



®

	Director Liaison		Committee Vice Chair
	Committee Chair		Committee Recorder

Meeting Details

Meeting Date(s) and Location(s): *List dates of all meetings held in the past year. *500 Character Limit*

Executive Summary

Information contained in this section provides an overall summary of the committee meeting including a judgment of the meeting's success compared to previous meetings. Photos or other additional documents that help convey the work of the committee in this past year should be noted in the text but added to the end of this document as an attachment to the Annual Report PDF.

**3700 Character Limit*



®

Director Information Items

*Information in this section should highlight the committee's progress to goals and objectives identified in the Technical Working Committee Charter, identify challenges or risks (perceived or realized) and include any other updates from Midwest state's or relative business discussed. *3600 Character Limit*



®

Committee Workgroups
 Identify workgroups that are associated with this TWC. Provide a brief 2-3 sentence summary of work accomplished in the past year. A workgroup is a smaller team that supports the goals and objectives of the TWC and is necessary and needed to help accomplish the work. It may include additional members not in the TWC but must be lead by a member of the TWC.
 *650 Character Limit

Workgroup Name (1)	States Member Lead
--------------------	--------------------

--	--

Workgroup Name (2)	States Member Lead
--------------------	--------------------

--	--

Requests for Action
 List below any accompanying documents attached to the annual report. Note: All formal requests for action by the MAFWA Board of Directors must complete the appropriate forms with approvals by MAFWA Executive Committee prior to the Annual Board Meeting. Ex. Committee Charter, Request and Risk Assessment. See page 12 of the TWC Guidelines Manual for timelines and details.
 *1300 Character Limit

--

Proposed Meeting Dates/Times/Location Dates and times the TWC will meet in the upcoming year.	
---	--



Agenda

*Provide meeting information from the past year in the space below. If additional supporting documents are needed, please combine into a single PDF and use the space below to document what is attached. Before final submission to the MAFWA Executive Secretary. *4000 Character Limit*

Remote Trap Checks

These recommendations were developed by the MAFWA Furbearer committee with input from the MAFWA Law Enforcement committee. These are only recommendations and considerations for states to consult if they need or want to pursue regulations specifically related to remote trap check devices.

Many states are considering questions around trails cameras and the “taking” of game. In our opinion, cameras for trap checks are not part of “take”. They are a way to inform a licensed trapper when take has occurred. There is potential for cameras to increase trapper efficiency by observing animal behavior around the trap. But the use of cameras for checks also has the potential to improve humaneness and selectivity by resulting in more frequent trap checks and allowing traps to be moved if domestic or nontarget animal appears on camera at a site.

States should consider their regulation language around animal removal during discussions around trap checks. Some states may find that simply requiring animal removal would meet their needs without other language.

Key recommendations to consider for allowing remote checks with visual images

- Draft language for states to review and adapt to their needs:
 - Must receive definitive visual confirmation whether an animal is caught and remove animals caught within trap check period*
 - This wording would require a photo with an original and digitally embedded time stamp in the metadata to meet minimum “receive image” requirements within the trap check period (e.g., at 8 am, every 24 hours).
 - We recommend that if a state plans to define the term “definitive”, it consider minimally including:
 - The trap must be clearly visible in the image, OR
 - The full ‘catch circle’ (i.e., full area a captured animal could reach given chain/tethering length) must be visible in the image to confirm if an animal is in the trap, AND
 - The image must provide a sufficient view of the site background to allow confirmation of the trap location in the field.
 - Lack of receiving an image, which could simply be failure of camera electronics, would not equate to a check; if an image is not obtained during the required trap check interval, an approved trap tender must physically check the trap.

- States may want to simultaneously review trap check period language, specifically the implications of whether your checking laws are framed as “once every X hours” or “once every X calendar days”.
 - Example 1: If your state requires a 24-hour check, an image received, whether time lapse or motion triggered, must allow time for a captured animal to be removed before 24 hours expires. If you set traps at 8 a.m., photo must arrive so any animals caught can be removed prior to 8 a.m. next day.
 - Example 2: If your state requires a trap check “once every calendar day”, an image received, whether time lapse or motion triggered, must allow time for any captured animal to be removed by 11:59PM (or the latest time of the day traps can be checked in your state) the calendar day following the previous check.
- In many cases, these recommendations may prohibit drags as definitive visual confirmation may not be possible if an animal moves the trap outside the camera’s field of view prior to camera detection. However, if the trap or a marker of a trap can clearly be seen (e.g., a bodygrip trap in a cubby or an above-ground snare), then drags could be allowable. If the animal, trap, or trap marker cannot be seen in an image, then the trap would require an in-person check.
- A requirement for definitive visual image would cover water sets, but states will want to think critically about allowances for regulations on dryland vs. water. For example, some traps set partially or wholly underwater, or animals captured therein, might still be visible in a camera image, whereas other water sets may not allow for definitive visual assessment. Remote trap checks ideally should require clear view of the trap, a reliable trap marker, or a captured animal.
 - Regulations would only apply to trap types that require a trap check.
- Recommend considering whether an image retention requirement makes sense for the state in question (e.g., images must be maintained for two weeks to be available for review)
- The person allowed to check the trap electronically should mirror existing state regulations for in-person trap checks.
 - Example: If current law requires the person who sets the trap to check that trap, that will also apply to electronic checks. Alternatively, if you can give written permission to someone else to check your trap, that would apply to electronic checks. However, any secondary person legally allowed to check another’s trap must be able to demonstrate they have/had access to

remotely captured images during the trap check interval in question and follow any applicable image retention requirements.

Key recommendations for allowing remote checks with trap transmitters (i.e., no definitive image, only an electronic trap activated/unactivated alert provided remotely).

- There is more hesitation about allowing transmitters without visual confirmation as a legal trap check. Requiring a visual seems best for regulated trapping as an outdoor activity. This could be reconsidered if a state's language focus is on animal removal rather than the trap check itself.
- States could consider allowing transmitter devices without an image for wildlife control operators
 - This could be especially relevant for urban wildlife control operators where images might be of more concern for privacy reasons
- If allowing transmitters, recommend trapper needs to obtain/retain proof that device was functioning during the mandated trap check interval
- States could consider requiring an additional in-person trap check but at a longer interval than allowed for physical trap checks if allowing transmitters so if a transmitter fails, there's still a mandated trap check fail-safe.
 - Example: A state could require that an in-person check be conducted every 72 hours if using a remote trap check transmitter to verify adequate device function.

Other considerations

- Device (e.g., camera) tagging – states may want to mimic existing state regulations on trap tag requirements or regulations around use of cameras on public lands.
 - Device tagging would allow an officer to verify trap check requirements or find the trapper to verify without disruptions to the trap to read a trap tag. Device tagging could be a regulation or just a recommendation to trappers, depending on state preference.
- Liability and proof of check considerations – states should consider wording on liability, consent, and legal requirements to view photos:
 - Clarify whether a warrant would be needed for Law Enforcement to view photos on cameras, computers, or phones of trappers. For example, a state may need rule language that specifies that images must be presented for view when requested by Law Enforcement, such as with electronic licenses.

This would allow for review for compliance but wouldn't imply showing images is a consent to a full search of the device, which would typically require a warrant.

- Consider clarifying or reviewing existing language about whether a state employee or law enforcement agency/officer is liable for damage to or loss of an electronic device that occurs as a result of viewing records.
- States could consider current trapper harassment laws to determine if disturbance of trap check devices by another person would be covered under existing laws. If not, consider if regulations should be expanded to include trap check devices.