



Bryce Wrigley, President
bjwrigley@gmail.com

Amy Seitz, Executive Director
amy.seitz@gmail.com

November 13, 2017

Subject: RC Comments on prop 64 by Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc.

Dear Board of Game members:

During public comments it was requested that I submit an RC comment with some of the options that are being discussed and points to consider when looking at each option before agreeing to it being a solution.

Below is a list of these options and considerations to take:

1 – Adding M ovi to import reg testing list:

- 1, 2 or 3 tests?
- Which Lab?
- If its 3 tests at WADDL and they don't give the discount that the current study is getting, that will be approximately \$100/animal
- 3 tests will add at least 2 months to age of animal – depending on breed, additional 30 lbs shipping weight, most likely the next size larger kennel – additional shipping costs
- Buyer would need to find a seller willing to hold onto animal an additional 2 months without selling to anyone else – this would add more costs for the extra feed the seller has to provide. The seller also has to be willing to let the buyer back out if the animal tests positive
- If the animal tests positive, the buyer will most likely have to cover the cost of testing – adding to overall expenses of finding a sheep or goat to import
- The herds/flocks that only had 1 animal testing positive - where did that single animal get movi from? If additional testing is put on sheep & goat owners to import, then movi is found in the environment, again we are significantly increasing costs to the ag industry without making headway with the problem

2 – “M ovi Free” state:

- 1, 2 or 3 tests to decide if animal is “movi free”?
- What if the animal tests positive on 1 sample but not the other 2 – is that a positive animal, or did it have the pathogen, shed it and will never test positive again?
- High cost to the state for enforcement – we should try to understand how we're ending up with single animals in herds/flocks and where they are picking up the pathogen

3 – Adding M ovi to the reportable disease list:

- What would be the protocol for positive tested animals – just monitoring or destruction of positive animals?

- If requirement for destruction of positive animals statewide, unless further science is known, there will probably be very little support from producers on this.
- State Vet doesn't have confidentiality so there is a concern that information on sheep/goat owners could be FOIAed.

4 – certification program for packing:

- Who will be in charge of running this program – options thrown out are Office of the State Vet and the Alaska Farm Bureau
- State Vets office – needs confidentiality
- Farm Bureau – we cannot agree until there's been time to look at the feasibility, what policy we need to put in place to protect people's information, what would it cost and how much time would it require to run and if additional staff would be needed.

5 – Education and Outreach

- This is something that should happen but the materials need to be based on facts and science and unbiased.

These are some of the options being discussed, but until there is time to work through questions and concerns and gather more information relevant to the options, it's too early to agree on a "final solution". All of these options will have costs to producers and the state and need careful consideration to minimize unintended consequences.

Thank you to board members for their willingness to hear from producers on this issue.

Respectfully,
Amy Seitz, Executive Director
Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc.