

Trapping Regulation Committee Members:

Chairman David McNinch

Commissioners: Jeremy Drew, Jack Robb, Karen Layne

Public members: John Sullivan

Staff to the Committee: Rob Buonamici

(775) 688-1540, rbuonamici@ndow.org

**NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
TRAPPING REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 S. GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
Saturday, September 21, 2013 @ 6:00 p.m.**

AGENDA

NOTE: Items may be taken out of order; items may be combined for consideration by the public body; and Items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time. Individuals with a disability who are in need of special services should contact the Department at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at 775-688-1549. Individuals with hearing impairment may contact the Department via telecommunication device (TDD) (775) 688-1550.

TIME LIMITS: Public Comment will be taken on every action item after discussion but before action on each item, and are limited to (3) minutes per person. Persons may not allocate unused time to other speakers. Persons are invited to submit written comments on items or attend and make comment during the meeting and are asked complete a speaker card and present it to the Recording Secretary. To ensure the public has notice of all matters the Committee will consider, Committee members may choose not respond to public comments in order to avoid deliberation on topics not listed for action on the agenda.

FORUM RESTRICTIONS AND ORDERLY BUSINESS: The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks which antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.

NOTE: Public comment allowed on each action item and at the end of the meeting for items not on the agenda.

Saturday, September 21, 2013 @ 6:00 p.m.

- 1 Call to Order – Chairman McNinch

- 2 **Approval of Agenda – For Possible Action**
The Committee will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Committee may remove items from the agenda, combine items for consideration or take items out of order.

 - 3 **Member Items – Announcements**
Committee members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Committee. Any item requiring Committee action will be scheduled on a future Committee agenda.

 - 4* **Trapping Visitation - For Possible Action**
The Committee will review the requirements of SB 213 and may take action to establish guidelines relative to visitation of traps in close proximity to populated or heavily used areas.

 - 5 **Future Committee Meeting – For Possible Action**
The Committee will discuss the date, time and location of the next Committee meeting. The Committee will also review and may take action to set potential agenda items for that meeting.

 - 6 **Public Comment Period**
Persons wishing to speak on items not on the agenda should complete a speaker’s card and present it to the recording secretary. Public comment will be limited to three minutes. No action can be taken by the Commission at this time; any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. In addition to this Public Comment Period, Public Comment limited to three minutes per speaker on each agenda action item, but not on reports or informational items.
- *Support material provided including updates, and posted to the NDOW website (www.ndow.org). Support material for this meeting may be requested from the Committee Staff Joanne Trendler, at (775) 688-1549; and will be available at the meeting. Notice to the Public: Nevada Department of Wildlife receives Federal Aid in Fish and/or Wildlife Restoration. The U.S. Department of the Interior prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex, or disability. In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda closes three days prior to the meeting date and has been posted at the meeting location, and at the following Department of Wildlife offices: 1100 Valley Road, Reno, NV, 89512; 380 W. “B” Street, Fallon, NV, 89406; 815 E. Fourth Street, Winnemucca, NV 89445; 60 Youth Center, Elko, NV, 89801; 1218 N. Alpha Street, Ely, NV 89301; 744 S. Racetrack Road, Henderson, NV 89015; and 4747 W. Vegas Dr., Las Vegas, NV, 89108. Individuals with hearing impairment may contact the Department at 775-688-1500 via a text telephone telecommunications device by first calling the State of Nevada Relay Operator at 1-800-326-6868. Individuals with a disability who are in need of special services should contact the Department at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at Joanne Trendler at (775) 688-1549.

Senate Bill No. 213—Senators Parks, Manendo, Spearman,
Segerblom; and Woodhouse (by request)

Joint Sponsors: Assemblymen Carlton, Ohrenschall;
Martin, Munford and Pierce

CHAPTER.....

AN ACT relating to trapping; requiring the registration of each trap, snare or similar device used in the taking of wild mammals; providing that any information in the possession of the Department of Wildlife concerning the registration of a trap, snare or similar device is confidential; requiring the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to adopt regulations prescribing the frequency of required visits for a trap, snare or similar device; providing a penalty; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Legislative Counsel's Digest:

Existing law provides that any person who intentionally steals, takes and carries away personal goods or property of another person with a value of less than \$650 or who knowingly buys, receives, possesses or withholds such property is guilty of a misdemeanor. (NRS 205.240, 205.275) **Section 1.6** of this bill provides that a person who intentionally steals, takes and carries away traps, snares or similar devices with an aggregate value of less than \$650 or who knowingly buys, receives, possesses or withholds stolen traps, snares or similar devices with an aggregate value of less than \$650 is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Existing law requires a person who takes fur-bearing mammals by any legal method or unprotected mammals by trapping to obtain a trapping license. (NRS 503.454) Existing law also provides that each trap, snare or similar device used in the taking of wild mammals may bear a number registered with the Department of Wildlife or may be permanently marked with the name and address of the owner or trapper using it. If a trap is registered, the registration is permanent and the registrant must pay a one-time fee of \$10 at the time the first trap, snare or similar device is registered. (NRS 503.452) **Section 3** of this bill amends those provisions by: (1) requiring each trap, snare or similar device used in the taking of wild mammals to be registered with the Department; and (2) requiring each registered trap, snare or similar device to bear a number which is assigned by the Department and is affixed to the trap, snare or similar device in the manner specified by regulations adopted by the Board of Wildlife Commissioners.

Under existing law, every person who takes fur-bearing mammals by any legal method is required to obtain a trapping license. Existing law also makes it unlawful to move or disturb a lawfully-set trap. (NRS 503.454) **Section 4** of this bill: (1) requires every person who takes fur-bearing mammals by trap, snare or similar device to obtain a trapping license; and (2) clarifies that the prohibition against moving or disturbing a lawfully-set trap also includes any lawfully-set snare or similar device.

Existing law requires each person who sets or places a trap, snare or similar device to visit those devices at least once every 96 hours and requires the removal of trapped mammals from the devices. (NRS 503.570) **Section 5** of this bill requires the Commission to adopt regulations prescribing the frequency at which a



person who sets or places a trap, snare or similar device is required to visit the trap, snare or similar device, which must be at least once every 96 hours.

EXPLANATION - Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter between brackets ~~omitted material~~ is material to be omitted

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN
SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Chapter 501 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto the provisions set forth as sections 1.3 and 1.6 of this act.

Sec. 1.3. *“Trap” means a device that is designed, built or made to close upon or hold fast any portion of an animal.*

Sec. 1.6. *1. Any person who intentionally steals, takes and carries away one or more traps, snares or similar devices owned by another person with an aggregate value of less than \$650 is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.*

2. Any person who buys, receives, possesses or withholds one or more traps, snares or similar devices owned by another person with an aggregate value of less than \$650:

(a) Knowing that the traps, snares or similar devices are stolen property; or

(b) Under such circumstances as should have caused a reasonable person to know that the traps, snares or similar devices are stolen property,

is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

Sec. 2. NRS 501.001 is hereby amended to read as follows:

501.001 As used in this title, unless the context otherwise requires, the words and terms defined in NRS 501.003 to 501.097, inclusive, *and section 1.3 of this act* have the meanings ascribed to them in those sections.

Sec. 3. NRS 503.452 is hereby amended to read as follows:

503.452 *1. Each trap, snare or similar device used in the taking of wild mammals ~~may~~ must be registered with the Department before it is used. Each registered trap, snare or similar device must bear a number ~~registered with~~ which is assigned by the Department ~~or be permanently marked with the name and address of the owner or trapper using it. If a trap is registered, the~~ and is affixed to or marked on the trap, snare or similar device in the manner specified by regulations adopted by the Commission. The registration of a trap, snare or similar device is ~~permanent.~~ valid until the trap, snare or similar device is sold or ownership of the trap, snare or similar device is otherwise transferred.*



2. A registration fee of \$10 for each registrant is payable only once ~~†~~ *by each person who registers a trap, snare or similar device. The fee must be paid* at the time the first trap, snare or similar device is registered.

3. *It is unlawful:*

(a) *For a person to whom a trap, snare or similar device is registered to allow another person to possess or use the trap, snare or similar device without providing to that person written authorization to possess or use the trap, snare or similar device.*

(b) *For a person to possess or use a trap, snare or similar device registered to another person without obtaining the written authorization required pursuant to paragraph (a). If a person obtains written authorization to possess or use a trap, snare or similar device pursuant to paragraph (a), the person shall ensure that the written authorization, together with his or her trapping license, is in his or her possession during any period in which he or she uses the trap, snare or similar device to take fur-bearing mammals.*

4. *A person to whom a trap, snare or similar device is registered pursuant to this section shall report any theft of the trap, snare or similar device to the Department as soon as it is practical to do so after the person discovers the theft.*

5. *Any information in the possession of the Department concerning the registration of a trap, snare or similar device is confidential and the Department shall not disclose that information unless required to do so by law or court order.*

Sec. 4. NRS 503.454 is hereby amended to read as follows:

503.454 1. Every person who takes fur-bearing mammals by ~~any legal method~~ *trap, snare or similar device* or unprotected mammals by trapping or sells raw furs for profit shall procure a trapping license.

2. It is unlawful to remove or disturb the trap, *snare or similar device* of any holder of a trapping license while the trap, *snare or similar device* is being legally used by the holder on public land or on land where the holder has permission to trap.

Sec. 5. NRS 503.570 is hereby amended to read as follows:

503.570 1. A person taking or causing to be taken wild mammals by means of traps, snares or ~~any other~~ *similar* devices which do not, or are not designed to, cause immediate death to the mammals, shall, if the traps, snares or *similar* devices are placed or set to take mammals, visit or cause to be visited ~~at least once each 96 hours~~ *each trap, snare or other similar device at a frequency specified in regulations adopted by the Commission pursuant to*



subsection 3 during all of the time the trap, snare or *similar* device is placed, set or used to take wild mammals, and remove therefrom any mammals caught therein.

2. The provisions of subsection 1 do not apply to employees of the State Department of Agriculture or the United States Department of Agriculture when acting in their official capacities.

3. *The Commission shall adopt regulations setting forth the frequency at which a person who takes or causes to be taken wild mammals by means of traps, snares or similar devices which do not, or are not designed to, cause immediate death to the mammals must visit a trap, snare or similar device. The regulations must require the person to visit a trap, snare or similar device at least once each 96 hours. In adopting the regulations, the Commission shall consider requiring a trap, snare or similar device placed in close proximity to a populated or heavily used area by persons to be visited more frequently than a trap, snare or similar device which is not placed in close proximity to such an area.*

Sec. 5.5. NRS 205.240 is hereby amended to read as follows:

205.240 1. Except as otherwise provided in NRS 205.220, 205.226, 205.228 and 475.105, *and section 1.6 of this act*, a person commits petit larceny if the person:

(a) Intentionally steals, takes and carries away, leads away or drives away:

(1) Personal goods or property, with a value of less than \$650, owned by another person;

(2) Bedding, furniture or other property, with a value of less than \$650, which the person, as a lodger, is to use in or with his or her lodging and which is owned by another person; or

(3) Real property, with a value of less than \$650, that the person has converted into personal property by severing it from real property owned by another person.

(b) Intentionally steals, takes and carries away, leads away, drives away or entices away one or more domesticated animals or domesticated birds, with an aggregate value of less than \$650, owned by another person.

2. Unless a greater penalty is provided pursuant to NRS 205.267, a person who commits petit larceny is guilty of a misdemeanor. In addition to any other penalty, the court shall order the person to pay restitution.

Sec. 5.6. NRS 205.275 is hereby amended to read as follows:

205.275 1. ~~+~~ *Except as otherwise provided in section 1.6 of this act*, a person commits an offense involving stolen property if the person, for his or her own gain or to prevent the owner from



again possessing the owner's property, buys, receives, possesses or withholds property:

(a) Knowing that it is stolen property; or

(b) Under such circumstances as should have caused a reasonable person to know that it is stolen property.

2. A person who commits an offense involving stolen property in violation of subsection 1:

(a) If the value of the property is less than \$650, is guilty of a misdemeanor;

(b) If the value of the property is \$650 or more but less than \$3,500, is guilty of a category C felony and shall be punished as provided in NRS 193.130; or

(c) If the value of the property is \$3,500 or more or if the property is a firearm, is guilty of a category B felony and shall be punished by imprisonment in the state prison for a minimum term of not less than 1 year and a maximum term of not more than 10 years, and by a fine of not more than \$10,000.

3. In addition to any other penalty, the court shall order the person to pay restitution.

4. A person may be prosecuted and convicted pursuant to this section whether or not the principal is or has been prosecuted or convicted.

5. Possession by any person of three or more items of the same or a similar class or type of personal property on which a permanently affixed manufacturer's serial number or manufacturer's identification number has been removed, altered or defaced, is prima facie evidence that the person has violated this section.

6. For the purposes of this section, the value of the property involved shall be deemed to be the highest value attributable to the property by any reasonable standard.

7. As used in this section, "stolen property" means property that has been taken from its owner by larceny, robbery, burglary, embezzlement, theft or any other offense that is a crime against property, whether or not the person who committed the taking is or has been prosecuted or convicted for the offense.

Sec. 6. 1. This section, sections 1 to 2, inclusive, 4, 5.5 and 5.6 of this act become effective upon passage and approval.

2. Sections 3 and 5 of this act become effective upon passage and approval for the purpose of adopting regulations and performing any other preparatory administrative tasks that are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and on July 31, 2013, for all other purposes.



Attendance Register

NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSIONERS
 TRAPPING REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
 Saturday, September 21, 2013 6:00 p.m.

NAME/PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY	AFFILIATION	TELEPHONE	EMAIL
STEPHANIE MYERS	MT. CHARLESTON	702 872-0180	—
Mary Maguire	NV Trappers Assoc	702-491-8342	—
Don McOrde	Self	775-857-3111	SKYSHRUNK@aol.com ✓
Mary Reese	Southern NV Coalition	619-992-2369	
Taylor Turkani	Southern NV Coalition	619-992-2370	
DEE BAKER	NV Trappers	775-742-1308	
Vivian Marchipella	NV Trappers	702-375-2007	
FRED VOLZ	RECREATION-1ST		

DAVE STOWATER	NV TRAPPERS	702-458-6119		
Debra Stowater	NVT	" " "		d.stowater@aol.com
Greg Veld		702-486-1143		
STACIA NEWMAN	NEVADA POLINDA Action for Animals	(702) 810-9354		POLITICS FOR ANIMALS @ YARD
BILL HALVORSEN	FRAATERNITY PRESENT BIG HORN	702 376-9322		✓ PUNKY9153 @ AOL.COM
ROBERT GAUDER	Neu. Wildlife Fed	702-438-2485		
TRISH SWAID	TRAILS AFEN			
Jewelle D'Arce	ASPCA Best Friends	775 815-1690		BWDAK@msn. com
JANA WRIGHT	←	702-455-0954		JWRIGHT @ CALICOOUNTY NV GOV
Joe Grim	SELF	775-770-0930		

JOHN FITZ GIBBONS	SPRING MOUNTAINS VOLUNTEER ASSOC.	702. 275. 7795	JOHN_FITZ_GIBBONS@YAHOO.COM
MARY & Sam DALZO			✓ MJDALZO@gmail.com
Michael Reese	Southern NV Coalition for Wildlife	702-400-6501	
Babs Kuehler	LAKE TRAPPEL WOLF RESERVE	702-349-0305	✓ Kuehler@sigyaho.com
Fon Raynor	NVTA	683-4755	✓ SBRITTON37@AOL.COM
STEVE BRITTINGHAM			
Nancy Salazar	NPAA		
David Coleman	NPAA		
DAVID RAYNO	NEVADON TRAPPEL		
Genevieve Raynor	NV TRAPPEL		

Alexandra Rayner	NV Trapper.		
Ryan Werner	NTA, NSU, Public, Coalition		
Victoria Werner	Coalition, Public Werner Family Taxidermy		
Robert Werner	NSU, Public, NTA		
James Werner	Public, NSU, NTA		
Wally Werner	Public, NSU, NTA		
Holly Haley	HSUS		
John Potash	Concerned Citizen	775-250-7025	Keeper73@shoglobal inc.
Gina Greise	NV Voters For Animals		

**DRAFT MINUTES
Nevada Department of Wildlife
Trapping Regulation Committee
Clark County Government Center
Commission Chambers
500 S. Grand Central Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89155**

Saturday, September 21, 2013 @ 6:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present

Chairman David McNinch
Commissioner Jeremy Drew
Commissioner Jack Robb
Commissioner Layne
John Sullivan, Clark County

Department Personnel Present

Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden
Tony Wasley, Director
David Pfiffner, Captain
Kristy Knight, Captain
Mike Maynard, Lieutenant
Joanne Trendler, Recording Secretary

Others Present

Joel Blakeslee, Nevada Trappers
Association
Steve Brittingham, Self
Joe Crim, Self
John Fitzgibbons, Self
Rex Flowers, Washoe CABMW
Holly Haley, Humane Society of the US
Bill Halvorsen, Fraternity Desert Bighorn
Beverlee McGrath, ASPCA, Best
Friends, NV Humane Society, NO NV
SPCA, Etc
Don Molde, Self, NBHN
Stephanie Myers, Self
Stacia Newman, Nevada Political Action
for Animals
David Raynor, Self
Gina Griesen, Self

Erica Griesen, Self
Ron Raynor, NVTA
Michael Reese, Southern NV
Coalition for Wildlife
Nancy Salazar, Nevada Political
Action for Animals
Dave Stowater, NVTA
Trish Swain, Trail Safe Nevada
Dave Stillwater, Self
Fred Voltz, Self
James Werner, Self
Robert Werner, Self
Ryan Werner, NSU & Self
Vikki Werner, Self
Jana Wright, Self
Annoula Wyderich, Self

Saturday, September 21, 2013 @ 6:00 p.m.

1 Call to Order – Chairman McNinch

Chairman McNinch said he would like to welcome John Sullivan as a new member of the committee and he thanked Tom Padden for his service on the committee. He said Tom had put a lot of work into them and he would like to recognize Mr. Padden on the public record. As the committee moves forward he would like to discuss what we are accomplishing at this meeting and the agenda. He said this is a very emotional issue, it doesn't matter what side of the issue you are on. People on the other side are going to be just as passionate. He said he appreciates every one showing a high level of respect for each other as individuals get up and make their comments. We will have formal public comment periods to satisfy open meeting law requirements. He said they will open the floor for essentially what will turn out to be a discussion. We will do a formal comment period for each agenda item and a more open forum where we bring people up with the intent of getting everything out that's on your mind so we can hear what you have to say.

2 Approval of Agenda – For Possible Action

The Committee will review the agenda and may take action to approve the agenda. The Committee may remove items from the agenda, combine items for consideration or take items out of order.

COMMISSIONER DREW MOVES TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS WRITTEN. COMMISSIONER LAYNE SECONDS THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3 Member Items – Announcements

Committee members may present emergent items. No action may be taken by the Committee. Any item requiring Committee action will be scheduled on a future Committee agenda.

Commissioner Drew said if you would like to make a public comment please fill out one of the cards. It's for our recording secretary so we can get your name right on the record on who was in the meeting. He said he will track the time, will limit the first round to three minutes per person. It's the Chairman's discretion that if you are representing an organization you get six minutes. Please state your name when you come up to the mike and, make sure the mike is on and he will remind you when you have thirty seconds left in your comment period. We will only do that for the initial round not so much for the discussion.

4* Trapping Visitation - For Possible Action

The Committee will review the requirements of SB 213 and may take action to establish guidelines relative to visitation of traps in close proximity to populated or heavily used areas.

Chairman McNinch said he would like to make clarifications and provide background. During the last legislature there was a Senate Bill 213 that dealt with a handful of trapping related issues. In that bill there was a specific item that mandated that we look at the frequency by which a person would take or cause to be taken wild mammals. It is Section 5, Subsection 3. The Commission shall adopt regulations setting forth a frequency at which a person who takes or causes to be taken wild mammals by a trap, snare, or similar device which do not or are not designed to cause immediate death to the mammals must visit a trap, snare, or similar device. The regulations must require that person to visit a trap, snare, or similar device at least once every 96 hours. In adopting the regulations, the Commission shall consider requiring a trap, snare or similar device placed in proximity to a populated or heavily used area by persons to visit more frequently than trap, snare, or similar device, which is not placed in close proximity to such an area. During our Commission meeting today there were provisions that were approved for this current trapping season and they were pertinent to visitation of traps for the upcoming season which begins October. The Commission did vote and approve to maintain a 96 hour visitation for this upcoming season. That's an item that the Commission would like the committee to discuss further. It's not something we intended to discuss tonight as part of the agenda. That item can be brought back at a later time. He said the focus for this meeting focus is talking about visitation around populated and heavily used areas.

Commissioner Layne said she thinks it is important, since there is some confusion. She said that is what we are talking about at this meeting and asked if it's going to apply to the 2014 trapping season as opposed to the upcoming trapping season.

Chairman McNinch said what they are working on will apply to the 2014 season not the 2013 season. There were many discussions with legislatures as part of the legislative process related to SB 213. The legislature and the individuals that were involved with the bill are aware of the intent to have the regulation in place for the 2014 season.

Commissioner Drew said the only procedural to point out is that anything that comes out of the committee as an action item will be a recommendation that will go to the entire Commission. Anything that will go on to NAC needs to be approved by the formal body. This committee is meant to provide a venue for more input, vetting everything out, and what ultimately comes out of the committee will be a recommendation to the Commission. It will go through the county advisory board process, public comment process and a full commission meeting. Don't expect to walk out of the room knowing exactly what is going to happen tonight. This is a forum to get more involved discussion and get down into the weeds where we don't always necessarily have the time in a Commission meeting.

Chairman McNinch asked if there were anymore comments from the committee. He asked the public if they had questions. He said he wanted to make sure everyone has a general understanding of the process and how this works and where we are.

Joel Blakeslee, President of the Nevada Trappers Association asked what the intent to make recommendation is tonight.

Chairman McNinch said he does not know where we are going to be. He doesn't think this committee is moving forward with the pressure of having to make recommendations tonight.

Dr. Molde asked if the committee would meet in Reno.

Chairman McNinch said they will be having several meetings.

Dr. Molde asked in a rural area as well?

Chairman McNinch said he has not talked to anybody about a rural area. It would be his intent to at least have one in Reno and one in the Eastern part of the state.

Dr. Molde asked would it be reasonable to assume at this point that there may be as many as two additional meetings about this topic.

Chairman McNinch said it's possible. Part of the reason they didn't want to do this through the Commission is to allow public comment both in the North and South and to get the best product. That was one of the reasons we asked the legislature not to adopt something and give us the chance to. We can frame something that has been run through the full public process and come up with the best product that works. He said they may not be making a recommendation tonight, but he wants to get someplace tonight. He wants to have some conceptual stuff. Framework that we can take forward and vet in future public meetings. He doesn't want to have a meeting and not get anywhere.

Mike Reese, Southern Nevada Coalition of Wildlife said he wants placed on the record, SB 213 directed the Commission to address trapping visitation. Did they also say what their goal is and what they are trying to accomplish? What are they trying to legislate for or against?

Chairman McNinch said he doesn't want to dump on Commissioner Drew and Commissioner Robb, but they have a lot more firsthand knowledge. Legislature wants us to take a look at populated areas. It goes back to the congested area stuff. This has to do with the visitation and frequency of traps that are being checked because of the safety of people's pets. He deferred to Commissioner Drew.

Commissioner Drew addressed Mr. Reese and said Mr. Reese you attended a lot of the hearings; he said he is not going to put words in legislators' mouths about the goal of what they are asking for. As things progressed through the process it was very clear that there wasn't going to be a consensus that both sides agreed on. They felt that the best venue to get as far as we could or as close as we could to a consensus was with the Commission. Ultimately I think what we really need to look at is the directive they gave us. The words are, "shall consider devices placed in proximity to a populated or heavily used areas."

Mr. Reese said he agrees. Chairman McNinch said, is it because of a safety reason, pets, and wildlife? He is wondering what's driving this so that when we bear our testimony on how we phrase our testimony towards it. If its safety, fine, he is not trying to push it, he is trying to clarify for the group what the spirit is. What's the spirit of the law?

Commissioner Drew said he would answer that with a yes. Those things were all discussed as part of the session. What motivated individual law makers to their vote he cannot say. All he can tell you is all the things you just listed were all on the table in the discussions.

Jana Wright said when she is reading, Section 5 Subsection 3, she breaks it down into three parts. The first part is the Commission will adopt regulations on the frequency on which a person has to check a trap. The second part is they can't have any more time than 96 hours. The third part is the heavily populated. Tonight's agenda is on part 3. In the future we will talk about these other issues?

Chairman Layne said one of the things we may want to do is talk about some of the issues we have already discussed, for example; Mt. Charleston, what was done in terms of that issue. We have looked at that area and there were concerns about trapping in that area because it was so close to a developed area. The fact that we have also as a part of another particular bill we have increased the area between a resident and a trap. She said it is important that everybody understands that this Commission has made some movement in terms of congested areas prior to this meeting.

Chairman McNinch asked Commissioner Layne to expand.

Commissioner Robb said he would like to. The Commission and the committee last time looked at issues that they could deal with under the laws the way they were. There were some NRS's that didn't allow us to work with registration of traps or visitation of traps. They were in NRS and not NAC. So when it came to heavily populated areas the only thing we could look at was set-backs. We repeatedly wanted shorter trap visitation, we wanted registration. At the time the Commission had no authority to do such actions. Even if they wanted to, it was off limits. Now the legislature has changed the game, so we are back here again. We changed what we could last time. We did set-backs in Lee and Kyle Canyon; and set backs from residents in Washoe and Clark County. We did some trail designations in both. There are additional rules, but since the legislature gave us registration back we did enact registration. Visitation is a bigger issue and what they ran into last time, north and south, there are different laws in Clark than Washoe County. He said speaking to the State Senators that were part of this bill; they are going to look at Douglas and Carson City. Last time it was Washoe and Clark only, but this time they will throw a couple more in there because of the population base and the proximity to a whole lot of people and hiking trails. They have the ability to go forward, now they are looking to get some ideas out there. Clark County has different county ordinances than the other three northern counties. To come up with something is going to take a while, because setbacks, wording of congested areas, firearm discharge area is different in each county. We will have to

come up with different ways to look at this to cover the statewide issue. Nothing is the same in north and south.

Chairman McNinch asked if there were any other comments from the committee. There was none.

Chairman McNinch asked for public comment. He reminded comment period here will be three minutes for individual and six minutes if you are representing a group. Relative to the regulation, he doesn't have anything specific to work on. He said they would go through public comment cards submitted.

Commissioner Drew called names by each public comment card.

Ron Raynor, Nevada Trappers Association – no comment.

Dave Stillwater, District Director for Clark and East Nye County, Nevada Trappers Association said Commissioner Layne already mentioned all the areas they have already given up. He said they have gone through Mt. Charleston and given stuff away and in Washoe County. He state they just keep giving, giving, and giving. He said what do they get back, nothing. He feels like, if this was your house and he went to your home and said he would like your refrigerator, TV or guns. No matter what he is going to get something because every time you get something you give them something. They have tried doing things, helping things, and have gone out of their way. If you give them more this time what are you going to give them next time? Look at all the animals, the wildlife, and pets that they as trappers save. They save deer, antelope, chuckar, and quail and even save Fluffy the cat and George the dog from the coyotes coming into town and killing the animals. His mom's dog was killed by a coyote last year. The only reason she knew it was killed by a coyote is because the neighbor was driving by and almost hit the coyote who dropped the dog in the street. He thinks it's time to stop giving; they are saving the state of Nevada many dollars from what they do. The few animals that get hurt don't amount to very much concern to the lives we save. They save a lot of wildlife and pets.

Mr. Blakeslee addressed Mr. Stillwater and said he wanted to correct one comment he stated in regards to Tom Padden on the committee the first go around. That wasn't the first go around. We have done Washoe County, we have done things for decades and it always ends up with us having a net loss. One question that he should have asked when they asked for questions, is can we ask for something that they want on this committee.

Chairman McNinch said Mr. Blakeslee makes your comment and the committee will address it later.

Mr. Blakeslee said on the first go around that the committee talked about the Nevada Trappers Association came up with an area that they thought was completely reasonable. They tried very hard to cooperate and do the right thing. Unfortunately that just goes on and his guys aren't happy with that so they aren't going to make that mistake again. The official position of

the Nevada Trappers Association is nothing. He wants the committee to consider the words populated, heavily used area, and close proximity. Those are words that having meaning. That's the English language and what the bill says. This bill does not mandate that we do anything, that's another point he would like to make. Safety of people's pets, he doesn't think they are in the business of being the dog catcher. They do something for wildlife then they should consider why we are doing this. What is the objective? He would like to mention that there have been a tremendous amount of complaints of dogs and cats being taken since they have done closures. He said he spoke to Mark Jensen and there were 360 reported cases of dogs and cats being killed by coyotes last year. There were over a hundred in Spanish Springs Valley alone. He wants to put that into perspective of the occasional dog or cat that gets caught; those are all things that didn't use to happen because they used to trap heavily around populated areas. He thinks that's worthy of consideration. He said he would like to ask for some things going forward in this committee. He wants to change this conversation from being where they are always losing to where they start considering getting something back.

Joe Crim, self no comment.

Mr. Reese said he appreciates the position the Committee is in. You started the meeting off by saying yes this is going to be an emotional meeting. He couldn't agree more. As some of you heard earlier today he testified that most of the decisions made have been emotional. If we are going to make a law on what basis and why did we make it. He thinks any common person would like to know why are we doing what we are doing and what will it solved. Commissioner Layne talked earlier about some of the things that we have done in Mt. Charleston. We took a regulation that was 200 ft from a dwelling and moving it to a half mile. In the interest of safety and kids. As a matter of comparison a sex offender can be within a 1,000 ft of a school. A law abiding trapper has to go a half mile. What did we accomplish? What we accomplished is we have more predators in our valley down here today than we did a year ago. Channel 3 has already done a story on it. You have Anthem security guards writing pamphlets to residents of a house on how to deal with a predator and human conflict along with pets. Yes it's true there have been a lot of pets hauled off. If we take the trappers out of the equation completely, what we are really asking for is we really want to have more conflict with predators in our valley. He doesn't think there is anybody on either side of the equation that wants that to happen which leads him to believe how do we stop that. His only thing is how we get more trappers into the field. If we pull these trappers out that are paying for an opportunity to go perform that service. The only alternative we have is to take money out of another fund and pay a government trapper to do what some of these guys have been doing for the same reason. The Department of Wildlife in Clark County probably once a month has to go to a homeowners association or some other community on the outskirts to inform, teach, and educate the homeowners of what not to do. Some of them are even feeding the coyotes. You are asking for the coyotes. Some of the coyotes have been eradicated out of there. Then you get phone calls that we have too many rabbits around. There is a trade off for everything we do. He is asking to have some common sense, let's get some facts on the table. Joel just threw one fact out; Wildlife Service's has already documented 360 animals taken by predators. Is that high, is that low? That is a starting point. This doesn't take effect until 2014. He would ask that we

closely look at the knowledge that we gain in the next year and we make it accordingly. The legislature was smart enough to say this isn't in our wheel house; this is something NDOW should address because they are the professionals. What they are really doing is they are your star/key witness and asking you guys as a panel why or why not should we do this. Currently you have a law of 96 hours, is that good? Is that bad? If we change that we are changing it based on what? He would hope that we get enough information out of these discussions and these forthcoming meetings to be able to look any legislature in the eye and say we did our due diligence. We vetted everything. We looked at every side of it. We let people testify more than once to bring facts to this table saying Mr. Senator this is why the decision was made what it's based on. He is hoping that in this we can vet this out, get to the bottom of it, and get to the facts. Make some correct findings and move in a proper manner and do the right thing.

Dr. Molde, representing No Bear Hunt Nevada said he was at the legislative hearings as well and in addition to safety which was one of the concerns mentioned there was also an issue of value judgment involved in SB 213. What the non hunting and non trapping public's interest might be in this issue, and he would like to simply include that as in the record, is one of the considerations that bring this matter to our attention. He would also remind Chairman Robb in contrast to what he said about Carson and Douglas, there is Elko, Winnemucca, Caliente, Ely, etc. are heavy populated areas. There are plenty of populated areas that we can talk about beyond the Sierra front. He hopes that we don't narrow our focus to the point where we don't do our job. Mr. Reese is interested in facts. He has some facts which he said he will briefly introduce but later will discuss the significance. He said he has 15 copies of these facts and is referring as you know to the non-target data that the Department of Wildlife has provided us recently. This is information which he suspects many people have not seen. The legislature did not see this information when they considered this bill. He thinks this information bears directly upon not only the visitation interval but perhaps the definition of a visit. These numbers are highly significant to both items. He asked the committee if they wanted copies of this for easy reference.

Chairman McNinch said he doesn't believe they have copies.

Dr. Molde distributed copies – (Exhibit 1). He presented a document Nevada Trappers Non-Target Summary Data 2002-2013. He went over the document. He said the information comes from trapper's self reports to the Department encouraged on a voluntary basis over the years. Basically this self report was asking trappers to tell the Department what they caught accidentally or unintentionally. This data has been at the Department for several years. Thanks to Russell Woolstenhulme we have this document. Dr. Molde pointed out that the data they are looking at are for the following years (2002-2004, 2007, & 2010-2013). The percentage of trappers to who contributed compared to the total number trapping at that time is approximately 20%. In front of you are numbers contributed by one out of 5 trappers during those years. The last page was received from Mr. Woolstenhulme sent him from which he extracted the numbers. This is the raw data from NDOW. Some of the highlights are: the first page summarizes animals killed accidentally by 20% of the trappers. 5,138 is the total animal number, that's a little misleading because 4,190 were rabbits. It gets interesting 195 domestic

dogs were reported caught by 20% of trappers, 116 cats. 172 mountain lions were reported caught by trappers accidentally. 17 of those reported dead in the trap. He thinks this should raise questions. 183 of livestock were caught; pack rats were a popular item. This is what concerns him, 9 Golden Eagles, Hawks 11, Owl 1, various other birds as well trapped. He would like to later discuss the significance of these numbers because they bear directly on trapping practices that we may want to consider as to whether we choose to allow this carnage to continue as reported by trappers. He also said he is not making this up. Or whether we want to do something to improve trapping practices in this state.

Trish Swayne, Trail Safe Nevada said it sounds like what we are talking about is determining the question of proximity of populated or heavily used area, county by county. How did we get to that conclusion? When was that decision made? The last time she thought about it we were to determine how we are going to determine what close proximity to heavily populated or used areas is. What is a heavily populated or used area? She wanted to look back at SB 213 as she understands what we are doing tonight and understands how we are defining these areas under discussion. To answer the question, why are we doing this? She said she has it printed her t-shirt, we can have battling t-shirts tonight. The point is an animal endures 96 hours in a trap, that's what we are about. That's the only thing they are about when they are talking about visitation issue is the pain and torment of an animal. Cruelty to pets is a felony in this state. The agony that an animal goes through with no food, no water, pain and fear and being at risk of being set upon by predators and exposed to the elements is what they are talking about. That is underlying why we are doing this. It's not political; it's not to make anybody a bad guy. It is the law in 33 states in our country and that is a fact visitation is 24 hours. The closest states which have 24 hour visitation which you may identify more with other states and more with other parts of the country are Arizona, California, Washington, Colorado, and New Mexico. Those are the closest to Nevada, none are 96 hours. Therefore asking for 24 hours across the board is not unreasonable, it is entirely reasonable and in accord with what's going on in the rest of the country and the 21st century has caught up with what people say is a tradition. There are more than 300 emails that you receive from people who think the way we do who are animal advocates. We are speaking for the animals who can't speak for themselves. 24 hours is desirable, it's what they want to see. People are shocked to realize that this kind of pain and suffering persists into the 21st century. If you look through the emails, particularly when people add on to the email, that talks about bringing Nevada into the 21st century on this issue. When we talk about populated or heavily used areas, what are we talking about? Are we talking about trail heads, campgrounds, picnic areas, road side rest areas? Those are under consideration if you read the regulations for the neighboring states. Those are all areas that have been singled as areas of heavy use. Are we just talking about counties? As Commissioner Layne said, what we have in SB 226 was a half mile setback from residences within a congested area. How do we deal with that? What can we say would be visited in a shorter amount of time? We can't say that because theoretically there is no trapping in those areas. How are we going to handle those perimeters of the populated areas in those counties? She thinks that's a question that needs to be examined more closely. She hopes she doesn't have three minutes to talk about it. She is hoping we really examine this, get out some maps, and talk about it. How do we define what you are charged with doing? The legislature left us, in her opinion, in

limbo. It would be nice if they said, 24 hours, but they didn't do that. We are tasked and it is a monumental one. Regarding Dr. Molde's comments on the unintended catches, it's her understanding when she was reading through the hunt book it is the law to turn in the after trapping report. It says you must, you shall turn in this report. How come only one in five is doing it when we have over a thousand license trappers? That is a question that came to her. She said they need closer examination as well because with the shorter visitation period you are going to liberating animals faster, they won't suffer as long and a pet has a better chance at survival. As far as the issue of predators that's a tough one, there are plenty of communities within the country within the thirty three states where there is 24 hour visitation across the board for the entire state. We are not hearing reports of predators raising havoc and killing everyone. There is the alternative of non-lethal co-existence. That is a concept that has to be examined more closely. It came up in the predator management discussions and she thinks the committee needs to talk more about non-lethal coexistence. She said, just like everybody else in this group none of them are sitting up on the committee. There is no one representing trail safe, animal advocacy, we fully appreciate Commissioner Layne's humane activities, however she is not representing Trail Safe, she is a Commissioner and we do need that to be on the record.

Beverly McGrath, ASPCA, Best Friends, NV Humane Society, Northern Nevada SPCA said she is going to discuss the frequency of the trap check and the unintended victims. 24 hour check is required by 33 states. Nevada has the longest trap check period of any state in the nation. 96% of the public is no hunting and no trapping license. They are not financially motivated. She said, 1088 trappers on the high end, each one has 300 traps, the possibility of 326,400 animals trapped every four days. There are 8 four day periods in a month that totals 2,611,200 animals a month. She asked how many of these animals non target animals are. She said give the trappers the benefit and say it's over a million animals. We're living in a society now that has become urbanized. Nevada is increasing in population at a regular rate. It's no longer the 1800's where you can go out and hunt and trap anything you want at the whim of the hunter or trapper. The 96% of the population that are bikers, hikers, wildlife watchers, bird watchers, etc. deserve consideration. There seems to be confusion about the issues that she would like to suggest to the committee. If you approach the Legislative Counsel and they can tell you the intent of some of these issues that are in question. There is discussion about change taking place that benefit the animal community and our handicap to the trappers. Their opinion is it's about time because Nevada has changed drastically over the years. She would like to commend the Trapping Regulation Committee for taking the time to review this. You state that you are making a thorough review of the issue and as stated before, how can you make a thorough review when you don't have Trail Safe sitting on your committee.

Commissioner Robb asked if he could ask a question.

Chairman McNinch said they will address that later.

Ms. McGrath addressed Commissioner Robb and said you are more than welcome to ask the questions. She also said she works for Trail Safe for the process of all of these bills. They are disheartened the language you have before you has been reduced.

Chairman McNinch said they can discuss the issue later in the meeting. Now is not the time. He said he understands the frustration. Commissioner Robb is our Chairman of the Board of Wildlife Commission. He makes the appointments to these committees. There was concern with the appointments that have been made to the committee. He appoints the people in the positions that he feels can work on these issues as a committee. He said, they could place a representative for every person in this room and it won't be enough. There is going to be somebody that doesn't have a representative on the committee.

Ms. McGrath said in the interest of camaraderie she withdraws her statement.

Chairman McNinch said it's a legitimate point.

Stacia Newman, Nevada Political Action for Animals said they are in favor of changing the 96 hours to 24. There is a concern in regards to congested areas because the real estate market is now recovering and building has resumed by major builders. What is congested today may quickly expand and right now we are pushing out to the outskirts beyond the 215 Freeway, and Red Rock can boom again. They have to be concerned as to keeping it under a broader aspect and include more ground. Also of consideration is the Governor's tourism campaign called "Discover your Nevada" which includes the wilderness areas. Basically, encourages people to come visit our state and to keep the people, residents who live here to explore what's in Nevada. In all of the brochures it shows people off the beaten track. She said she would like to comment about the coyotes that come into communities. The more we expand and build we're expanding into their area and they have no way out. She feels she wanted to address why the coyotes are in communities. The other is about the business aspect of the trapping industry because it is a business and like all other businesses there should be regulations, code of conduct, and humane standards. This brings a gray area that she is not sure on how to address Dr. Molde in regards to the given non-target data. This leaves a gray area of what happens to the non-target animals that are caught, because if they are discarded or disposed of. Some are going to be alive, do they kill them or do they toss them in a nearby area of traps or multiple traps. In her thinking non-target animals in essence are bait. Baiting is illegal, she would like to think that somehow these animals are either disposed of properly and taken completely out of the area and not left to sit there for four days and be used as bait. Whether these animals are eagles, hawks, and rabbits seem to be way up on the list. There are other animals that have distress calls and if the animal is caught and removed from the trap and nothing is done with them they become the bait animal. She feels it's only fair to bring down the visitation to 24 hours to clarify and not have these non-target animals exploited who can now be used as bait for the target animals.

Annoula Wyderich, self said she finds it incredibly disturbing that we are allowing four day visitation of traps. No matter where they are located, whether we're talking about target

animals or the collateral damage of pets and non-targeted animals. It seems incredibly inhumane and unnecessary to allow them to languish and suffer for four days. As the previous speakers have indicated she said it would only be fair and humane not to prolong any creatures suffering and to require a 24 hour on site visitation.

James Werner, self no comment.

Ryan Werner, self said he is here for the public and a register voter. His family has done their own personal research and they have been fighting these battles for the last three years. He is Nevada resident and to be honest he doesn't care about other states. This is where he is a resident and takes his pride. As far as the public goes, his mother, aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents, the list goes on and they don't hunt, fish, or trap but they support him in what they do. They are not anti's and they are members of the public. His family has personally trapped for Boulder City airport. Boulder City airport couldn't find anyone to help them. They went in there the last few months and removed 8 coyotes. They have had two non-target species caught, one jack rabbit and one crow. When it comes to the fact sheet that was presented. They say what was caught accidentally, non-target species. Most of those animals aside from squirrels were released and unharmed. There isn't anything like that in the fact sheet. With that fact sheet coming up his family is going to try to abstain from putting in that fact sheet this year. Henderson Animal Control and veterinarian clinics that they personally contacted regarding SB 226 and SB 213, not one injury from a trap to a person or a pet. Not one or a complaint in the Henderson area of the ones they talked to. Numerous concerns from the Henderson Animal Control that they have problems with wild animals coming in and a danger to people, children and numerous domestic pets. He has a lot of faith in NDOW, they have been doing a great job with the Wildlife Commission. He has been a little disappointed the last few years it seems like sportsmen's voices aren't being heard. They show up to all the meetings and will be at all the rest of the meetings. His family supports what they do; they are here to protect their rights. They control everything by setting seasons, dates, and quotas. They take this into consideration of everything that's being done. There are numerous trapping ethics and laws that we have. As the community expands so do our boundaries. That's why we have 200 feet or 1000 yards, half mile limits. If someone builds out a half mile, that pushes our boundary out another half mile. There are numerous laws that are already there and most of the violations aren't in congested areas. So many people getting written up for trap visitation. What counties are they from? Are they here? Were they even convicted or did they prove that they visited that trap; that information isn't in there. There is a lot of information not being heard and he hopes that everyone does their research. He appreciates the Trapping Regulation Committee for hearing both sides and making an educated decision. He knows his family supports our wildlife and wildlife management and they don't want to lose anything anymore unless there are hard facts of numerous injuries not accidents. He supports the laws and visitation the way they are.

Vikki Werner, self said she is here to represent the public. She said she has not met one trapper yet that waits 96 hours to check their trap. She has never waited that long to check traps. She does feel for these animals, but there is also management for a reason. As for the predators,

they are getting worse. She wonders on the opposite side trappers, sportsmen are taking care of the problem. Her concern now is who is going to take care of the problem. She is not going to pay a state trapper to come in and do her job. She is grateful that they have stats and glad that the trappers of Nevada provided it for them. Although, like her husband said, it's voluntary and she is not doing it anymore if it's going to be used against them. They can't come up with their own facts, she is not doing it. It is portrayed wrong and that is the only reason she is not. They aren't asking if these animals are released. They don't know all the facts. We were lucky enough in five years of trapping to catch one bobcat. Not a scratch on the bobcat, we could have let it go. If we don't start making a decision on facts, just like our traffic and police laws. There are safety things about traps and their safety. If you watched the legislation, her son put his hand in a trap. They don't cut your fingers off, it will hurt. She gave an example; it hurts when you slam your finger in the door. She said she is disappointed in some of the groups that she was a part of. She doesn't think they are spending their money wisely, she is no longer going with those groups. She also said she doesn't think that they have wildlife in their best interest.

Fred Voltz, self said it's truly important for all of us to remember that trapping is a revocable privilege; it's not a right to trap and sale the public's wildlife. In any trapping situation, pointless and needless animal suffering is no less in an urban populated area versus a non urban area when wildlife is in a trap. A trapped animal is the same regardless of setting. Our state needs to move beyond the mindset that if you can't kill an animal, torture an animal or otherwise exploit an animal what good is an animal. Trapper convenience is not the paramount consideration in making balanced public policy. Here is a scientific litmus test for trappers and the reasonableness of 96 hours intervals and distant trap viewing. A test group of trappers should volunteer to have one of their appendages placed in each trap type for the same length of time and under the same condition as wildlife is subjected to before insisting 96 hours and distant trap viewing is considered appropriate in both sparsely and heavily populated parts of the state. Bottom line we need to have a statewide 24 hour inspection interval and an in person trap inspection has already been set. 33 other states have adopted. Finally to reiterate what's also been said the composition of this committee tragically fails to include even one non-commissioner, non-cab member from the general public. It is an egregious error that excludes over two and a half million state resident who don't buy wildlife killing licenses.

Stephanie Meyers, self said she was going to remark on the lack of balance on this committee but because Commissioner McNinch said he will address this later she will withhold her comments. Leash laws vary, the indiscriminate jaws of a trap catching animals whether non target or target does not vary. In the Spring Mountains you must have your dog on a leash when within a U S Forest Service campground, picnic area or registered trail. Leashes are not required elsewhere on the mountain nor should they be. There is nothing as beautiful as a family running and playing with their dogs up there on the mountains when the dog is usually cooped up. Those pets don't know what lies beyond that ridge or log, neither do their owners. If they knew about trapping they wouldn't go there. Trapping is a nasty secret. The steel jaws ready to snap shut on anything that land on it. As you've heard from Dr. Molde it is often a non-target animal or bird. In eight years of self reports almost 200 dogs were caught in traps.

Trappers say that people do not congregate in the mountains when it is snowing and therefore traps are safe from harming pets or people in the winter months during trapping season. Her dog Sunshine was caught in a trap on a clear warm sunny January day. Our weather is unpredictable and will be even more so as climate change comes. Trappers say that the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners removed so much land from Mt Charleston from trapping last year. Trappers didn't even want the trails at higher elevations, trappers don't want to walk. This board withdrew only 200 ft on either side of five roads last year, Cardimine, Champion, Max Canyon, Power Line and Telephone Canyon. 200 feet is almost nothing her dog can run that in a few seconds. She measured roads and the total of those five roads including Spur Rose came to a monumental 19.85 miles, not even 20 miles of roads. Even if you round that off it's a total of 970 acres or 1 ½ square miles. That's infinitesimal when you are talking about the Spring Mountain recreational area that has 316,000 acres of land. This area hosts two million people a year that come to the Spring Mountains. They come to hike, ski, bike, and recreate. 96 hours is too long. Visitation, boots on the ground, in person, every 24 hours.

Steve Brittingham, self said his dog was caught in a trap in the Spring Mountain area. Both of his dogs have been caught in a trap, one required transport to Las Vegas for sedation to have the trap be removed. He said he is here and in his anger is not only that it happened, but Tracy Truman who was an attorney and trapper who wrote me a letter saying that for one it was his fault the trapping event because his dog was off a leash, which is illegal up on Mt Charleston and in Clark County. He also indicated that he was liable for breaking the law because he removed the trap with his dog to have the trap removed. The arrogance of that added to is infuriating. We are here is at the center of our trapping debate is ethics. Since trappers aligned and pursued with hunters. Let me quote the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, an excellent hunting organization, whose basic principals include a prohibition of crumb commerce of dead wildlife and principal of non frivolous use. That is a prohibition on the non consumptive killing of wildlife for parts. Trappers violate these basic hunting principles by killing predators to merely sell their hides. Trappers also aggressively resist any ethical responsibility as to the proposed daily trap visitation. Despite the dehydration, pain, and suffering of the animal because it would be inconvenient. The daily visitation would not only reduce the pain and suffering but allows reasonable monitoring by NDOW. NDOW does not have the ability to monitor an illegal trap or an animal in a trap during the current 96 hour visitation rule. This spring NDOW was called to Kyle Canyon where a fox was found frozen in a stream in a leg hold trap. This is unacceptable in any moral code. Trappers should be required to personally visit each trap everyday and not just say that they scanned the area with binoculars from afar. This excuse has been used in the past to avoid conviction. He also suggest NDOW cameras use a spot trap tampering be used to monitor traps themselves. Trappers are angered that any restriction of them is a taking of their animals, apparently unaware they are denying the majority of us the right of enjoyment and enrichment of seeing these animals in the wild while benefiting of disease control of rodents. In America we all have rights.

Nancy Salazar, member of Nevada Political Action for Animals said she is asking to change the visitation from 96 hours to 24 hours in populated areas. These animals need not to suffer for long periods of time due to the lack of compassion that these trappers display.

Robert Werner, self said in regards to the possible non target animals trapped he does not know about other trappers, he knows his family does not run a 300 trap line. The number would decrease on that point. He also stated he is not the greatest trapper but he doesn't catch an animal every time in a trap. He believes that the number previously stated is inaccurate.

Commissioner Drew said he does not have any other public comment cards. If you would like to comment, please fill out a card when you are done. Please state your name for the record.

Bill Halverson, Fraternity Desert Bighorn, Vice President said he is a firm believer that 96 hours is the proper amount of time. He has listened to a lot of the comments that people have put out there. What bothers him is he hasn't heard one of these people talking against this, talk about the fact that people should be responsible for their pets. He has owned pets since he was a child, not one of his pets, and he lived in rural areas and areas where bobcats and coyotes, that visit the property on a daily or weekly basis. Not one of his pets has ever been taken by another animal. He is responsible for his pets. If these are people so foolish that they don't believe predators live within the city limits of the cities in Clark County their very naïve. He can show areas where there are bobcats living within Henderson, Las Vegas, and other areas. He used to work on a golf course, and saw coyotes every day. We had a resident bobcat there and the only time that bobcat was ever an issue was when a drunken golfer thought it was a mountain lion and called 911. The bobcat never bothered anybody, lived off of the rabbits on the golf course and was fine. These people that are losing their pets to predators need to talk about responsibility. He personally, when this whole thing started, called numerous vets in the northwest area because the main complaints seemed to be coming from the Mt. Charleston area. He lived in the Northwest at that time; he talked to his vet, and talked to the previous vet he used and can't find a vet in the northwest area and about 20 that have clinics up there that can say they treated an animal that was caught inside a trap. He says that has happened, but he would like to see the vet bills because he personally doesn't believe he can't find anyone that's treated an animal. 60 years of taking his dogs to the mountains, desert areas, and he has never allowed them to be out of his site. If these people are so irresponsible that their dogs are taking off and running all over the mountain, shame on them. That's their fault their dogs are getting caught in the trap. He wants to point out that the information the doctor provided to you and the location of these things and the averages. Domestic cats, 11 miles from the nearest resident, domestic dog, 10 miles from the nearest resident, mountain lion, 18 miles from the nearest residence. His guess that just doesn't give the idea that there is a problem around here where animals are being caught in traps, not when the evidence they supply from the doctor here shows that the statewide averages for 2002-2013 show 11, 10 and 18 miles that these animals are being caught. If they are concerned about their domestic dog or their domestic cat being caught in traps why are they 11 miles away from their residence? 18 miles for a mountain lion puts those dogs and cats in a prime area to be eaten by a coyote or bobcat. He thinks these people need to start taking responsibility. Secondly, he doesn't know a lot of trappers but knows a few. Almost all of them have full time jobs; He doesn't know anybody that makes a full time living off of trapping unless they are retired. To require

someone to check traps every 24 hours, given the distances they may have to go and the number of traps and the number of lines, he thinks that's unreasonable. The 96 hours should stand.

David Raynor, self said he wanted to state a couple things of what his dad has done for him and his family. He raised good kids, and basically showed them to honor what they do and to respect the land. In his time of growing up, a native, he has seen nothing but trash thrown on the ground, nothing but disrespect. When he traps he spends half his day just picking up trash from people that don't respect what is out there. Checking traps every 96 hours is definitely the right way. They are out there more than 96 hours and doing other things, not just trapping. They are doing good causes that are destroying our world today. He said he has two girls who love trapping and wants them to because of what his dad has done for him. He is a native and a registered Indian. 96 hours is definitely an adequate time to check traps. None of their animals are dead. They can be released and they release animals every time they go out. They are going out to manage wildlife. He is a member of the Fraternity of the Desert Bighorn Sheep. He goes out with his family to build water projects and what you see on the mountain today is facts of what they do. It brings more animals that people that come to this state to see what they do and see animals. If they were not managing in that they won't see what we see today. The distances that are on this sheet are over and above what they are asking and what they have given. He said he is not giving anymore.

Holly Hailey, Humane Society, Nevada State Director said they don't advocate to end all forms of hunting, try to stop the most egregious practices of animal cruelty. She feels the 24 hour trap check time is not unreasonable and doesn't think it should be limited to highly populated areas. For an animal to be stuck in a trap longer, it's inhumane. We are animal custodians, we have the responsibility to take care of these animals and we do use them, we should be responsible. That's a part of human nature, but we don't have to be cruel to them. She thinks that for them to sit back and say it's ok for an animal to be trapped for any amount of time without checking the trap, for four days without food, water, being scared. They're animals they have that right; they need food, water, and want to survive. If we are going to use these animals then we need to be responsible. She doesn't think that 24 hours is over reaching for any area.

Chairman McNinch asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak.

John Fitzgibbons, self said he is in favor of the Board of Wildlife Commission making decisions based on the best available data as far as whether trapping coyotes or coyotes are non-target animals caught in traps are a consideration. One thing that was mentioned was as much data as possible should be gathered. He thinks several people threatening to stop submitting data because it could be used against them he feels is absolutely the wrong thing to do if they believe the data would support them. In addition another comment was they didn't personally know any trappers that wait the 96 hours. If that's true, then it's not necessary to retain the 96 hour visitation limit. In addition he is a lifelong hunter himself, but one of the things he has

always been taught is to try to be as humane as practical when harvesting animals. Having the potential for an animal to be trapped up to 96 hours is inhumane.

Ron Raynor, Nevada Trappers Association said he would like to say his dad served in Vietnam, he fought for our freedom, he lost some of his best friends that fought for our freedom and it seems like every other week they are fighting for their freedom. They are abiding by the laws of trapping. They are not breaking any laws. He wants to voice his disagreement with letting them constantly attack something that has been here since the beginning. He said he has Indian rights but trapping has been here forever. They want to take away our freedom and disagree with it.

Chairman McNinch asked if there was any other public comment. If not they would take a break. He asked the committee to think of any comments they might have. When they return he would like to discuss issues they heard about and frame those into some discussion points to move forward. He also said early on someone mentioned framed up populated, heavily used, and close proximity and there were some areas specifically identified. He thinks for lack of better direction from the legislature at this point we can ask for some review and some input or thoughts back from LCB if we need to. He would like to discuss trails, campgrounds, picnic areas, road side areas. He asked Chief Buonamici to walk the committee through the regulation.

Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden said the regulation regarding southern Nevada trails and covers is it lists a myriad of trails where trapping is prohibited within a thousand feet of those trails. He said he won't walk through and name all the trails, there are several. The regulation addresses, "trapping is prohibited other than with a box or cage trap within a half mile of any residents in the Spring Mountain National Recreation area." It lists the townships, ranges, and sections and it addresses some roads, forest service roads and where trapping is prohibited, "other than with a box or cage trap within 200 ft of the designated multi use roads." It address a couple of campgrounds, picnic areas, and defines resident and box or cage trap.

Chairman McNinch said he thinks the importance of bringing the regulation up is it could help them frame our thoughts and put into perspective of what's already been done and they have something to reflect back on whether it's for or against anything. That's something that has been addressed and has been included in the regulations. He asked the committee members if they have any comments at this point.

Commissioner Layne said she would like to point out that in terms of those issues that the chief just discussed there were a lot of exemptions from that. She thinks one of the discussions tonight; Ryan Werner talked about trapping around the Henderson airport as an example. There are still, what has been passed already, there are exemptions in terms of congested areas that we may want to look at. That's the whole point of this is that in those areas that are still close to the congested areas according to what's being discussed here to possibly reduce the 96 hours to 24 hours or some amount. She feels they have to look at some of those issues around the congested areas.

Mr. Sullivan said general impression of a lot of what he has heard he thinks can be addressed. He said people who are concerned about this issue should be aware of a report that is on the NDOW website. There is a lot of information that he has heard tonight that he would characterize as being somewhat misinformed. He thinks before this committee and the Commission goes forward that it's very important that we bear down and try to get to a clear understanding of the facts on wildlife and furbearer management. There is an excellent report on the NDOW website called Furbearer Management in Nevada; he distributed copies (Exhibit 2). He said the report is on the NDOW Website and the report is called Furbearer Management in Nevada. He feels that will clear up a lot of misunderstandings and miss-characterizations which he has heard tonight. It addresses non-target animals. Dr. Molde talked about that. It addresses a host of issues concerning traps and how the professional wildlife community including this state's wildlife agency treats trapping and furbearers. As a committee and people who are concerned about wildlife. If we always bring it back to the animals and how they are treated and how they would be treated in the absence of some of these scientific programs he thinks the wild animals would be well served and the public would be as well.

Commissioner Robb said his thoughts after what he has heard tonight, you have one group that wants to keep 96 hours everywhere and one group that wants to go to 24 hours everywhere. He said he looks at it two different ways. What the legislature came out with and understand what that means and do something with that. He also has to look at what we do with trapping on a statewide basis and with those two things conflicting and the two groups conflicting he is prepared to move to a shorten trap check time frame around urban areas without a doubt. If the trappers think that nothing is going to change he thinks they are sadly mistaken because something is going to change. To reduce 96 hours in some portions of the state could be a mistake for wildlife resources. He honestly believes that in his heart. If we have a thousand trappers one way or another. If we take away their ability to get to Northern Washoe, rural Nye and Esmeralda County, a lot of people in Las Vegas do not know the remoteness of this state. He said he spends a lot of time looking through the windshield of his truck driving down two track dirt roads for six hours to get someplace. If there was a 24 hour trap check in that area there is no way that anybody could accomplish a 24 hour trap check. We would see population dynamics change of our predator base. Then it would change the dynamics of everything. We would concentrate the trappers because they are still going to trap, we would put a thousand trappers in closer proximity to where they live. He knows Dr. Layne asked for some numbers and those numbers showed there were quite a few trappers in Clark County. Washoe County has a lot of trappers, and those are the two urban areas we are talking about. If we reduce trap checks statewide we are going to pull those people back in and increase the possibility of conflict, but we could also have a negative impact on the wild populations of multiple species if we heavily trap those areas. He has to look at this as a Wildlife Commissioner and what's best for the species statewide. He also said he has to look at by what we have been told to do by the State Legislature, and that is to look at the urban areas and come up with something different. After we go through everybody's comments he has a couple places he would like to start. He said he is more familiar with Washoe County and Northern Nevada so he has to come up with a map which he believes we can start with in Northern

Nevada. He wants a starting point in Northern and Southern Nevada. He feels it's only fair to everybody to know where the game starts. He wants to get something on paper tonight and where some of these starting points may be for shortened trap checks. He has a few other ideas; everybody throws out 24 hour and 96 hours. There are other ways to look at this that may accomplish similar things but leave more flexibility for everybody. Once Commissioner Drew has his opportunity to speak he would ask the Chairman for an opportunity that overhead projector turned on so he can get this map up and discuss his ideas for Northern Nevada on visitation and duration between visitation.

Commissioner Drew said he thinks what evolved in the Legislative Session as people were informed on both sides. He knows it has occurred with but there are a lot of pieces and moving parts to this whole issue. It's not as easy as picking what either side of the room wants. There are a lot of nuances and a lot of different components to consider. He thinks that is probably the most likely reason why it ended up back here instead of a resolution one way or another from the Legislature. It's not going to be easy. At the end of the day he doesn't know that anyone in this room is going to be 100% satisfied. He said what is the obvious, it won't be easy or clear cut. We will work through the process.

Chairman McNinch said we need to be realistic about what we are heading into. The reason is the Legislature did not provide us specifics on what is expected. He thinks what that means is that while we explore populated, heavily used, and close proximity and try to define and identify what those mean to us. There are going to be specific things brought to us and they are in a situation where we have to address those as they come up. We need to justify why we took action or why we did not take action. Why it was relevant to the discussion or why it wasn't. There are things that the Legislature didn't want to address at that level because it's not quick and it's not easy. He thinks that is why they have ended up with it here. He asked Commissioner Robb if he had some thoughts in regards to his map.

Commissioner Robb went over his map on the overhead projector. (Exhibit 3) he said this is an area of the state that he is familiar with because he has lived in Reno for more than 30 years and spent quite amount of time in the surrounding areas. He has spoken with Chief Buonamici and if they do set backs from residents or imaginary lines it's not very clear to anyone where we are at. The best we can do is to use well defined land marks, existing hunting units or something that is recognized by the community. He said Reno is in Unit 196, which is Peavine Mountain outside of Reno. It goes from Stead area to the California over to the California line that is a Big Game Management Unit. Area 194 South of that is South of I-80, west of 395 and goes clear down through Washoe Lake and Carson City that is Unit 194 and 193. Unit 192 goes through Carson City down along the Stateline, clear down 395 until reaches California, which is the Sierra Front. This is much larger than the area we closed down for the Lake Tahoe Basin Bear hunt. This is a good portion of the land. On the other side of 395 there is unit 195. That is primarily Storey County to Fernley. He doesn't propose in this first thing that he is throwing out there he did not put the whole unit of 195, he only put everything in 195 to the West of Louse Town Road and the Virginia City Highway that goes down to Dayton. That's all of McClellan Hill. It's a good size area. This is all hiking trails along the Sierra Front, Lake Tahoe, and our urban

interface with the Sierra Mountains, this is a highly used area, and it reaches the criteria that the Legislature asked us to look at. In close proximity, populated and highly used areas. He believes this is a good starting point and honestly thinks it could be a good ending point for close proximity in Northern Nevada. He said he is hearing 24 hours, but he wants to look at 24 hours in a totally different way. He said he has never trapped; Commissioner Drew and McNinch aren't trappers. The only trapper on the committee is Mr. Sullivan. He doesn't know about trapping, but he does know about time management. What he wants to look at for trap check is not an hour interval. He wants to look at a calendar day. That trapper needs to make it to that trap once every calendar day in the area that is shaded in. That gives him some flexibility for time management. It could be at six this evening that he checked it and it could be at seven tomorrow morning. If he checks it at seven in the morning he would have to check it by seven the next morning under the 24 hour scenario. On time management people lives, and the way things happen he would give them once a calendar day. It gives them flexibility throughout that day to make it to that trap site and it allows family events, jobs, and life to still occur. He thinks that is the intention is to get to that trap site once a day, it may not be 24 hours, and it could be 17 on one and a little farther on the other end. He feels once a calendar day is a reasonable approach that could work for everybody. Those are the ideas he has. We need to come up with something in Clark County. He would like to see a map similar to this as framework that we can go forward with. He doesn't know Clark County well enough. He can draw a map easy enough but he doesn't want to do the wrong thing for either side. That's why we have this committee is to get things right. He also said this is his suggestion and he would like to hear other committee comments and see if there is anything we can stick with and get some public comment on what he proposed for Northern Nevada in regards to the map.

Commissioner Layne said she would like to see tonight and she knows that we do have people here from the Northern Nevada area. She would like us to possibly talk about this but would also like us to talk...she thinks they are going to have another meeting in Reno. She would also like us to at least look at the Southern Nevada area to try to develop a similar map. Maybe it is too soon, based on what you are proposing. She asked Commissioner Robb when you did this map, what are you looking for in terms...were you basically looking for what you considered to be the most congested area?

Commissioner Robb said he was going off personal knowledge of the area and has spent quite a bit of time in the surrounding hills of Reno. Unit 196 it's the Northern part but you don't see a lot of hikers. It's basically turned into a mountain bike park. He said he use to go up there when he was younger to see deer and now he sees more mountain bikers than deer. Unit 195 is right behind Hidden Valley; quite a few hikers go into that area from the east side of the valley. Down south of Geiger Grade, where you see Washoe Lake in the middle, there is a lot of foot and horse traffic. It has multiple uses and is heavily traveled. Units 194 and 192 are behind Carson, Genoa, Gardnerville, Minden, and Mt Rose in the Reno area with considerable hiking trails. A lot of it is wilderness there is quite a bit of day use in those areas and high numbers of people. In looking at what the legislation wants around heavily populated and high use areas. In Northern Nevada he thinks that map represents what it is. Joel may totally

disagree with him, but he is not a trapper so he may look at the world different than he does. He believes that is where he would be comfortable starting.

Commissioner Layne said to Commissioner Robb it would seem to be based on what you are saying then that for example if you were to look at Southern Nevada, that in the past we had issues when we looked at the congested areas. We looked at the shooting areas and then we had this area of Mt Charleston over here that we had to deal with because it wasn't in the shooting area. It seems to her that on the basis of what you are talking about with hiking trails and those kinds of things we would probably include the Mt Charleston and Lee Canyon areas because they have a large population of people who come to that particular area. She thinks somebody sighted the figure of two million people a year. She asked Commissioner Robb would you see that as being a part of that. If you are looking at this and taking your ideas of what you are proposing up here, would you see that as well in terms down South? We would be going out beyond what we now call the congested areas because of the tourism factor.

Commissioner Robb said what they ran into in their trapping regulation committee they were looking at setbacks is what they call congested area, in Washoe County means a firearm discharge area. The firearm discharge area runs into the county portion of Washoe County quite a bit outside of Reno, Sparks, and the incorporated areas. In Clark County there is no congested area designation as we have in Washoe County. His understanding is there isn't really a firearm discharge ordinance in Lee and Kyle Canyon. What the people in Northern Nevada consider as congested area has a whole different meaning than what you are asking on a congested area. He said does he consider Kyle and Lee Canyon a high use urban area? Yes. Under the definition of congested that we understand in Northern Nevada he wouldn't consider it congested under the laws we use as congested in the north. But high use urban setting he would say yes.

Mr. Sullivan said he sees what Commissioner Robb is trying to do. He has to say he opposes what Commissioner Robb for two reasons. It looks like an awful big area to him. He shares with Commissioner Layne, the belief that this would probably be better brought up with the Reno residents. There are a few people here from that area. He is not familiar with it, but it sure strikes him as a big area. He certainly didn't realize that Reno was so heavily populated and congested. If that's the definition and that's what we are looking for, close proximity to a congested area or heavily populated area. He said he suspect we are closing down some areas that do not meet the definition of close proximity to congested areas or heavily populated. The other reason is from what he stated in his opening comments was simply biological and scientific. He thinks unless there is a biological and scientific reason from a furbearer management stand point to be closing these areas. He would be opposed to it.

Commissioner Robb said as follow up to Mr. Sullivan's comments; you look at Unit 194 on the southwest portion of Reno there, the stuff right along 395 gets quite a bit of use. The stuff on the California border is designated wilderness area with non-vehicle travel. It's pretty remote. To get a quad or truck into some of that stuff, even outside the wilderness area, you are looking at 3-4 hours to get in there and in the winter it's not passable. From a lot of years, October and

November on, it's totally impassable because of the snow load up there. It looks big but in keeping with Mr. Buonamici's viewpoint of using major boundaries, something definable so we know what we are dealing with, that's why Unit 194 is bigger than people really walk and what I would consider congested because it is big and remote. To use the whole thing for the ease of being able to describe it. He doesn't think there are a lot of trappers, on the west side of unit 194 because of the remoteness and the snow level.

Commissioner Drew said he doesn't think they are going to be at a point where he is not at a point where he can say he supports or oppose this completely. He will say that he appreciates Commissioner Robb putting something on the table for them to consider and one approach in the sense that you are trying to look at a different check time in the urbanized areas in Northern Nevada. He said his hunch is that in Southern Nevada, in terms of wildlife management units, isn't going to break down nearly as easily. There is going to be some devil in the details if this is the approach you want to take. He said he will say that if we are looking at, in terms of your idea of the one calendar day, he thinks that has some merit. A lot more merit than the 24 hour trap check because to him it doesn't make any sense for a person to set something at 3:00 p.m. and then they show up at 3:30 p.m. and their criminalized. From that standpoint he can see where you are coming from. He said he thinks it's something on the table to discuss. There are a lot of details they will have to work through in his mind on a lot of different things, but he appreciates the effort to get us a starting point.

Commissioner Robb said he knows there was a chance this was going to miss. He said he had conversations with three of the five Natural Resource Senators, not just short conversations. He said he has talked to one of them multiple times even in the past week. Two others were at length about this. His take away from the conversation with those guys was something similar to this is what they are looking for and what they had envisioned the Wildlife Commission doing. This wasn't without basis of some type of knowledge of discussions from three of the five Senators on the Natural Resource Committee. If somebody doesn't throw out a first idea it gets hard to go forward. He doesn't think that the trappers were going to throw out a first idea less than keeping the whole state 96 hours and nor are the animal advocacy groups were going to throw out anything other than covering the whole state with 24 hours. He really couldn't rely on either party to give a starting point. He felt it best that if they get a starting point it was going to have to come from the committee. He said he took the initiative and here's what we have.

Chairman McNinch said he appreciated the starting point as well. He asked Commissioner Layne did you have a comment.

Commissioner Layne said she finds the use of the hunt units is interesting. Most people know those areas and she said she would assume the trappers know those areas. She never thought about using hunt units to try to develop boundaries.

Commissioner Robb said following up to Commissioner Layne's comment and Commissioner Drew's comment, hunt units around the Reno area are fairly small and it was easy to use. As

you can see he didn't use the entirety of hunt unit 195, he used a well known landmark of Louse Town Road and the State Highway. Our hunt units are not set up on artificial boundaries. They are definable areas; we have worked on them over time to make sure the hunters know where they are in the field. When we get to southern Nevada we may not be able to use the entirety of the hunt units but maybe can use a combination of hunt units and definable washes, ridge lines, roads, pole lines or anything that is discernible on the map for people will recognize.

Chairman McNinch asked Commissioner Drew would he like to follow up. He told the audience everyone will get an opportunity to come up and speak.

Commissioner Drew said the only comment he would make in kind of a cautionary in his own mind. Our wildlife management units are based primarily on our deer herds. While he agrees with Commissioner Robb in that they do have discernible well defined boundaries he doesn't know if maybe we should look outside the box at something that makes a little more sense and keep the discernible boundaries, but maybe not use the hunt management zones because he has a hunch it's not going to be as clean in the South. He said he is not sure the way these were set are going to warrant what they are going for. Maybe some outside of the box thinking would warrant some further discussion. He doesn't have an idea right now.

Chairman McNinch said he does appreciate what Commissioner Robb has brought to the committee in order to get the discussion started. A couple things he picked up out of it, he thinks it's already been touched on is the concept of one calendar day versus 24 hours. The discussion on that aspect is to make sure there is clarity that we can have proper consideration. As well as the discussion on how to define the boundaries, if that's the direction we need to go in specific areas. What he is going to do is allow the public comment to come to the podium and give the committee their thoughts. He said he will allow latitude to the public comment, he knows there is a lot on people's minds. If you come up at this time, he will hold public comment to the items that the committee is discussing which is specific to populated, heavily used, and closed proximity, how we define boundaries, is it necessary. What heavily populated means, is there is an aspect in Nevada that meets that definition? He asked Mr. Blakeslee if he would like to comment. He will not hold individuals to the time limit, the dialog portion where you are sharing your thoughts with us. He asked the public to be respectful of the time that they are using so others can comment.

Mr. Blakeslee said could they get an overlay of where the wilderness areas are on this map?

Chairman McNinch said he doesn't know if they have that with them.

Mr. Blakeslee said he knows you don't now, he said he is suggesting at some point we do that. As far as the definition of what an urban area is. We have done that before. It's like populations of several hundred thousand; there is a precedent for that. It would basically be Reno and Vegas.

Chairman McNinch asked Mr. Blakeslee are you suggesting an actual population number.

Mr. Blakeslee said he is not suggesting we do anything. He has made his point. He said he is not agreeing to do anything. What he is saying is if we have starting points, last time we expanded this time he thinks we should subtract maybe even all the way down to zero. His official position is all the way down to zero. He thinks definitions are really important. English language words are something we really need to talk about what populated and heavily used means. He understands that a hiking trail is heavily used at certain times of the year. He asked if there was a concept that they could talk about having these visitations not be for the whole trapping season? There are times during the year where there is going to be more human use in an area and other times where there is not. A lot of these, when it gets snowy up north there isn't anyone running around to speak of. He would like to look at the wilderness areas and maybe cut the city away. He said there is going to be an evolution here and he is not clear on anything right now except for no, no, and hell no.

Mr. Halvorsen said he is looking for something that's fair, fair to the trappers and fair to the people that are concerned about trapping. He sees the trappers making concessions, but he doesn't see concessions being made by others. They made a concession of 200 feet from trails; concession of a half mile from a residence. He said in California it's 150 feet from a residence and they brought California's regulations. If they are going to look at these things and California says 150 feet, the trappers have already gone to half a mile which is more than what some of the other states are doing. When you look at congested areas, are you going to use city limits? The city limits of Las Vegas versus Henderson versus Boulder City? Boulder City has 400,000 acres of open area. How do you define what kind of a congested area you are going to utilize. He feels Commissioner Robb made a good start with this overlay. There is a lot of wide open land in that overlay. He has been through that area and there are some huge open areas in there. Where do you set this at? If the trappers have already agreed to half a mile from a residence that leaves a lot of area and when you already have the predators that are well within that half a mile taking the pets that these people are losing he is not sure exactly where you go with this. If a half a mile isn't fair but 150 feet is fair in other states. What is going to satisfy the people that are concerned, a mile or two miles? Or are they actually going to come up with their hidden agenda of doing away with trapping and hunting in the state of Nevada forever.

Ms. Swayne said they don't have a hidden agenda. They were thinking about the hunt management units and didn't know that we would not have the opportunity to discuss that in more detail and maybe in the future. She thinks the hunt management units are practical because hunters all have the map and the map is included in the hunt book. It's something we can all get a handle on. She personally thinks that is a good way to go. Once a calendar day makes sense. The urban areas extend and you have the half mile boundary, she asked how you adjust for that.

Commissioner Drew said he had a question from a trappers standpoint, he asked while you guys are coming up to the podium and something to think about, from the trappers standpoint, does wildlife management areas matter to you? Or if there were some other designation what

definable boundaries would work? Is there any reason why we should be married to those units? You don't have to answer that; he can ask it off the record between meetings. He said he was curious if wildlife management unit boundaries mean anything to them.

Mr. Werner said he will have Mr. Blakeslee define that with Commissioner Drew in future comments. He said it is relevant you guys know what it's like to not trap. You guys have never been trapping. My family extends an invitation to everyone of you to come out with them. A 24 hour trap check is unreasonable. For one as soon as you set the trap the time starts. How many hours does it take for an animal to come in there? What he has learned from trapping is it's not likely you will catch an animal that first day. You have to leave scents; and you have to get out of the area. To catch an animal one day is not likely. You are placing a burden on family time. 24 hours every day, he gets off work at 3:30. He said he will be out there until dark, he has checked traps in the evening, and has never set one. You are placing a burden on Nevada Sportsmen's. He asked the committee to take that into consideration. He asked the committee to come out with us and spend some time with a trapper. He said he traps in the wilderness; there are some areas that take half an hour to hike in. 24 hour trap check is difficult.

Dr. Molde said a point of perspective, it seems to him that the dilemma we are facing at the moment, we are trying to decide what we are going to do weighing trapper convenience on one side and concerns about wildlife and animals caught in traps on the other side. In this state for decades trapper convenience has ruled everything. That's been the only consideration that he can think of that's ever entered into any decisions about trapping in front of this Commission since he has been coming here in the late 70's. He said you are looking at a situation where public values the welfare of animals caught in traps before you. He thinks that's why SB 213 was passed, which you were not able to kill. The trappers were not able to kill, the legislature i.e. the public passed the bill. He thinks that value judgment that he mentioned is embedded in the bill. He appreciates that the trappers have a privilege to trap, which they do not, it requires a license. They think they have a right to trap, it's a privilege. He understands that because that's the way it's been for decades. He said he appreciates Commissioner Robb's starting point and despite what you said we have actually considered creating our own map in the same way you did with the hunt unit map. They decided not to because they were not sure which way the committee wanted to go. From what Commissioner Drew said it may not be viable. If you want to pursue, then they would construct a map using your hunt unit maps themselves. Where we think in the state trapping should be restricted in terms of the visitation interval so that they can present our ideas rather than being simply told your ideas as to how this should go. Elko is a populated area. He stated 197 dogs trappers reported catching on the non-target species report form that you have are probably mostly rural dogs. He said Trail Safe has done a good job of collecting trapped dog incidents in Northern Nevada. His conclusion is that most of these dogs are caught in rural areas not around Reno or Las Vegas. He suggested trapping be regulated shorter visitation requirements in certain rural areas where dogs are being caught and Elko is a possibility. He said if need be they could call those Senators on the committee as well, explain their view, and present them with the non-target data as to why they think this is the case. They will start with their map and you can start with our map and we'll see where we meet.

Commissioner Drew asked Dr. Molde do you believe that varying the trap check time would vary our trapper distribution and ultimately our harvest.

Dr. Molde answered no.

Commissioner Drew asked Dr. Molde do you understand the question.

Dr. Molde said no, he does not. Trappers trap because of pelt prices. We aren't terminating trapping we are changing the conditions under which it occurs.

Commissioner Drew asked Dr. Molde if we went to a one calendar day trap check or 24 hour trap check statewide, hypothetically, you don't believe that would change the distribution of where our trappers trap?

Dr. Molde said it might, you don't know where they trap. Nobody on this Commission knows where they trap; he said he doesn't know where they trap. He can find trap lines but doesn't know where they all trap nor do they have any goals or objectives to what they should trap. You don't set any goals, objectives or quotas for bobcats, foxes, beaver, muskrat, skunks, and raccoons. Everything they catch, you have no quotas or management objectives for any of those animals. To claim that harvesting objectives might not be met, doesn't mean anything because you don't have any. If you want to make that argument you should set objectives which he said he has mentioned to this Commission over in the last three decades. No Commission has ever done. If you want to go that way, he is interested. Set some objectives, numbers and quotas, and then talk.

Commissioner Drew said he finds it interesting that we are criticized for being short sided on only considering trapper convenience but somehow we don't think that changing those things would have any biological impact. He said this is his only point and that is what he is saying. Don't criticize us for being short sided and only looking at trapper convenience when there is a whole of other things out there. He said he is fine with the criticism, but he thinks it is unfair to state that or make blanket statements like, they don't know where trappers trap because he has spent a lot of time outdoors in the middle of absolutely nowhere that takes a lot of time to get to and he has seen more traps there than he has been around any other congested area, by personal experience. It's unfair to make those statements even though he is not a trapper, doesn't mean he hasn't seen where trappers go.

Dr. Molde said he has seen where they go. He has had the same experience, but that is not his point. If you are going to claim that if there is a biological impact on furbearers by changing trap visitation, please show me the base line data to which you are going to compare. He said that is his point and you don't have it.

Commissioner Drew said knowing science as well as you do you will understand that there are so many variables that that would probably never ferret out.

Dr. Molde said why even suggest it if you aren't willing to make an effort to collect that baseline data if you think it's important.

Commissioner Drew said in his opinion its common sense.

Dr. Molde said common sense told us the earth was flat.

Commissioner Robb said he wants to address the quota and the biology issue. He said they might not set a target for the number of animals taken each year, but they do collect jaws from these bobcats. They do have mandatory check in and as a Commission, require the biology and to know about biology when they set the length of the season dates. If they think we are overharvesting or having an impact on a population you'll see our season dates shrink tremendously. If our population is robust and growing, a healthy population, you see those season dates grow. To say that they are not using biology is a false assertion. They use biology in setting those season dates every year. If our biology tells us we do not have a healthy population you have seen it in the past, we shrink those season dates tremendously and that's how they use biology. It is not a target harvest, it's a target healthy population is what they are after and that's our target.

Mr. Sullivan said he would like to reiterate what Commissioner Robb said and also point out that not only do the biologists limit the season, the Nevada Trapper's Association whole heartedly and unanimously at a board meeting recommended a 32% reduction in the season for bobcats four years ago based on the data. The biologists and the trappers pointed out to the biologists first that we are seeing a reduction of the bobcat population statewide. The trappers are the first ones to work with the biologist to suggest we cut back on the season. And they did. For two years, 32% of the season including the whole month of November, which is the best month to trap, was loped off. Then when the resource rebounded, two consecutive years, then the biologists based on science recommended that the season return to its normal length. Nevada for what it's worth is considered one of the best managed furbearer programs in the Western United States, especially for bobcats. There is no other state that he can think of and he knows a lot about the surrounding states because he has trapped in most of them, have any better data than this state.

Chairman McNinch said he has been allowing a lot of latitude. We are talking biology and he knows they are trying to find our way through this that there are connections with visitation. He said he understands that everything is interconnected but as Chairman of the committee he feels they are deviating kind of to that boundary where we have to pull ourselves back on the conceptual side with our visitation aspect.

Mr. Reese said part of the reason for him asking to quantify what our main goal is as you guys know he doesn't have a dog in this race. He wants to help to be part of the solution. He helped design the shooting park out there and when we marketed to that we started in the center of town, they started doing circles around town on how far does somebody have to travel. His

question is, he knows Commissioner Robb and Commissioner Drew have been out on those roads and are lucky if you are doing five miles an hour. On other road you can probably get up to 15. If they look at this as saying where are you going to drive an hour out of town? Or drive a half hour out? How far can you get? How far can you get if you go two hours? He said he know you guys know the state as well as he does and if you say how long it is going to take to get over there, they know that. Now, you dictated by how many traps you put out. For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. If you start cutting back and a trapper says he still wants to trap but he can't put 40 traps out now he has to cut back to 20. He doesn't have time. He is still working; he is not doing this as a daily job. If we lose trappers you guys have seen the checks that the Department of Wildlife has had to write to US Wildlife Services to eradicate some coyotes and predators.

Chairman McNinch asked Mr. Reese to get back on the visitation aspect of it.

Mr. Reese said that is what he is doing. Are we doing the visitation because of safety or what?

Chairman McNinch said there has been some comments and people have expressed their opinions that the true fact of the matter is that there was a bill introduced at the legislature and everybody was provided an opportunity to make comment on who, what, when, where and why. The legislative responses to that process you shall, as a Commission, provide an opportunity to discuss these issues. In order to make some proper decisions we have to frame up what does heavily used, populated, and close proximity. What are we identifying? There are comments about value judgments. He said it earlier today; we don't have to have anything broken from a system standpoint. If for no other reason that there is perception of these issues that something is wrong we have the responsibility to review it. The legislature has stepped in and said, you may not be considering all the aspects of wildlife management and we are telling you, you better get to the table and discuss them. In his opinion we better strongly consider dealing with some of these things. If we don't we better have a really good reason why we didn't. That is what our charge is. If there are things being brought to the table by certain people and certain people disagree we are going to have to make some decisions based on the input provided to them. We are the ones that better hit the right buttons in the right order because it is going to impact how you respond and we'll all be back at the legislature.

Mr. Reese said he believes that was part of his opening testimony, is the information to give to you guys to go back and tell the legislators. But in asking them what is it you are doing? Are you doing it because an animal stays in a trap too long? Are you doing because of a safety issue? I think we have heard, and Mr. Sullivan can tell you, once a trap is set. He said the question needs to be answered how long it takes to get an animal caught in the trap.

Chairman McNinch said what he sees happening here is they have people in the room that have stated that traps in close proximity, populated areas, and heavily used areas. He said we have people in the room saying no it's not. He wants to receive input so that he can make a determination because that is what the legislature is asking them to consider the issue at hand

and the arguments. Take input and make some decisions based on the information provided to them.

Mr. Reese said he agrees. He is trying to define when you said we had a problem trap. He is asking what it is. Is it a safety issue because it has caused something it's not supposed to? Is it because an animal sits in it too long? What is the problem?

Chairman McNinch said he tried to answer that. He said he is not going to argue. What he said he is trying to tell you there are people that have testified in their opinion the bill was generated because of value judgment issues. They believe it's an ethics issue. From the human dimension standpoint and attitudes towards wildlife, there are some who are referred to as pluralists and utilitarian's. The utilitarian's look at an animal as having a useful purpose for humans for eating, fur, etc. There are people more mutualistic based. Mutualistic means that animals are personified, they are closer to humans than other people place on the scale of value. What's happening in his opinion is that those two interests are now meeting in the legislature and saying that a utilitarian use of an animal is 100% acceptable isn't flying anymore. You need to take into consideration other aspects of wildlife.

Mr. Reese said he understands that.

Chairman McNinch said why are we here? We are here because the legislature has said we're not shutting the door on this aspect that's been brought in front of them.

Mr. Reese said he thinks we are talking visitation time. Why would it be 24, 48, 72 or 96? He thinks we need to understand what our target goal. You have some body that says let's go all the way down to 24 hours. Then you have our current law which is 96 hours. He is trying to grasp if it's 24 versus 48 or 72, what are the consequences with either one.

Chairman McNinch said he understood. Part of this is that tonight is clearly a night where we are trying to wrap our arms around what we are here for. He does understand that your question is legitimate. He said he doesn't mean to discount your questions, comments, and concerns. Part of this has to do with Commissioner Robb's map as far down the road as it might be in some respects, it's very basic in others in the sense that it provides them a foundation to have the discussion. Here we have this concept of identifying an area so that they can consider if it is populated, heavily used, or in close proximity. If so what does that mean? There were comments regarding real estate, as the real estate market heats up they expand into those areas. Mr. Blakeslee brought up a seasonal option. On top of Mt Rose there will be 25 feet of snow at some point. Probably not heavily used, but certainly used. Those are considerations. Unfortunately they just didn't have it in front of them before the meeting, that's the value of having this meeting, so people can make their comments and get these issues on the table. Then as a room full of people with varying interests we can have those discussions and eventually this committee can take action to recommend or not recommend based on all of these items. He thinks anything that hits the table they better be prepared as a

committee to say they have considered this and are not doing this because... or we considered this and we recommend.

Mr. Reese said their valley is round, so to speak. If in 24 hours, what he is trying to establish, or a calendar day is how far can you get?

Chairman McNinch said there are going to be varying opinions. Some people will say 24 hours statewide, so it could be 300 miles. Is that reasonable? You guys are going to make the argument why that's not reasonable. Eventually we will come up with some considerations for us to make decisions.

Mr. Reese said he was trying to help, is it 25 miles out of town or 50 miles out of town.

Chairman McNinch said he is looking for you to give him an idea. He is not going to sit here and tell you that he thinks 100 miles is adequate. He needs you to tell him what you think is adequate so he can make some considerations.

Mr. Reese said he was coming up with a suggestion. All he was doing was setting it up. They have 24 hours in a day, 8 are working, and 8 are sleeping. What his point is they are going to get 8 hours of discretionary time for the average person.

Chairman McNinch said those are personal decisions. If you want to trap 24 hours a day that's their thing.

Mr. Reese said you are missing the point.

Chairman McNinch said he is not missing the point. The point you are trying to make to him is that you only have 24 hours in a day. How you choose to use that 24 hours is your call not his.

Commissioner Robb said he thinks Mr. Reese is saying how far can you get and be reasonable with a daily trap check. Whether it's a 24 hour trap check or a daily trap check, if you choose to trap in that area you are bound by those rules.

Mr. Reese said he agreed.

Commissioner Robb said if you want to use 96 hours then you can't trap in there, you have to go someplace else. Your argument only applies to that area. He said he is not telling you can't trap in there, he would be telling you have to trap in there under this rule. If you don't want to use that rule of calendar day you have to choose someplace other than that area to trap. He said he doesn't care how long it takes you to get someplace, he is looking at what's right.

Mr. Reese asked if he can ask one question.

Chairman McNinch said he will allow one more question.

Mr. Reese said is our only choices 24 hours or 96?

Chairman McNinch said no, it's all on the table.

Mr. Reese said ok thank you.

Jana Wright said tonight's agenda is on the close proximity to a populated or heavily used area, are we talking about do we need to define populations? Because Senate Bill 226 was for populations over 100,000. The committee and the Commission passed that it was the congested area and congested area was defined as where you couldn't discharge firearms. Those areas have been defined for populations over 100,000. Her question is, and said she appreciates Commissioner Robb's map because it's a starting point, are we going to talk about hunt units or about cities that have 50,000 or more. She is trying to figure out how we can move forward to help you and they get where we want to go. She said she is confused.

Chairman McNinch said he appreciates her comments. He said Mr. Reese's point is he is trying to find a way to get the discussion on the table. The bottom line is that the legislation was driven by animal advocates. He said when he says animal advocates he doesn't mean anything as condescending or demeaning. The reality is there were certain interests that came to the legislature and said we have concerns. To expect the people that didn't share those concerns to come to the table to suggest how to move forward isn't realistic and it's not right. Maybe what does need to happen is as Dr. Molde suggested is...and he thinks of them as a form to provide facilitation, but that might very well be the way to get the discussion started is to see a map. He believes that the people that are representing what was brought before the legislature are the ones who are best going to represent what that legislature acted on. That legislature took action based on concerns brought forward by people that are in this room. He thinks the same interests can give us a start by possibly putting a map together, and it will be very different than Reno, Carson, and Las Vegas. He anticipated Tonopah and Elko to be considered because they are populated and heavily used. Let's get the trails out on the table as well. That's the whole point of this meeting is to talk about these things. That is probably going to be the best place to start so that the trappers who don't share those same concerns can say wait a minute they don't think they agree with... This way we can go down the list and if every last one of them has to be addressed one at a time unfortunately this is what we are left with the legislature. He said he thinks they are all starting to realize the enormity of the consideration. He said it would be very short sided of us to cut it too short because the legislature would respond to it. That might be the ultimate best way to get started. We are in a situation where we are working on how to get it lined out.

Ms. Wright said your suggestion that all start working on maps to bring to the next meeting as a conversation starter.

Chairman McNinch said if you don't that's going to force us to do something. We can't require anybody to bring a map to us, what's going to happen is it's going to leave us with the decision on where we are going to go. They might end up taking votes. Chief Buonamici might need to go back and write up this and this. If you guys want control where this is all at, everybody is going to need to provide their thoughts.

Ms. Wright asked would you suggest that we use an overlay of the hunting units for whatever kind of map that we would bring back?

Chairman McNinch said that may be a starting point to get a feel for what everyone is thinking.

Ms. Wright said ok, the hours for visitation and definition of visitation is high up on her priority list.

Mr. Stillwater said trying to find areas and shorten the time check and everything. By shortening the time check people are going to be all tied up and close together. A lot of people won't even trap because they can't do it in a day's time. What his concern for the public safety, you will have less trappers; his concern about animals with plagues where you'll have to close down campgrounds. They have done in California due to rabies. If you have fewer trappers these animals can bring in diseases. To him you guys are supposed to look at this. It's good, it's a done deal. It's been working, why change it. You are going to create problems. He realizes you guys have a tough job but some of these things that you are coming up with are ridiculous. You come on up with hunting maps, you would close down the whole state. Don Molde and other people have already said, how about Elko? This isn't over; you give them something they are going to ask for more.

Erica Grayson said the comment that was made earlier; she is not against hunting. She said she doesn't like it or agree with it. Trapping you shouldn't leave an animal for 96 hours. To leave them for 96 hours that's cruel and unusual punishment for the animals. She said if you are going to call it a job then have it be a job. She said she has to wake up every day for her job, spend time there. That's what you have to do for a job, 24 hours is enough time to go and check the trap. You don't have to go all the way and deep and look at the trap. If you see something in the trap. Go make sure there is nothing in the trap. Why make it suffer for days and have it die when you are going to go and do what you got to do right then in there. She said 96 hours is cruel.

Ms. Werner said she had a couple questions and maybe she is totally misunderstanding things. She was open minded a couple years ago and is trying to be more being in your shoes. Herbal areas and rural areas are that kind of your population and non populations. She has only been to Reno a couple times. As trappers we take a whole year to find those places that nobody is using, but if you just take one general area and put that in that shaded area, it's in there, that's unfair. There are some places and because she doesn't want to disclose her places, but there are some places that have taken us five years to find. She has not found one other soul out there and they go every other day to check their traps. We do that because that's what we

want to do and we have two adults that can drive so if he can't go they can go. Ms. Werner asked is the wilderness areas you are talking about, with her profession she talks to hunters all the time. Wilderness areas are already a big issue because it's different for us, it's not like back east where they can do a tree stand and deer come by in a field. We actually have to get out there and hunt. If we are going to do those and she understands the 24 hours their big thing on that is they are scared that the whole state is going to be 24 hours. Then it would matter, how far you can get. If it's in congested areas she would respect the 24 hours or a daily visit. In the wilderness area, how do you expect someone to hike in that far and come back and then turn around and hike again? She does understand a lot of people think it's a job, we don't use trapping as a job. She has a full time job. She use it as recreation, everyone takes the outdoors a little different. That would be her question is know you have to hike in the wilderness areas because you can't take motorized vehicles or fly in. So what would be your suggestion for that on wilderness areas?

Commissioner Robb said his suggestion would be to look for a different place to trap. He said he never showed up here saying that this wasn't going to have an impact on trappers.

Ms. Werner said she knew today would be an impact on trappers.

Commissioner Robb said we aren't going to walk out of this committee and Commission and do nothing because we have been given something to do. He will never say it's not going to have an impact on you, because it will have an impact. If there is wilderness areas you have to get into, there are places that he used to hunt either they are locked off or something has changed. The world changes around us, and this is one of those things that changes. There may be some places that just don't work out for you anymore.

Ms. Werner said she respects that. She doesn't think anyone came here thinking that you guys weren't going to do any changes. From one respect to the other, neither one wanted to budge anymore so we all came with both extremes and that's how it was going to be. She understands change but if we don't fight for what we want then you are just sitting back and letting the world take over. She does feel they have that right to fight for what they want. Those were her questions and trying to give a thought on some of your areas, if you are going to do a whole section think of those.

Chairman McNinch addressed Ms. Werner we do respect the fact that you are here advocating for what you have and what you want to keep. He said he speaks for the committee we respect that. There are no apologies for that. We expect it from everybody.

Commissioner Robb said he may have been a little harsh; you are going to lose something. In his mind that's reality. To talk about change, he changed what he told his wife. He told her he was off the commission in June, but he is here for another year for two reasons; bears and trapping. He said he made commitments to the legislature that he was going to see some things through. He came into it knowing one side was going to be upset with him and the other side as well. He is going to do what he thinks is right and come up with something. He thinks he

can defend to the legislature and explain why they came up with the decisions they came up with. He said on the record in front of the Assembly Natural Resource Committee. Skip Daily asked him if he could get the consensus. He said he told him closest he can get to the consensus is Joel Blakeslee and Larry Johnson mad at him at the same time Katherine Brickner and Chris Schwanbarger are mad at him. That's consensus to him. That's the only consensus he gets on this issue.

Commissioner Layne said as a committee they need to talk about where they are headed.

Mr. Blakeslee said that's exactly what he was going to bring up. What he suggested to the committee is to direct NDOW to gather some information, trail information of how many people use the different trails and the seasons of use. Maybe look at some zoning regulations to consider the density. He would say a third acre or less would fit the definition. Those are things that we can justify with the legislature, some hard facts on data. This area is up in these mountains, how many people hike up there in December. He is not saying he is agreeing to giving up anything, he is suggesting for now we direct the Department to gather facts about these two particular things that the legislature directed us to.

Commissioner Drew said the only point he would make is when we came in here tonight it was pretty clear that the people on this side of the room would consider any change to the 96 hours a loss. Anyone on this side of the room would consider anything but a 24 hour visitation a loss. That's where the legislature ended. Part of the reason he thinks we didn't get anymore clarification is because that was the line and they were looking and hoping to get something more of a consensus. He clearly understands why each side thinks the way they do. Both sides have clearly articulated the point. They can either try and work to a consensus or leave it up to the committee to try to work through one change or another change. His encouragement would be if you want to see something happen that's not all or nothing for either side, then you are going to have to work with them. He knows that's going to take some trust and give and take. Specific to that he doesn't disagree that maybe we can look at some information. Things that he would be curious from both sides, to see how far off we are, is what you would consider a close proximity populated area and heavily used area. He doesn't think we have a real clear legislative intent on any of those three things that are very important to the decision we are going to make.

Mr. Brittingham said he thanks Chairman Robb for a nice beginning. He thinks he put something on the context of our discussions we are having. He thinks the tree huggers and trappers are going to lose what we care about most which is the freedom to be wondering in the woods just simply because as the one gentleman said people come up and don't respect the land by leaving trash. He said the context is that we are all going to lose. He thinks it is a good positive beginning. All of us will be here again fighting over the details. It does have a chance to reduce conflicts. There is a possible abuse to this. He thinks the calendar day is most reasonable rather than having a set time. These guys are smart and can figure out that they can drop a trap off at 6 in the morning and can pick it up at 11:55 at night to essentially have 48 hours or at least 36 hours. There is the possibility of abuse. Chairman Robb pointed out that in

reducing our trap visitation to 24 hours if we went to that, it will concentrate a lot of trapping. He would hope that NDOW and possibly an independent scientist would be evaluating the concentration remaining of the animals so they don't have an area depleted. Predators do have a very important ecological role in controlling rodents. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that trappers are on the ground seeing what the species populations are suffering or not. If their input is that species are declining and they need to back then his respect for the trapping organization goes up. Hopefully we can kind of meet at that rising level of respect.

Mr. Voltz said a couple of comments on what he has heard listening to the give and take that you on the committee are talking about. It seems that for ease of law enforcement trying to pick and choose these hunt management units off of this map is going to be a real challenge because on page four of SB213 under item 3 it specifically says, "in close proximity to a populated or heavily used areas." It doesn't say heavily populated, we aren't talking about the major urban areas of the state. For ease of law enforcement trying to pick and choose areas when you think about the huge number of recreational areas, there is a National Park and the surrounded area which could be described as heavily used. There are so many different places around the state and each one of these areas. He thinks to try to segment that out as Commissioner Robb attempted to do on his map is going to be so complicated to administer, is not going to make a lot of sense. He does not go along with that approach, he thinks you are making things more complicated than needs to be. He said 33 other states do the 24 hour interval. They must know something that they use that system, why is it not acceptable in our state. He agrees 100% that the legislature temporarily punted this subject to you folks and the Commission to do something with it. What's been proposed isn't reasonably minimize animal suffering and that's really at the core of what the legislature was doing in passing SB 213. He has not heard that from this committee as far as the discussion. He thinks that's a huge gap in the consideration of what should be done with this bill to meet the legislative intent. Again he can't emphasize enough that we are talking about a hidden lethal weapon. If there is any possibility that there is going to be unnecessary animal suffering or that people are going to be potential injured or their companion animals we need to take as many steps as possible to preclude that from happening. The so called trash animals, the over 5,000 that have been reported by only 20% of 1088 trappers over an eight year period, is a huge statistic and it should not be pushed to the side as a non consideration. He wanted to emphasize that trapper convenience is not the paramount consideration even though many of the comments that have been made have emphasized that. The trappers in conclusion should only place traps where they can reasonably manage those traps. As was said very eloquently by some of the committee members there is no reason for someone at the state level to tell somebody how to use their time. That is totally up to them whether they set 20 or 40 traps. That is their job to say where they are going to be based and how much time they are going to spend managing those traps. They have a responsibility to the people in this state to manage those traps effectively and safely. Their convenience is not the primary consideration.

Ms. Myers said she wanted to thank the committee for taking this seriously, she is very grateful.

Chairman McNinch said don't read into it too much it's a big discussion and the intentions are honest to have an honest discussion. He said he always promised that to everyone. He will bring that back to the committee.

Mr. Sullivan said he would like to comment on a couple of Chairman McNinch comments. He thanked Steve for the words about the compliments for when the trappers tried to shorten the bobcat season a few years ago. Jeff talked about animal suffering and he will address that. Dave Stillwater mentioned diseases in California and Mike Reese asked for the consequences of changes. He wanted to address Dave and Mike's comments. A disease in California, California is very close to where we are right now but the diseases in furbearing animals are much closer than that. He has an article called Urban Jungle from the Washington Post (March 5, 2013) about sarcoptic mange in foxes. We have a plague problem on Mt Charleston in grey foxes and a mange problem in red foxes throughout the western United States including the neighboring state of Utah. An epidemic of sarcoptic mange in the state of Utah. He knows of a Nevada trapper that was invited over by Utah Fish and Game to help them with the mange epidemic in Utah. The trapper caught the mange, came home, and was seriously ill. Diseases are very close to home. Those of you on the animal rights community if you truly care about suffering of animals look into some of these diseases plague and mange. There is nothing more miserable and pitiful than a coyote or a fox dying from mange. Their fur falls out and they die a very slow death. They literally freeze to death. Mange is very close to home and right next door to us in Utah. Nevada we have a very healthy fur bearer population. We do have a plague problem on Mt Charleston that the trappers have been addressing fast and furious over the last several years until we eliminated half the trapping areas up there. He thinks the trappers have kept these awful diseases in check in this state but the consequences of making wholesale changes to trapping could be horrible to the animals that everybody wants to protect. Other diseases, a biologist in Grand Canyon National park from a plague after doing an autopsy on a mountain lion. Very close to home. These diseases are far away although they are here and real and having a modern furbearer management program is about the only way to keep these things in check.

Commissioner Layne said she said it seems to her that we have more structure in these meetings in terms of...she certainly thinks this has been a very good discussion about where they are going. The fact of the matter is we have not a lot of time, maybe four meetings of this committee, and we've got issues not only in terms of the trapping time, the definition of trapping that the Commission has said that we will address in the committee along with some other issues, she is concerned that we spent what your agenda said and would spend tonight on talking about the whole issue of what constitutes congested. It seems to her that we have to first of all figure out before we can start mapping anything what we are talking about in terms of congested. She thinks that one of the most critical things that as a committee have to do and decide what it is that we are going to look at. We only have so much time to do this. Are we going to be looking at those in each area? We need to have some sense of what we are going to be dealing with. She doesn't think that we can possibly address some of the things that have been discussed tonight. The other issue that we have to talk about is what we use in terms of boundaries. The reason she talked about the hunting units was that they have

definable boundaries that people can see. It's not 6 feet north of such and 10 feet south of that. They are clearly defined that whatever we decide to use those boundaries have to be defined, easy to be seen and everyone is clear what those boundaries are. She thinks trying to address those issues before we end tonight, that the next meeting we go to, we have a better handle on that.

Chairman McNinch said he will address that issue. From a structure standpoint he doesn't believe that we can accomplish what is expected of us from the legislature without having meetings like this. We had absolutely nothing to work with here. It says we shall consider. Consider what? Heavily used, was outlined early and he thinks because of the discussion we have had tonight and he understands the anxieties with the time. He does not feel he is in a race. As a Chairman of the committee that might be a fault or he could be off base. In order to get the issues out on the table and properly vet this so when we go back to the legislature he can tell them yes everybody got their shot at it and rebuttal. He said he is willing to put the time in. Over the last two and a half years we took a little bit of time while the legislature was in we have an awful lot of meetings and a lot occurred outside these meetings to try to frame things up. With all due respect he thinks having these meetings where we get things out on the table and work through some of the emotion and by having the discussions that we have done people understand that there are things that need to be talked about. Regardless of where it ends up it has to be discussed, that's our mandate. For lack of a better start he will lay that at the feet of the legislature. They didn't give us anything but this that says you better talk about it. We started that discussion and he does believe we need to move on here so we can get an idea of how we are going to proceed. We do have a lot of issues to address. This is what's in here that the Commission is asking us to address, visitation as a whole. He doesn't know what else is on the table. That is stuff that will have to be considered as we move along. With that, he would appreciate a discussion on our next step. Where are we going to go and what are the considerations? He said he has a couple thoughts but prefers to hear from the committee at this point.

Chairman McNinch addressed the Commission they can't rely on anybody doing anything out in the audience. He thinks we can expect some kind of a map but we can't require it. He certainly thinks that a map would get the discussion moving for better or worse. What it does to him is it defines with all due respect to Mr. Voltz it defines the discussion. Are we talking about mapping every populated area and trail? Or are we talking on a broad scale. If we come back and see a map that's largely red then he thinks that we have to have the discussion. Are we talking about a statewide time frame? Nothing in here says that we have to restrict any of these areas in close proximity to populated or heavily used areas to 24 hours. It doesn't say anything in here, at least not that he has read. It says it will be considered. The 24 hour thing got stuck in our head, but that doesn't say it in here. These are all discussion points that we have to work our way through.

Commissioner Robb said as a committee member he knows that we are going to see a map come back now. He knows the trappers have had a bad taste in their mouth because they say they put a map forward on Charleston and it didn't work out for them. Maybe they can get past

their bad taste and come up with a map in the south that they think would be reasonable. He knows himself; he is going to work on a map that he thinks would be reasonable in Southern Nevada. He said he has hunted the Muddies and the Blacks and has been in the rivers quite a bit. We took a tour of Mt. Charleston, he is familiar with the area he can't do the map because he doesn't know the names of the roads, but he knows where he wants to go. He said he is going to create a map. If you guys choose to do a map it's up to you. He will produce one for himself as a starting point. If we all have something on paper we all have a place to start. Maybe Jeremy has his own map and doesn't like my Northern Nevada map. He can come up with something different up there too. If he didn't throw the map out tonight they wouldn't even be talking about maps. We needed a starting point. He said he will continue to throw out maps.

Commissioner Layne said she is concerned about time and we have trapping season starting. What she would like is some chronological sequence that we are going to be looking at since we do want to conduct more meetings in other areas. It would seem to her, and tell her if she is wrong about this, but we are going to have to have something in hand to present to the Commission by the June meeting of next year in order to get this processed through LCB before the next trapping season in 2014.

Chairman McNinch said we couldn't take action on that tonight but under future agenda items we could have a discussion on a time frame. He thinks it's going to be prudent to do something sooner than later where we can talk about time frames. He wants to keep an open mind here that things may not move forward. We are having the discussion like we have been asked. If we decide to take action then we will have a time frame of when we get it done and we do have to be respectful of that because the idea here is that the legislature would intend for us to get it in place and not 15 years from now. If there are things that need to be taken care of, we have that responsibility. Back track on all of his comments, there are time frames that we need to be considerate of and we can talk about that at the next meeting as an agenda item. He is reluctant to go home and say everybody do their own map. He doesn't want homework for himself, if everybody else would like to do it that's great. Rob has a map that talks about densities and population per square mile is the measurement on it. It's a general map and maybe it helps frame the discussion on the next go around on what the State of Nevada looks like and what density might mean. Building a map for consideration of defining close proximity to a populated or heavily used area. For lack of any motion he would ask Rob to bring that back. We can make it an agenda item and focus more on some of the things that we have heard to get started. He asked if the committee has any comments and if anyone wants to take action/direction to staff.

Commissioner Robb said instead of him working out a map, the staff working on a map, he asked Chairman McNinch if he works with Rob and comes up with some ideas that will work for law enforcement and work in his head of what he believes he heard from the Senators that he spoke with and the direction he believes they want to go. He said he can work with Rob to come up with something and present it at the next committee meeting.

Chairman McNinch asked the committee to discuss further.

Commissioner Drew said if Commissioner Robb is willing to take that on he is not going to prevent him from doing it.

Commissioner Layne said she would definitely think the chief needs to be involved in this because it seems part of the problem we have right now has to do with some of this in terms of being able to delineate. If we are going to have separate areas or differentiate between 24 and 96 hours she thinks it's important that we have law enforcement involved because they are the ones. It seems to her how difficult is this going to be for them? She thinks that should be a very big part of what they are trying to do.

Chairman McNinch asked do we want to put what Commissioner Robb is proposing into a motion. He asked Mr. Sullivan did you have something you were going to add.

Mr. Sullivan said the only thing he would ask is to ask Chief Buonamici to bring something to us in the form of an idea of the number of problems in visitation, the law enforcement scope of the problem both north and south. We have heard a lot at their County Advisory Board meetings in Clark County; they have discussed these items much longer than tonight and still don't have an idea what the size of the problem is that some people have said. Visitation is fine statewide, per year. He would like to see the numbers as far as enforcement cases.

Chief Buonamici said from 2007 to 2012 we had a total of 41 visitation violations. 25 of them were citations, 16 of them were warnings.

Chairman McNinch said he is not sensing that the committee wants to take action.

Commissioner Robb said if he works with Rob when they produce a map he thinks it would be only fair to both sides that we would publicize that map. Make it public so both sides can see it and absorb it before we get to a meeting. It would be appropriate to release a map prior to our next meeting as support material. We would designate multiple personnel in each group so they can distribute it amongst themselves.

Chairman McNinch said that sounds good.

Commissioner Layne said she understands that we are going to get a map of densities by census information.

Chief Buonamici said he looked up the US Census Bureau and they have density map for Nevada and it has 11 categories within that map. Anywhere from a population, per square mile of less than one to greater than 5000, it's tiered. His thought is pick a density that everybody thinks is somewhat reasonable as a quote populated area, the maps already done for us, then take our management units and see how closely we can match them up.

Commissioner Layne said if you do that with census tracks because of the way that they don't include tourists. So you may run into some anomalies.

Chairman McNinch said for lack of a motion the committee is going to expect me as a Chairman to establish at our next meeting based on what we talked about in agenda item #5. If there is no action to be taken and no further discussion we will move on to agenda item # 5.

5 Future Committee Meeting – For Possible Action

The Committee will discuss the date, time and location of the next Committee meeting. The Committee will also review and may take action to set potential agenda items for that meeting.

Chairman McNinch said now he would propose to have a more aggressive agenda where we talk about populated areas, have maps to look at and get a feel how we define these areas. The definition of what we want to put some boundaries or do we want to have discussion on what those types of things mean and we can frame up the rest of the conversations we are having relevant to. Is there a need to restrict based on what we interpret to be definitions of certain things, close proximity, populated areas, and heavily used. Also a chronology and map ourselves out and get a game plan for when we want take action on a particular item or area. When do we really need to have that done by and can we frame that up and make sure that if we are going to do something we have some parameters.

Commissioner Robb said on future committee meetings he would like to start discussing some dates and where he knows we are going to be going. Our next Commission meeting isn't until December, which is quite a time span, and he doesn't want to wait that long to meet. Our next Commission meeting will be in Reno in December. The Commissioner meeting following that is in Las Vegas. He would propose that we do a meeting and maybe work with staff and not determine a date. We do have several committee members in the south, three committee members in the north, and doing a video conferencing to beg and borrow to whatever we can do to get a video conference sight. He would like to have it on a Monday or a Friday. If we do midweek he has to travel twice in one week. He works out of state on a regular basis. He doesn't want to wait until June, when he is off of the Commission. He wants to keep this ball going and does not want to wait until December. We have a June deadline of him leaving the Commission and he wants this done before we get there.

Mr. Sullivan said if we could do it in late November, he has a conflict in early November. Beyond the 15th would be good for him and any time in early December.

Chairman McNinch said he can see where conflicts might occur. He will probably be out in the field in October. He will look at some dates and check available dates from the committee.

Commissioner Layne said in terms of the agenda, can we include the definition of visitation in your definitions.

Chairman McNinch said we could take that on now. This isn't anything new for a lot of us, for the two or three issues that we have handled it took six 4 to 5 hour long meetings and a couple trips down here one on one to get them done. He wants to be respectful of the fact that it takes a while. He said he will look at that and he will talk with Rob and how we want to lay them out.

Commissioner Robb said he understands what Commissioner Layne is asking but he would like to take one apple at a time and get it done before we move on to the next. We have time before the next trapping season to get there. He thinks we can consume a meeting and try to get one topic completed before we start another.

Chairman McNinch said some of this other stuff might lead straight into visitation as Mr. Voltz was mentioning. It might lead us into a statewide concept as opposed to an area concept.

Commissioner Drew said his assumption is this is a priority and he would tend to agree with Chairman Robb if we could focus on this one addressed. If there is something pertinent to that needs to be discussed then we can do that. He is assuming you meant when you chronology just a general schedule of how this will lay out.

Chairman McNinch said it would be general, if action has to be taken or action is taken that we understand time lines it needs to be done by. I don't think it would be in anybody's best interest to allow this thing to go into the 2015 trapping season. If things are going to happen they need to happen for the next trapping season.

Mr. Voltz said he thinks that having the meeting in early November is wise. The ability to schedule another one prior to the commission meeting in December. June is going to come up very fast in what has to be done. There is no point in waiting around to get to this and then at the last minute try and rush to get something done that doesn't do the job it's supposed to do.

Ms. Myers said she wish the North and South can communicate. She doesn't know how you can manage to have that, but we are not hearing each other when you meet in Reno.

Ms. Griesen said for the next meeting she would like the idea of video conferencing and making it convenient for everyone to participate. She is thinking back to the bear hunt discussions, not just one map but several maps to choose from. Maybe some from each side, some from this side and maybe something that you guys come up with so there are a couple justifications as to why we have something to work with. She does believe that the comments that Commissioner Layne made were important that there does have to

be some definitions because you can't go on populations. She said she met a woman who hikes with her dog every day and her dog was caught in a trap up near Mountains Edge. She knows there was a guy who saw a coyote in a trap right off of Grand Teton. She said we do need to have some parameters as far as definitions and thinks that is important to bring to the next meeting so you can start defining your frame a little tighter.

Chairman McNinch said he may have misunderstood Commissioner Layne when you said visitation, were you talking about defining what a visit is or time frames.

Commissioner Layne said - ??? Too quiet to hear

Ms. Griesen said population.

Commissioner Layne said - ??? Too quiet to hear

Ms. Griesen said on the citations if we could maybe have them on the map. She would like to do a public records request on the citations that were given.

Chairman McNinch said she can do that later.

Ms. Griesen said right, she thinks it's important on the map to point out with a star where those citations were issued so we have an idea on enforcement.

Chairman McNinch said this is a future agenda item and needs to be addressed in public comment.

Mr. Blakeslee said if we are going to expand into the definition of visitation and anything that is not spelled out by SB 213 then there are things that he wants to add and ask for. If we are going to expand it then he wants to expand it as well.

COMMISSIONER DREW MAKES A MOTION THAT THE NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING BE CALLED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR BASED ON AVAILABILITY. COMMISSIONER ROBB SECONDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6 **Public Comment Period**

Persons wishing to speak on items not on the agenda should complete a speaker's card and present it to the recording secretary. Public comment will be limited to three minutes. No action can be taken by the Commission at this time; any item requiring Commission action may be scheduled on a future Commission agenda. In addition to this Public Comment Period, Public Comment limited to three minutes per speaker on each agenda action item, but not on reports or informational items.

Ms. Wright said for her own edification are you planning on having a trapping committee meeting in Reno because if it's a yes then she wants to get her plane ticket.

Chairman McNinch said he will work on with Rob as soon as he can and get it set up. He understands the need for people to make arrangements. We will look into the video conferencing and see if we can make something work there. It's not as easy as it sounds. He understands that it's out there but it an accommodations issue. We will see what we can do to facilitate some of that but no promises.

Ms. Wright said she was under the impression the next one was definitely going to be a video conferencing, but what she is hearing you say is you are going to hope to make that work.

Commissioner McNinch said we are going to try. He said he can't promise it. We have to find video conferencing in both places, there are some challenges.

Dr. Molde said he should render an apology to Commissioner Drew and Commissioner Robb. He said he has been a little hard on them. To the extent that is warranted please accept. The second thing is that as far as agenda items, he is astonished that you didn't include a brief discussion on the non-target data that he presented to you as a future agenda item. There are some significant implications of those numbers that we haven't even touched on. He would appreciate 15 minutes to discuss with you because he thinks they bear directly on what you are doing

Ms. Griesen said she was saying before about the future meeting in order to move things along she thinks it would be important to provide input. She respects that your enforcement and you know the hunting territories. It's important to provide input and justification on particular maps and have a choice of maps. Also we are looking at populations that are heavily used. Is the lady that goes out every day with her dog heavily used? Even though it's an off beaten trail off of Mountains Edge. As far as Red Rock Canyon is there trapping allowed or not allowed in that additional area. She doesn't know if that was ever resolved on those questions that were left. We still need to look at where trapping is and isn't allowed in BLM and forest service land. She would like to see on the map citations that were issued. She would like the map identified by stars or dots to reflect where those citations were issued so they can get an idea of where more enforcement is going on and things are happening. Defining what is heavily used, it's a little ambiguous maybe everyone can make suggestions on coming with some language on what this means. Clark County is much different than Northern Nevada.

Mr. Reese asked Chief Buonamici the map that Ms. Griesen is asking for the violations on, is it possible for you to define the 41 violations. Were those violations? He knows it's for lack of visiting in the proper amount of time, but is there anything that says

whether you did it because an animal was in the trap and it wasn't pulled out or was it an empty trap and the guy didn't come and check? Maybe that was the warnings, because there were no animals but they know you didn't check the traps on time.

Chairman McNinch said they are on public comment, there won't be any conversation.

Mr. Werner said he had something he was concerned about when he was thinking about Nevada as a model state when it comes to wildlife management. NDOW biologists are second to none. He asked the committee to consider when we implement, if you have to make a change, is it going to be temporary to see how the studies go? Let the biologists do their work and maybe guide you guys. NDOW has been doing an outstanding job in managing our wildlife issues. Let them make some of these decisions and studies to really hit the scientific part.

Mr. Halverson said he would like to invite the committee to the Nevada Trappers Association trap education day next Saturday, September 28th. Prospect Ranch up in Mt Charleston. It's going to be an educational day. For those of you that don't have a lot of knowledge about trapping and what trappers do might be beneficial if you attended.

Chairman McNinch asked if there were anymore public comment – there was none.

Chairman McNinch said he appreciated everyone coming and their respect today.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20.

Exhibit 1 – Dr. Molde – Non-Target Data 2002-2013

Exhibit 2 – John Sullivan – Furbearer Management in Nevada

Exhibit 3 – Commissioner Robb - Map

In accordance with NRS 241.020, this agenda closes three days prior to the meeting date and has been posted on the website www.ndow.org, and at 4 locations including the principal office of the body (Department of Wildlife offices: 1100 Valley Road, Reno, NV 89512, 380 W. "B" Street, Fallon, NV 89406; 60 Youth Center Road, Elko, NV 89801; 4747 Vegas Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89108). Nevada Department of Wildlife receives Federal Aid in Fish and/or Wildlife Restoration. Federal law prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, natural origin, age, sex [in educational programs], or disability. Members of the public wishing to participate should appear in person at the physical meeting location, or may submit written comments to be contained in the exhibit.

Exhibit 1 – Dr. Molde – Non-Target Data 2002-2013

**Nevada Trappers Non-Target Summary Data
 2002-2013**

Species	Numbers	Released		Dead
		Unharmed	Injured	
Animals	5138	582	441	3579
Birds	234	41	18	158
Total	5372	623	459	3737

Annual Percentage Per Year of Trappers Reporting

Year	Number Reporting	Total Trappers	Average Percent over 8 years
2002-2013	1069	5252	20%

**Nevada Trappers Non-Target Summary Data
 For Years 2002-2004, 2007, 2010-2013 (8 years) By Animals**

Species	Numbers	Released		Dead
		Unharmed	Injured	
Rabbits	4190	191	400	3145
Domestic Dogs	195	163	14	16
Domestic Cats	116	33	7	28
Mountain Lions	172	135	8	17
Other	183	15	5	153
Livestock	25	15	3	5
Game	33	20	3	4
Badger	1	0	0	1
Bear	2	2	0	0
Bobcat	1	1	0	0
Chipmunk	5	0	0	6
Ermine	1	0	0	1
Feral Pig	1	0	0	0
Ground Squirrel	11	1	1	9
Pack Rat	193	0	0	191
Pond Turtle	5	5	0	0
Skunk	4	1	0	3
Total	5138	582	441	3579

Exhibit 2 – John Sullivan – Furbearer Management in Nevada

FURBEARER MANAGEMENT IN NEVADA

Introduction

The Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) acknowledges that furbearers occupy a significant ecological niche and that management actions undertaken to affect these species must account for this. The NDOW manages Nevada's furbearer populations in accordance with established laws and regulations and promotes both consumptive and non-consumptive uses.

The management of furbearing species focuses on their protection and conservation since they are viewed as an integral part of functional ecosystems. However, inherent population growth characteristics of many furbearers allow unchecked growth to reach levels that negatively affect natural systems. Likewise, non-regulated populations of these same species may ultimately affect public health and safety, and/or result in nuisance animal interactions with the public. It is a management strategy of the Department to utilize the consumptive processes to help minimizing negative impacts to Nevada's citizens.

The professional wildlife conservation community universally endorses traps and trapping as critical and essential wildlife management tools. Highly structured and replicated studies have repeatedly shown that leghold (foothold) traps are the only efficient, practical, and humane live capture/control tool currently available for many furbearer species. They function as the primary and most selective live restraining device currently available and in widespread use.

The topic of trapping, and more specifically the use of leghold (foothold) traps, is filled with controversy and pervasive misinformation. Fundamental management decisions that were once based on sound science have now entered the arena of public debate and are subjected to increased scrutiny. Consequently, the following text and salient documentation will attempt to objectively clarify the role of leghold (foothold) traps and trapping in furbearer and ecosystem management strategies.

By necessity, leghold (foothold) traps are a decisive and entrenched part of most trapping strategies, and it is therefore virtually impossible to separate them from any discussion concerning trapping. It should be assumed that, unless otherwise mentioned, any further reference to traps or trapping shall include use of leghold (foothold) traps. It should also be noted that leghold (foothold) traps are live capture restraining devices that allow release of captured animals.

Professional Support

Governmental wildlife agencies, universities, conservation organizations, international species recovery groups, and public health officials routinely use, or prescribe the use of traps and trapping for a variety of projects. These include, but are not limited to research, reintroduction, ecosystem management, endangered species recovery, population and disease management, critical habitat protection, exotic and invasive species control, protection of private property, and control of crop and livestock depredations.¹

The WILDLIFE SOCIETY and the ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES (AFWA) are the largest international organizations representing professional wildlife conservation employees and governmental wildlife agencies. Both groups actively support and promote trapping and leghold (foothold) traps as invaluable management tools. Position statements by these organizations relative to trapping include the following excerpts:

The Wildlife Society (<http://wildlife.org/>)

The policy of the Wildlife Society in regard to trapping is to: "Support the use of regulated trapping for sustained harvest of some species of furbearers as an effective method for managing or studying furbearers, controlling damage caused by furbearers, and at times reducing the spread of harmful diseases, and for economic benefit, subsistence, and as a legitimate recreational activity".²

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (<http://www.fishwildlife.org/>)

Resolution No.1 on Traps, Trapping and Furbearer Management states in part:

" WHEREAS, regulated trapping guided by responsible wildlife management principles is a safe, efficient, and necessary means of capturing individual animals without impairing the survival of furbearer populations or damaging the environment; and

" WHEREAS, lethal harvest or control techniques are not feasible or appropriate in all situations and

"WHEREAS, live restraining traps often offer advantages over other techniques in efficiency, safety to humans and domestic animals, release of non target animals and lack of adverse environmental effects".³

Animal Welfare and Trap Selectivity

The basic tenants of sound furbearer management dictate that some furbearers have to be captured. By definition, wild animals are free ranging and typically not subject to confinement. Regrettably, it is impossible to capture, restrain, or handle any wildlife species without animals experiencing some degree or level of stress and injury. Similarly, each species has unique physical characteristics and/or behavioral manifestations that predetermine the species-specific effectiveness of differing capture devices. While box traps, snares and kill traps work for some species in some applications, for many species and in many circumstances, leghold (foothold) traps are the safest, most ecologically sound, efficient, and humane trap currently available.

Commentary on the acceptability of leghold (foothold) trap use can be found in the following resolution passed by the INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE

AND NATURAL RESOURCES SURVIVAL SERVICE COMMISSION (IUCN/SSC) which states in part:

"Whereas, it is often necessary to live trap wolves for research that promotes conservation, and Whereas every method of live capturing animals presents a potential danger to that animal, Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the IUCN/SSC Wolf Specialty Group supports the use of modified steel foothold traps to live trap wolves for conservation research as being the most efficient, effective, and practical method available of catching wolves while minimizing possible injuries. Steel foothold traps represent a method safe enough to be used in any context including wildlife refuges, protected areas for endangered wolf populations".⁴

Concerted efforts between the professional wildlife community, trap manufacturers, and trappers have been undertaken to improve animal welfare. Notwithstanding the major improvements in humane attributes of traps and trapping systems that have occurred during the last 30 years, these same entities have greatly accelerated their efforts during the last decade.

The American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) recognized advancements in leghold (foothold) trap design and on April 12, 2008 adopted a new policy that while opposing conventional, unmodified steel jaw traps, accepts that modified traps are an acceptable industry tool. The AVMA's policy recognizes that current trap designs with modified features such as offset jaws so as not to close all the way on an animal's limb, padded jaws, modified spring strength, chain length and the use of a swivel or shock and other similar features that minimize injury, pain, stress and suffering are acceptable.⁵ Further, a member of the AVMA Animal Welfare Committee explained that *"some special interest groups oppose trapping of animals in general, but this can actually compromise animal welfare. Sometimes it is necessary to trap animals."*⁶

In 1997, representatives of the 50 state wildlife agencies, Canada, Russia, and member nations of the European Union reached multi-national agreements governing the development of 'Humane Trapping Standards'. Under the auspices of the AFWA, U.S. and Canadian representatives have initiated the largest systematic evaluation of traps and trapping systems ever conducted. Existing traps, modifications of commercially available traps, and experimental trap types have been tested in efforts to improve the welfare of trapped animals. The results of these investigations have and are being incorporated in the development of Best Management Practices (BMP's) guidelines for traps and trapping. The foundation of this monumental initiative is to improve the welfare of trapped animals, while concurrently maintaining adequate efficiency, practicability, and safety standards. Realizing the interdependent complexities of this issue, prudence has mandated an exhaustive testing regime that yields scientifically defensible advancements in the humane characteristics of trapping systems. For an in depth explanation of AFWA's process for determining and accepting BMPs the reader should see the AFWA booklet

“Best Management Practices for Trapping in the United States”

(http://www.fishwildlife.org/files/Introduction_BMPs.pdf)

As of June 2012, over 50 trapping systems for 21 species of wildlife have been evaluated in 41 states. BMPs data for many species suggest the following:⁷

- With few exceptions, there are currently no viable alternatives to leghold (foothold) traps for live capture of many species.
- Various modifications to commonly available leghold (foothold) traps have substantially increased animal welfare properties of some traps in compliance with evaluation guidelines established by the International Standards Organization.
- Not only do leghold (foothold) traps allow the release of unwanted animals, BMP studies document the high degree of selectivity for target animals using these traps. Studies that have included the trapping of thousands of animals have resulted in non-target species capture rates as small as 3% of total number of captured animals.
- Contrary to popular belief, the selectivity of leghold (foothold) traps resulted in no captures of non-target threatened and/or endangered species.

Relative Importance of Traps and Trapping as a Management Tool

Trapping and leghold (foothold) traps are the pivotal management tools for modifying population trends in furbearers. Alternative control and/or live capture techniques, including cage traps, hunting, and poisons tend to be more injurious, less effective, and often pose secondary environmental hazards. Leghold (foothold) traps are routinely used to address the following management concerns:

A. Threatened and Endangered (T&E) Species Protection and/or Restoration

Non-regulated predator populations possess the inherent abilities to depress recruitment/recovery of several key species. Likewise, high population densities of furbearing species often result in habitat destruction or other ecological disturbances that decrease carrying capacity, displace, and/or preclude survival of additional species. Nationally, leghold (foothold) traps have been employed in innumerable efforts to restore T&E species. In Nevada, the NDOW has been involved in studies documenting that some predators such as badgers and coyote may have detrimental effects on nesting Sage-grouse, a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service candidate species.

By design, capture devices used to reintroduce extirpated species or augment T&E populations have to ensure minimal injury probabilities for target animals. Nationally, leghold (foothold) traps have been used almost exclusively to capture and reintroduce red wolves, gray wolves, Mexican wolves, lynx, and river otter. Over 4,000 river otter have been released in reintroduction projects conducted in 18 states. The overwhelming majority of these animals are captured by commercial/recreational trappers using conventional leghold (foothold) traps.⁸

B. Habitat and Ecosystem Management

Furbearers are essential components of Nevada's divergent ecosystems. Balanced populations contribute greatly to the overall health and viability of these natural communities. Conversely, inflated populations of many furbearers can significantly disrupt the complex interrelationships necessary for the functional health of ecosystems. At high population densities, beaver and muskrat have the ability to degrade, destroy or convert existing ecosystems. The net result can often be the total elimination of aligned species dependent on that ecosystem. Beaver, especially when overabundant, can have many deleterious effects to ecosystems and other wildlife populations. Beaver ponds can slow streams, increasing water temperatures and decrease dissolved oxygen levels posing significant threats to bull trout, a threatened species in Nevada. Further, beaver pond activity is known to interrupt trout migration, flood spawning areas and increase the occurrence of parasites.⁹ The effect of beaver on streams and stream flow can be so profound that statute has been created to ensure and enable beaver control in Nevada. ¹⁰

C. Wildlife Disease Control

Although disease normally occurs in all wildlife populations, stress resulting from increased population densities may precipitate or confound the occurrence of disease infestations. ¹¹ Non-regulated furbearer populations can function as disease/parasite reservoirs that pose a continual threat to humans, and decrease the viability of wildlife populations. Furbearers are the primary vectors for numerous threatening maladies including rabies, giardias, distemper, tularemia, and mange. While trapping may not prevent the onset of these afflictions, it can reduce furbearer population densities. This may result in a reduction in disease transmission and reduce the intensity of further disease outbreaks. ¹

Wildlife biologists and wildlife health care professionals have long recognized the integral role of trapping and foothold traps in the control and/or abatement of wildlife disease. Dr. Victor Nettles, co-author of the *Field Manual of Wildlife Diseases in the Southeastern United States*, affirms this in the following statement: "Our main concern at Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study is the importance of trapping as a wildlife management tool to deal with health concerns. Under the guidance of professional wildlife biologists, trapping can be the most effective method to maintain some furbearers at optimum population densities. As a result, animals remain in good physical condition, and risk of devastating disease outbreaks is diminished. The reverse is true of some unmanaged populations, where depletion of food supplies due to overpopulation results in declining physical condition. Animals are thus predisposed to increased transmission of disease and parasites. When wildlife are permitted to overpopulate, the net result is weak, pitiful animals that cannot defend themselves or care for their young."¹²

D. Animal Damage Control

As human and furbearer population densities increase, the relative probability of negative interactions also escalates proportionately. Historically, the majority of wildlife complaints attributed to furbearers have been borne by rural residents. These conflicts typically affect agricultural producers and can result in substantial economic losses from livestock and crop depredations. Understandably, extensive attitudinal and public opinion studies document strong support for trapping and the use of leghold (foothold) traps by rural inhabitants and agricultural producers.¹³ Locally, the Nevada Farm Bureau has issued a policy statement supporting the continuance of regulated trapping.¹⁴ Although these types of interactions tend to define furbearer complaints, shifting human demographic patterns are changing the complexion of many furbearer management issues.

While encroaching suburban sprawl has eliminated and/or fragmented wildlife habitat, many furbearer species have proven extremely resilient and now flourish in close proximity to dense human habitation. Prey species, den sites, etc. may become substantially altered in suburban and urban environments, but basic behavioral traits still fall within genetically predetermined boundaries. Coyote depredations quickly switch from sheep and cattle, to dogs and cats. Fox pursue cats instead of chickens, and raccoons raid garbage cans and pet feeders instead of natural food sources. Beaver continue to fell trees and dam bodies of water. However, they are now flooding septic systems and destroying ornamental trees in planned communities instead of impacting farmland and commercial forests. Similarly, preferred densities for raccoons now include attics and chimneys as well as hollow trees and rocky outcrops.

Aesthetically, most people enjoy viewing wildlife safely from a distance, and in "wild" areas. Nevertheless, these symbolic attitudes and tolerance levels quickly change when wildlife behavior deviates from the 'idealistic' norm. A study conducted of residents of 10 of the 100 largest metropolitan areas in the United States found that more than half of the respondents (61%) reported that they or their households had a problem with a wildlife species in the prior year.¹⁵ Moles, raccoons, skunks, squirrels, mice, pigeons, and starlings were cited most often as being the cause of the problems.¹⁵ But, other wildlife also commonly cause problems. While no statistics are kept by the NDOW, coyote related pet deaths have become commonplace in many Nevada communities. A study on beaver management found that those individuals who had experienced beaver-related problems were more likely to think there were too many beaver (65% of people who had experienced problems wanted the population decreased, and only 20% of people who had not experienced problems wanted the population decreased). The study also showed that individuals who had experienced beaver-related problems were more likely to think that beaver were nuisances, to have negative attitudes toward beaver, and to support more invasive actions in wildlife management policies than were others.¹⁶ It is likely that people who have had problems with other wildlife, similarly, are more likely to feel a need for decreased populations than those who have not experienced problems.

The economic ramifications of furbearer damage are well documented. Specific examples are as follows: In 2010, cattle/calf, sheep/lamb and goat/kid losses to predators in the US were estimated to exceed \$137 million.^{17&18} The same year (2010) in Nevada, livestock losses were estimated to exceed \$2.4 million. ^{17&18}

The Jack H. Berryman institute at Utah State University reports that more than six million tax dollars was spent annually to address coyote damage. In the absence of trapping, it was projected that coyote populations in the western US (including Nevada) would increase by 30% during the following ten years. ¹⁹

Government agencies estimate that beaver accounted for an estimated \$109,279,000 in annual property damages and losses in the US. In the absence of trapping, it was projected that these beaver populations would increase by 40% during the next ten years. ¹⁹

Raccoons were responsible for an annual estimated \$41,732,000 in damage in the US. It was estimated that raccoon populations in the west would increase by 30% during the following ten years if trapping were prohibited. ¹⁹

The Importance of Trapping in Furbearer Management Strategies

Regulated trapping can accomplish management strategies established by the NDOW to achieve furbearer management objectives. The occupied range and densities of furbearer species in Nevada requires a substantial statewide trapping effort to manage. Trappers function as NDOW's unpaid technicians in the implementation of structured management strategies. In many locations across the state, recreational trappers and nuisance wildlife control operators use traps to remove nuisance and unwanted animals from around human occupied areas. Without this highly trained community, fiscal and manpower constraints could prohibit NDOW from fulfilling other natural resources stewardship mandates. In addition to overall population management efforts, regulated trappers in Nevada have used leghold (foothold) traps to aid the NDOW in research projects, ecosystem protection, nuisance animal damage abatement, and public health and safety issues.

Based on a survey conducted by Utah State University's Jack H. Berryman Institute, wildlife management experts predict that without hunting and trapping, government budgets would have to increase phenomenally to provide the same level of service received today. ¹⁹

References Cited

1. Organ, J. F., et. al. 1996. Trapping and Furbearer Management: Perspectives From the Northeast. Northeast Furbearer Resources Technical Committee. 33 pp.
2. Boggess, E. K. 1990. Traps, Trapping, and Furbearer management. Wildlife Society Technical Review. 90-1. 31 pp.
3. International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. Resolution No. 1. Traps, Trapping and Furbearer Management. 2 pp.
4. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. October 1993. Survival Service Commission. World Recovery Group. Resolution. 1 pp.
5. American Veterinary Medical Association. 2008. Policy on trapping and steel-jawed leghold traps. http://www.avma.org/issues/policy/animal_welfare/trapping.asp
6. American Veterinary Medical Association. 2008. Press Release: AVMA Discourages Use of Conventional Leghold Traps, Sets Guidelines for Humane Trapping. http://www.avma.org/press/releases/080520_trapping.asp
7. International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. April 2000. Fur Resources Technical Subcommittee. Unpublished Data.
8. International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 1999. Furbearer Resources Technical Work Group. Case Studies, Kiss the Babies Hello. 3 pp.
9. Novak, M., 1987. Beaver. *In Wild Furbearer Management and Conservation in North America.* Novak, Baker, Obbard and Malloch eds. pp 283 – 312.
10. Nevada Revised Statute 503.470 Control of fur-bearing mammals doing damage.
11. Addison, E. M. 1987. Diseases and Parasites of Furbearers in Wild Furbearer Management and Conservation in North America. pp 893-909.
12. Nettles, V. F. May 2000. Written Correspondence to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study. 3 pp.
13. Fleishman-Hillard, Inc. 1999. Human Dimensions of Trapping and Furbearer Management. A report to the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' Fur Resources Technical Subcommittee. Fleishman-Hillard Research. 114 pp.
14. Nevada Farm Bureau. 2012. 2012 Nevada farm Bureau Policy; pathway for stronger Nevada agriculture. 71 pp.
15. Conover, Michael R. 1997. "Wildlife Management by Metropolitan Residents in the United States: Practices, Perceptions, Costs, and Values." *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 25(2): 306-311
16. Siemer, William F., Tommy L. Brown, Sandra A. Jonker, and Robert M. Muth. 2003. *Attitudes Toward Beaver and Beaver Management: Results From Baseline Studies in New York and Massachusetts.* HDRU Series Publication 03-02.
17. National Agriculture Statistical Service. 2010. Cattle Death Loss. Agricultural Statistics Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 17 pp.
18. USDA National Agriculture Statistical Service. 2010. Sheep and Goat Death Loss. Agricultural Statistics Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture. 16 pp.

19. Kenyon, S., et. al. 1999. Bears in the Backyard, Deer in the Driveway, The Importance of Hunting and Trapping in Helping Wildlife Professionals Manage Our Treasured Wildlife Resources. Report Prepared by Southwick Associates for the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 24 pp.

Exhibit 3 – Commissioner Robb - Map



