - there would be little incentive for these shippers to acquire an annual Wisconsin license. Yet without these shippers we would have no way to safely ship giraffes. The same situation applies for many other zoo animal species.

In addition, we receive animals trucked to us from zoos throughout North America. These zoos have their own preferred shippers. Any one zoo would rarely ship an animal to our zoo. Again, there would be little incentive for these shippers from zoos elsewhere in the country to obtain a Wisconsin license, yet their services are vital to our cooperative animal conservation efforts.

We urge that shippers who make less than six shipments in Wisconsin annually be exempt from this licensing requirement for the purposes of moving wild animals to and from public zoos and aquariums. This is the exemption currently provided for livestock shippers.

Section 219. 95.72(7)a.

It is sometimes necessary to transport a dead zoo animal to a laboratory or institution for veterinary diagnostic purposes. The proposed bill would require that a license be obtained to transport the animal to the laboratory.

We urge that an exemption from licensure be granted for the purposes of "veterinary examination".

Section 224, 169.01(14)

The use of common names for animals can be ambiguous, misleading or unintentionally non-specific. For example, there are dozens of species of opossum and several species of wolves.

We recommend that either the scientific name of the animal be included or that the phrase "native to Wisconsin" be added to the definition.

169.07(1)(a)

The wording is ambiguous, and suggests that only captive live Ursidae are subject to this requirement.

We recommend that the wording be changed to read:

"No person may exhibit any captive live non-native wild animal of the family Ursidae or any captive live native wild animal except as authorized..."

169.08(1)

The wording is ambiguous, and suggests that only Ursidae are subject to this requirement.

We recommend that the wording be changed to read:

"No person may propagate any non-native wild animal of the family Ursidae or any native wild animal except as authorized..."

169.12(3)

The phrase "more than 5" is confusing and unnecessary.

We recommend that the phrase "more than 5" be deleted.

169.15(4)(b)

If the intent of this notification is to protect the public and the environment:

We recommend that escapes of all animals designated by the department as harmful be subject to this notification requirement, and that notification occurs immediately after discovery of the escape.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.



Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
2036 West 9th Avenue
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54904
(Phone / Fax # 920-235-6186 / 6030)

January 31, 2002

State of Wisconsin
Senate Hearing
Room 300 SE

Re: SB 307 "Captive Wildlife"

The Wisconsin Wildlife Federation "WWF" expresses strong support for passage of this bill. The WWF represents 35 district clubs, 18 affiliate organizations and 10,000 members throughout Wisconsin. This includes a wide variety of interests in support of hunters, fishers and outdoor enthusiasts. Our varied groups include conservation clubs, rod & gun clubs, field trial organizations, bird & game breeders, muzzleloaders, sport fishing, hunters education, waterfowl organizations, trappers, taxidermists, sporting dogs and deer & bear associations.

Our organization works within a committee structure utilizing the resources of our constituency and receives additional input and support from The National Wildlife Federation, the University System and the Department of Natural Resources. The WWF has been involved in this captive wildlife issue with roots dating back to its inception some 20+ years ago. The current WWF Wildlife Committee has been working with this bill for the entire decade of the 1990s. Until 3 years ago, we did not see a consensus of support for legislation. A great amount of work has been accomplished in the last two years allowing our committees, clubs and organization to come together in endorsing wide-based support for this bill.

Wisconsin's natural resources and outdoor beauty continues to undergo dynamic change. This legislation goes a long way in recognizing the change in landscape and will allow Wisconsin to manage the resources we have well into the 21st century. We thank you again for this opportunity to be heard as we urge passage of SB 307.

Respectfully submitted,

James G. Weishaan
President

[Message delivered by: Mr Larry Gohke, WWF Wildlife Committee]
P.O. Box 42, Neeshkoro, WI 54960
gohkel@vba.com

MEMO

TO: Members, Wisconsin State Senate
FROM: Gary R. Goyke, Legislative Lobbyist
Wisconsin Game Preserve Association
Wisconsin Wildlife Coalition
RE: Senate Bill 307, Relating to Captive Wildlife
DATE: Thursday, March 7, 2002

FLOOR DISTRIBUTION
AUTHORIZED BY SEN.
MOEN

On behalf of the Wisconsin Game Preserve Association (WGPA) and the Wisconsin Wildlife Coalition (WWC), I am writing to request your support for Senate Bill 307, which is on today's Senate's calendar.

The Senate Committee on Environmental Resources held a well-attended public hearing, conducted a lengthy discussion and recommended SB 307 for passage. During the public hearing, there were no registrations or testimony against the bill.

This proposal was originally brought forward by three state agencies — the Department of Natural Resources; the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection; and the Department of Health and Family Services. The proposal was refined over several years. It allows Wisconsin laws to reflect the realities of captive wildlife issues for the 21st century. The recent detection of three cases of chronic wasting disease in Wisconsin's wild deer herd (the first ever) has increased the urgency of this measure.

The WGPA and the WWC have joined with many other groups, associations and individuals in supporting this legislation. The following is a list of groups that support SB 307:

Wisconsin Game Preserve Association	International Crane Foundation
Wisconsin Bird and Game Breeders Association	Farm Bureau
Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers Association	Wisconsin Audubon Society
Whitetails of Wisconsin	Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association	Wisconsin Wildlife Society
Conservation Congress	Wisconsin Holstein Association
Wisconsin Cattleman's Association	Wisconsin Wildlife Coalition

Several members from these associations are present in the Capitol today to help answer any questions you may have. If you have any questions or comments, you can reach me at the address and phone numbers listed below.

Gary R. Goyke, 754 Williamson Street, Madison, WI 53701
Office 608-255-1166 608-255-3301 (FAX)
Home Office 608-245-3777 608-245-3787 (FAX)
Home 608-249-8118 (Evenings) gnregoyke@mailbag.com e-mail

VIA FAX 267-677
CC: To Sen. Jim Baumgart
Mr. Pat Henderson

February 19, 2001

Pat - any calls to Sen. Chvala
would be great! I think
it looks good for the 26th

The Honorable Charles Chvala
Wisconsin State Senate
Room 211 South, State Capitol
P.O. Box 7882
Madison, WI 53707-7882

Dear Senator Chvala *Chuck*

On behalf of the Wisconsin Game Preserve Association and the Wisconsin Wildlife Coalition and the many individuals who have worked hard to develop an acceptable captive wildlife proposal, I request the Senate Organization Committee schedule Senate Bill 307 for action by the full Senate. SB 307 is sponsored by Senator Rod Moen and five other Senators.

When Senator Baumgart's Committee on Environmental Resources heard this proposal, there was absolutely no opposition to the proposal. There is a growing consensus on the need to make the necessary statutory changes to reflect the realities of the 21st century on captive wildlife issues. We respectfully ask to have the bill scheduled for action on Tuesday, February 26th. This will enable us to work with the State Assembly for final passage.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

Gary
Gary R. Goyke
Legislative Representative
Wisconsin Game Preserve Association
Wisconsin Wildlife Coalition
754 Williamson Street
Madison, WI 53703
(608) 255-1166

Pat:
Scott Goetzko WPGA
Jim Pankow (your district)
Sarah Hurley WDRR
will be at your office
on the day of the vote
to help answer questions
during the debate
Thank you!
-Gary

Co-sponsorship Request, Captive Wildlife Health Legislation

DATE: September 28, 2001
TO: Legislative Colleagues
FROM: Representative DuWayne Johnsrud and
Senator Rod Moen
SUBJECT: Captive Wildlife, co-sponsorship request (LRB 2708/3 & LRB 3747)
DEADLINE: October 12, 2001

Dear Colleague;

Some key points of the new and improved Captive Wildlife Health bill are:

- **Requires health certification** for captive wild animals moving in interstate commerce.
- **Allows for the development of clear standards for humane care and housing** of captive wild animals.
- **Minimizes privatization/commercialization** of the public resource by requiring that wild animals held under license be purchased from captive bred stock rather than taken from the wild.
- **Clarifies Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection's authority** under Chapters 93 and 95 to act to protect the health of animals in the state and to serve as the lead agency for receiving health certificates, issuing quarantine orders and interacting with the public on animal health issues.
- **Continues to allow hunting of game birds on Hunting Preserves, transfers captive white-tailed deer to the list of Farm Raised Deer** regulated by DATCP and adds the authority for Farm Raised Deer farmers to **hunt farm raised deer** on their property.
- **Reduces fees** for many licensees to provide that a person with multiple licenses shall pay the full fee for the first license and then 50% of the fee for any additional licenses.
- **DNR, DATCP and DHFS would list, by rule, animals that are harmful.**

Sincerely,
Representative DuWayne Johnsrud

Senator Rodney Moen

Supporters of LRB 2708/3 and LRB 3747

Department of Natural Resources
Wisconsin Game Preserve Association
Wisconsin Bird and Game Breeders Association
Wisconsin Commercial Deer and Elk Farmers
Association
Whitetails of Wisconsin
Wisconsin Veterinary Medical Association
Conservation Congress

Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
International Crane Foundation
Farm Bureau
Wisconsin Audubon Society
Wisconsin Wildlife Federation
Wisconsin Wildlife Society
Wisconsin Cattleman's Association
Wisconsin Holstein Association

Handwritten notes:
New Request
Approved

Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

Original Updated Corrected Supplemental

LRB Number 01-3747/1	Introduction Number SB-307
Subject Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP	
Fiscal Effect	
State:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No State Fiscal Effect <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations	
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs	
Local:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Local Government Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Indeterminate	
1. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	3. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
5. Types of Local Government Units Affected <input type="checkbox"/> Towns <input type="checkbox"/> Village <input type="checkbox"/> Cities <input type="checkbox"/> Counties <input type="checkbox"/> Others <input type="checkbox"/> School Districts <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts	
Fund Sources Affected	
<input type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEGS	
Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations	
Agency/Prepared By DOR/ Dennis Collier (608) 266-5773	Authorized Signature Brian Pahnke (608) 266-2700
Date 11/14/01	

Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DOR 11/14/01

LRB Number 01-3747/1	Introduction Number SB-307	Estimate Type Original
Subject Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP		

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under current law, licenses issued by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to pheasant and quail farms, game bird or animal farms, fur animal farms, deer farms and wildlife exhibits are denied or revoked if the license applicant owes the state delinquent taxes. This bill, which would revise the regulatory structure of DNR, provides that licenses for captive wild animal farms, wild fur farms and bird hunting preserves are to be denied or revoked if the applicant owes delinquent taxes.

The Department of Revenue believes that the businesses subject to license denial or revocation under current law would remain subject to those actions under the bill. Therefore, this bill is not expected to impact the department's compliance efforts or state delinquent tax collections.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

Original Updated Corrected Supplemental

LRB Number **01-3747/1** Introduction Number **SB-307**

Subject
 Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP

Fiscal Effect

State:

- No State Fiscal Effect
- Indeterminate
 - Increase Existing Appropriations
 - Decrease Existing Appropriations
 - Create New Appropriations
- Increase Existing Revenues
- Decrease Existing Revenues
- Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget
 - Yes No
- Decrease Costs

Local:

- No Local Government Costs
- Indeterminate
- 1. Increase Costs
 - Permissive Mandatory
- 2. Decrease Costs
 - Permissive Mandatory
- 3. Increase Revenue
 - Permissive Mandatory
- 4. Decrease Revenue
 - Permissive Mandatory
- 5. Types of Local Government Units Affected
 - Towns Village Cities
 - Counties Others
 - School Districts WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS 20.370(1)(mu) and (3)(mu) **Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations**

Agency/Prepared By

DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794

Authorized Signature

Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794

Date

12/13/01

Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DNR 12/13/01

LRB Number 01-3747/1	Introduction Number SB-307	Estimate Type Original
Subject Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP		

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Bill Summary: This bill establishes a new regulatory structure in the Department for captive wildlife. The bill eliminates all current licenses and establishes new types of licenses. It clarifies DATCP authority to require health certification for captive wild animals moving in interstate commerce and transfers registration of white-tailed deer farms to DATCP as farm-raised deer. The bill allows the department to set standards for humane care and housing and eliminates the taking of free-ranging wild animals which is allowed on game farms under current law.

Fiscal Estimate: Costs to the department include issuance of permits, records review, inspections, enforcement investigations and monitoring of licensees. These costs are also expended under current law. An estimated 2.5 FTE of effort is currently expended statewide to issue captive wildlife related permits and licenses. These FTEs are currently Conservation SEG funded and are located in Customer Service and Licensing, Wildlife Management field stations and in Law Enforcement. Under this proposal, these efforts would continue and would still be funded by Conservation SEG.

Under this bill some additional Law Enforcement effort may be needed to issue permits and provide monitoring and investigations to thoroughly implement the provisions of this bill, but this additional level of effort is undetermined at this point. It is assumed that any extra workload will be absorbed by the department, or re-evaluated at a later date. There may also be some changes in the number of licensees as a result of the transfer of white-tailed deer farms to DATCP and also as a result of changes in the license fee structure.

Revenues may be reduced. License fees for captive wildlife licenses were raised separately in Wisconsin Act 9 (1999-01 biennial budget). Revenue for License Year 2000, the first year the new fees have been in effect, is approximately \$116,500, an increase of approximately \$80,000 over previous estimated annual revenue. Under this bill, the fee structure will be, for the most part retained, but there may be an undetermined reduction in revenue from license holders who would receive discounts for multiple licenses.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

None

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2001 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

Original
 Updated
 Corrected
 Supplemental

LRB Number 01-3747/1		Introduction Number SB-307	
Subject			
Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP			
I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):			
II. Annualized Costs:		Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:	
		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs
A. State Costs by Category			
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes		\$	
(FTE Position Changes)			
State Operations - Other Costs			
Local Assistance			
Aids to Individuals or Organizations			
TOTAL State Costs by Category		\$	\$
B. State Costs by Source of Funds			
GPR			
FED			
PRO/PRS			
SEG/SEG-S			
III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)			
		Increased Rev	Decreased Rev
GPR Taxes		\$	\$
GPR Earned			
FED			
PRO/PRS			
SEG/SEG-S			
TOTAL State Revenues		\$	\$
NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT			
		<u>State</u>	<u>Local</u>
NET CHANGE IN COSTS		\$	\$
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE		\$	\$
Agency/Prepared By		Authorized Signature	Date
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794		Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794	12/13/01

Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

Original Updated Corrected Supplemental

LRB Number **01-3747/1** Introduction Number **SB-307**

Subject
 Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP

Fiscal Effect

State:
 No State Fiscal Effect
 Indeterminate
 Increase Existing Appropriations Increase Existing Revenues Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget
 Decrease Existing Appropriations Decrease Existing Revenues Yes No
 Create New Appropriations Decrease Costs

Local:
 No Local Government Costs
 Indeterminate
 1. Increase Costs 3. Increase Revenue
 Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory
 2. Decrease Costs 4. Decrease Revenue
 Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory
 5. Types of Local Government Units Affected
 Towns Village Cities
 Counties Others
 School Districts WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected **Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations**
 GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS

Agency/Prepared By DATCP/ Karen Kane (608) 224-4883	Authorized Signature Barb Knapp (608) 224-4746	Date 1/8/02
---	--	-----------------------

Fiscal Estimate Narratives
DATCP 1/8/02

LRB Number 01-3747/1	Introduction Number SB-307	Estimate Type Original
Subject Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP		

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

The bill assigns DTCP authority to require health certification for captive wild animals moving in interstate commerce and transfers registration of white-tailed deer farms to DATCP as farm-raised deer. The bill allows DATCP to set standards for humane care and housing and eliminates the taking of free-ranging wild animals which is allowed on game farms under current law. In order to regulate the taking of farm-raised deer, DATCP may promulgate rules to establish tagging requirements or other methods for identifying dead farm-raised deer that have been legally hunted or killed and to impose other conditions or requirements regulating the hunting of farm-raised deer.

DATCP will also be responsible for registrations, issuance of permits, disease free certifications, compliance, inspections and disease testing and surveillance. At this time, captive wild life is not heavily regulated. The bill makes specific testing, registration and movement requirements. These requirements will need to be communicated to the captive wildlife industry. While some of this education on disease control will be done at industry meetings, much of it will also need to be done in one on one meetings during case investigations. Complaints made by the public, the industry, itself, other regulated entities and the DNR will generate inspections. DATCP suspects that there is currently a significant level of underground or illegal interstate movement of captive wildlife that will also increase workloads above levels seen in more traditional agricultural species. AB614 authorizes DATCP to expand its import and movement regulations to include captive white tail deer and game birds. The legislation also transfers authority of "game bird" producers from DNR to DATCP. These producers are required to be enrolled in the National Poultry Improvement Program.

Fiscal Estimate: At this time, DATCP assumes that initial workload will be absorbed within the department or by DNR. DATCP will re-evaluate the need for staffing at a later date. Changes in number of licensees and the license fee structure could occur in the future.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

To be determined.

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2001 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

Original
 Updated
 Corrected
 Supplemental

LRB Number 01-3747/1		Introduction Number SB-307	
Subject			
Captive wildlife, partial transfer to DATCP			
I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):			
none			
II. Annualized Costs:		Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:	
		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs
A. State Costs by Category			
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes		\$	
(FTE Position Changes)			
State Operations - Other Costs			
Local Assistance			
Aids to Individuals or Organizations			
TOTAL State Costs by Category		\$	\$
B. State Costs by Source of Funds			
GPR			
FED			
PRO/PRS			
SEG/SEG-S			
III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)			
		Increased Rev	Decreased Rev
GPR Taxes		\$	\$
GPR Earned			
FED			
PRO/PRS			
SEG/SEG-S			
TOTAL State Revenues		\$	\$
NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT			
		State	Local
NET CHANGE IN COSTS		\$	\$
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE		\$	\$
Agency/Prepared By		Authorized Signature	
DATCP/ Karen Kane (608) 224-4883		Barb Knapp (608) 224-4746	
		Date	
		1/8/02	



Hillcrest Farms, Inc.

January 24, 2002

The Honorable Jim Baumgart
The State Senate
Madison, WI 53707-7882

Dear Senator Baumgart:

I am pleased to hear you will be holding a hearing on January 31, 2002, on SB307. I know you disagree with me on the hunting portion of the Bill, but that's OK it happens all the time. I respect you for being straightforward with me. I will be at the hearing to state my position and see what happens.

I'm told you are a fair and honest man, so I am asking that if the majority of the committee would vote to keep elk hunting in the Bill, you would let the Bill out of committee intact.

Thanks again for your time. I can be reached at work at 920-893-0596 or at home at 920-892-6753.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jim Pankow".

Jim Pankow

JP/baw



7-7472
(608) 255-1166

Sarah Hurley
← Gary Goyke

Plymouth Elk Growers

~~Jim~~ Jim Pankow

920-893-0596 (w) / 920-892-6753 (H)

Elk Assoc. have created a standard for others
→ Founders are in our districts

→ That's better rather than done by rule it's done by statutes.

- Distinguishes the powers of DATCP & DNR.

Inside the Pen = DATCP

Outside the Pen = DNR

Elk is part of farm - raised deer classification & not
able to hunt currently. → Used to be hunted but the
switch to DATCP they were no longer allowed to hunt.

→ 2.71 sets min acreage of 80 acres.

↳ Around 10 who want hunts & of those 10 only
3 or 4 will have 80 acres.

→ DATCP will require testing of TB & others. if they
don't test then after the hunt/slaughter ^a the vet must
inspect (this is part of rule)

✓ Chuck is on Board

- Kevin & Loren object to the bill.

× No fiscal note needed

Elk Solution

- Separate the Elk hunting w/ an amendment and then move the bill w/out the Elk hunts.
- Allow ~~for~~ hunts for ~~at~~ only white-tail deer

Bill is done by consensus

Additions to Captive Wildlife

- 2 in the bill
 - 2 create JFTE
- (Good ideas but Fiscal note is a killer)
no public debate on them - sep. Bill

1) ^{can} Add specific animals - fine but there never to have same regs. (Don't as pets w/ licenses)

- Can have up to 5 of every species ~~not~~ native to WI that are non-game animals

(§. 60 list - can amend the list)

(Illegal to have animal w/out ^{game-farm} permit - now they have a simple permit to allow for the ~~use~~ use)

Animal Health/Humane rules:

- Draft*
- * Ch. 173.40 ⁽¹⁰⁾ Definition of Humane. - This could be added. (Kevin can introduce as amendment).
 - Now that Captive Wildlife is out of ch. 29 we not dealing w/ hunting - this will make it difficult for parties to raise humane treatment as an issue.

Local Regulations

- Current law grants TAs authority. There will be no increase - they can currently make their own decisions through zoning.

Enforcement Authority

- Only used to enforce hunting regulations relating to Captive Wildlife. SR 207 - Allow consultation w/...

- Anything on the list the wardens would not be able to enforce under the bill.

↳ Dept has already had the power to regulate wild animals

→ if violate the law ~~by~~ for hours etc. the wardens could now give a citation.

Shibitski: Concerns

1. Ability to ~~lose~~ enclose land - pay DNR for deer on the land + now you own those deer.
2. Rule making authority for humane treat is too broad.
3. Inspection language.

Game Birds current:

Pg. 74

1) Pay DNR for deer on your land + it's yours.

↳ Now:

Deer

Pg. 30

- Document the # of ~~birds~~ animals on land
DNR then gives that # of tags + must document any new animals + then can get new tags for these new ~~to~~ captive bred source.

- This will protect the resource
+ Couple of people are grandfathered. Those who have unbreedable animals + for only document owner.

Pg. 99

2) Different animals need different types of care to insure humane treatment.

Our
Memo

- 5 - Amend. 2 - Humane Care
 - Eliminates rule making + enforcement tasks
- 6 - Amend 3 - Limits DNR's ability to search land + vehicles + equipment related to the animals.
- 7 - Amend 4 - stops local control
- 1 - Amend 5 - Says you could have as many native species as you want. Curr

Amend 6 - Specifies that D+TCT's rules must go to the Ag Committee.
 ↳ why handcuff the legislature

~~Amend~~

- 1 - Amend 7 - Creates an exemption from permits for all domestic animals
 - ↳ Allows you to have 400 deer as "pets"

Amend 8 - Testing - Bill already specifically allow for testing of CWD.

Sub - 19-14 - rejected

Elk Hunting - rejection Apr 28 Nov 4 rejected

233
4
128