

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Seventy-Eighth Session  
March 12, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Don Gustavson at 1:31 p.m. on Thursday, March 12, 2015, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada and Room 110, McMullen Hall, Great Basin College, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Don Gustavson, Chair  
Senator Pete Goicoechea, Vice Chair  
Senator James A. Settelmeyer  
Senator David R. Parks  
Senator Mark A. Manendo

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Scott T. Hammond, Senatorial District No. 18

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst  
Matthew Nichols, Counsel  
Lynn Berry, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Richard Perry, Administrator, Division of Minerals  
Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State  
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Mike Reese, President, Southern Nevada Coalition of Wildlife  
Joel Blakeslee, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife; Nevada Trappers Association;  
Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife  
Larry Johnson, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife

Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
March 12, 2015  
Page 2

William "Willie" Molini, Nevada Waterfowl Association  
John Sullivan  
Robert Gaudet , Nevada Wildlife Federation, Inc.  
John Ridgeway  
Riley Manzonie  
Jason James  
Dave Gowan  
Bob Brunner, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife  
Andrew Zaninovich, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers  
Kevin C.K. Baily  
Tom Smith, Truckee River Fly Fishers; Federation of Fly Fishermen  
Gil Yanuk, Friends of Nevada Wildlife  
Tracy Truman  
Tony Perkins  
Rich Gibbons  
Justin Alanis  
Antonio Mendive  
Jeff Turnipseed, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited  
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom  
John Wagner, Independent American Party of Nevada  
Doug Martin  
Everett Weisner  
Elaine Carrick, NoBearHuntNV.org  
Caron Tayloe, Trailsafe Nevada  
Stephanie Myers  
Margaret Flint, Nevadans for Responsible Wildlife Management  
Leah Sturgis  
Fred Voltz  
Joe Johnson, Sierra Club

**Chair Gustavson:**

I will open the work session for Senate Bill (S.B.) 44.

**SENATE BILL 44:** Makes various changes to provisions related to oil and natural gas. (BDR 46-344)

**Alysa Keller (Policy Analyst):**

Senate Bill 44 removes the statutory limit on the fee for a permit to drill or operate an oil or gas well and authorizes the Commission on Mineral Resources to include in the fee reasonable administrative costs of the Division of Minerals related to the filing and examination of the permit applications. The bill also raises the statutory limit on the administrative fee which may be assessed on oil and natural gas production.

One amendment was proposed that provides caps for the fees which may be assessed for permits and requests to change the terms of a permit. It also provides a lower cap on the administrative fee assessed on oil and gas production. There is a mock-up on the proposed amendment within the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

No testimony was offered in opposition to the bill. The fiscal note is the last page of [Exhibit C](#). The bill is eligible for exemption and requires a two-thirds majority vote for passage on the floor. Additional information is in [Exhibit C](#).

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Could there be an instance where the cap amounts would be exceeded?

**Richard Perry (Administrator, Division of Minerals):**

No. A change application occurs when an operator wishes to go back into a well after it has been drilled and make a modification. A review of the original design is performed before we will approve the change.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Are the caps of \$2,000 for a conventional well and \$5,000 for a hydraulically fractured well sufficient?

**Mr. Perry:**

Yes. We researched this to ensure accuracy. We developed a matrix of costs based on 2014 actual activity. If this bill becomes law, the Commission would proceed with rulemaking and base the actual fee on three items: the depth of the well; whether it is on federal or private land; and, is it a conventional well or is it to be hydraulically fractured.

**Senator Goicoechea:**

Are you comfortable the caps are adequate no matter what the scenario?

Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
March 12, 2015  
Page 4

**Mr. Perry:**  
Yes, we are.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 44 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 9716.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Gustavson:**  
We will open the work session on S.B. 89.

**SENATE BILL 89:** Revises provisions regarding expenditures from the Fund for Cleaning Up Discharges of Petroleum. (BDR 51-370)

**Ms. Keller:**  
This bill was heard on February 19, 2015, and increases the limitations on expenditures by the Division of Environmental Protection from the Fund for Cleaning Up Discharges of Petroleum and broadens the authority of the Division to use the fund for the clean up of petrochemicals. I will read from the work session document for S.B. 89 ([Exhibit D](#)). There are no proposed amendments. The fiscal note is included in [Exhibit D](#).

**Senator Goicoechea:**  
Is this bill discussing petroleum feedstock?

**Colleen Cripps, Ph.D. (Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):**  
No, it is not.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 89.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Chair Gustavson:**

We will open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 11.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11**: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to preserve the right to hunt, trap and fish in this State. (BDR C-1001)

**Senator Scott Hammond (Senatorial District No. 18):**

I am here to present S.J.R. 11. There are many benefits of wildlife recreation. It provides an economic boost to our State and offers those who participate in it a unique connection to the land. It gives us a true appreciation and respect for wildlife. Sportfishing and hunting activities contribute significant amounts of money, even millions of dollars, in retail sales to our State's economy. These contributions are made through local and State tax revenues. Nationwide, state wildlife agencies could not survive without the financial contributions of hunters, trappers and fishers. They provide the majority of revenue for these agencies. Wildlife recreation goes beyond simple economics. It promotes healthy lifestyles through exercise, relaxation and comradery between those who participate in it. Most hunting and fishing organizations tend to be altruistic. They promote community-fundraising events, field days and outdoor education. Wildlife recreation offers opportunity to interact with nature and provides a deep spiritual connection between the people and the land; the wildlife and our planet.

Senate Joint Resolution 11 specifically provides that hunting, trapping and fishing by the use of any traditional method is a right and must be preserved for Nevada residents and managed through laws and regulations to preserve the right. These public activities are the preferred means of managing wildlife. The resolution clarifies the right to hunt, trap and fish does not create a right to trespass; divert, appropriate or use water; diminish any other private right; or prohibit the enactment or enforcement of laws requiring the suspension or revocation of a person's hunting, trapping or fishing license. There is the ability to curtail any kind of activity and regulate and revoke licenses in the bill.

This bill is not unique to Nevada. There are 17 states that have enacted similar constitutional amendments. There are 12 states that are in the process of doing

so. Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming have the amendment. Those in the process of having hearings to enact this legislation are Illinois, Oregon, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Nevada, Kansas, Texas, New York, Indiana, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, these states and a few others are in the process of trying to secure for themselves what we too are trying to secure. Included in the Department of Wildlife (NDOW) mission statement is a directive to protect, manage and restore wildlife in its habitat for its aesthetic, scientific, educational, recreational and economic benefit to our citizens. This resolution ensures this mission statement is achieved.

Hunting, trapping and fishing have been an integral part of the human experience for generations. Amending the Nevada Constitution to protect these activities will guarantee that future generations will enjoy the outdoors and continue to support our State's economy. Opponents say this amendment is not necessary and that many residents do not want it. They say we are overstepping legislative boundaries. What we are proposing is a resolution. It will go to the State ballot at some point. For those who say 98 percent of Nevadans oppose slaughtering animals, they do not have to worry, as all we are doing is allowing them to voice their opinion on the general ballot initiative.

**Mike Reese (President, Southern Nevada Coalition of Wildlife):**

I support this bill. I am vice chair of the Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife, but I am not representing that organization today. Many wildlife improvements have taken place in the last 150 years of our statehood. The majority have occurred in the last 60 years. We now see strategic planning, financial investments and sweat equity paying off. Bighorn sheep are at an all-time population high. Elk are doing well. Antelope have made great strides and their numbers are up. Black bears are "canvassing" more of our State. We have challenges with some species such as mule deer and sage grouse. Funds provided by current and future sportsmen and sportswomen are critical to the success of these species.

Wildlife must have value to those who will pay for management of it. When consumptive uses are removed from the equation, wildlife loses. This bill will

help ensure our place at the table for future generations, not only for sportsmen but for the animals and their habitat as well.

How do we protect the investment with regard to wildlife that sporting individuals and business have made? A private citizen would put most assets in a trust. There have been reseeding and habitat projects, as well as water projects for wildlife improvements made by volunteers. We need to make it a right to hunt, trap and fish in our State.

In today's uncertain political climate, it is imperative to protect the work we have done along with the millions of dollars spent.

To date, 18 states have amended their state constitution to make it a right to hunt, trap and fish. Vermont has had this amendment since 1777. Alabama called their bill the "Sportspersons Bill of Rights." Ours is referred to as the "Sporting Families Protection Act."

This amendment will not limit the NDOW in the performance of duties. It will enhance wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Do we want the right to decide for ourselves if we wish to hunt, trap or fish? Do we want our children and future generations to have the right to make their own decision regarding these activities? If so, we need to support this legislation.

In 2011, approximately 163,000 hunters, trappers and anglers spent \$409 million at Nevada businesses. This amount was spent during a depressed economic year. Hunters and anglers supported 820 more jobs in our State than the Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center—5,326 versus 4,500. The sales tax collected was over \$38 million. That amount of money is enough to support the average salaries of 579 police and sheriff patrol officers. Please support S.J.R. 11.

**Joel Blakeslee (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife; Nevada Trappers Association; Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife):**

We represent a number of coalition organizations including Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, Truckee River Fly Fishermen, Nevada Guides and Outfitters, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Safari Club International, Carson Valley Chukar Club, Nevada Waterfowl Association and Backcountry Hunters and Anglers in

northern Nevada. The southern Nevada coalition comprises of the Fraternity for the Desert Bighorn, Ducks Unlimited, Rocky Mountain Elk and Mule Deer Foundations, Las Vegas Woods and Waters, Wildlife Habitat Improvement of Nevada, Nevada Firearms Coalition, Las Vegas Retriever Club and the Nevada Wildlife Federation.

There are those who say only 2 percent of our State's population participates in the consumptive use of wildlife through hunting, trapping and fishing. If we number those who hold licenses for these activities, it is 6.38 percent. Many people have family members and cultural ties to the people who are participating in these activities. This is important to note. There are several people who can attend a hunt together. There may be an effort to separate trapping from this legislation. I would like to remind everyone this city is named after a trapper named Kit Carson. We need this legislation. I support S.J.R. 11.

**Larry Johnson (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):**

I have been involved with wildlife conservation for more than 30 years. I have performed numerous bighorn sheep and antelope captures in Canada and elsewhere to bring them back to Nevada. I have provided information to the Legislature regarding tags for antelope and deer, as well as for landowner damage compensation. Our group provides water to expand viable habitat from February to June each year. I have loaded seed hoppers for wildfire restoration for decades. I have conducted black bear research for the NDOW for the past few years. I have conducted mountain lion research. I heard in this Committee recently that Native-American people only hunted and trapped for food and clothing. I want to dispel that myth. My father was Native American from the Sierras and I was raised in ancestral homelands. I was trained to hunt, trap and fish by some of the finest outdoorsmen. I have raised millions of dollars for wildlife. I have volunteered hundreds of hours for wildlife. Detractors question our ethics and morals. I challenge them to match our endeavors. We are under attack by anti-bear hunting and anti-trapping organizations, among others. We need this amendment. I support S.J.R. 11.

**William "Willie" Molini (Nevada Waterfowl Association):**

I worked for NDOW for 30 years and was director of that organization for over 16 years. Hunting, fishing and trapping are a definite part of our heritage. This measure is important. Wildlife management in the United States and Canada is based on the "North American Model of Wildlife Conservation." This model is successful and is one the world could do well to follow. In Europe, the common



man does not have an opportunity to hunt. This model has been practiced to a large extent by the NDOW. Our thriving wildlife resources demonstrate this fact. Sage grouse are having some difficulty, but other species, including the desert tortoise, are doing well. Because of this system, most of our wildlife are in good condition. The direct revenues from the hunting, trapping and fishing activities and revenue from the Pittman-Robertson Act and other legislation relating to surcharges are critical to the success of our State. The Nevada Waterfowl Association supports S.J.R. 11.

**John Sullivan:**

I advocate this amendment, not only for the hunters, trappers and fishermen in our State, but for the wildlife as well. It is a fact that wildlife prospers in states with science-driven wildlife programs in which these activities are used as critical and essential tools. Large volunteer groups are formed to support wildlife. They prosper as a result. In areas that do not have these programs, wildlife has suffered terribly. Their numbers decline and certain species of wildlife disappear. Wildlife populations in Nevada are healthy and abundant. They are increasing in numbers across the State in almost every species. In California, there are opposite results. Once a wildlife paradise, California is beset by many problems. Feral hog numbers increased by the thousands. Feral cats kill small birds and mammals by the billions. Coyotes have moved into cities. They prey on pets and attack people. They have killed a child. Twelve licenses were issued in California to hunt bighorn sheep. By comparison, Nevada issued 460 licenses last year. Please protect our wildlife by passing S.J.R. 11.

**Senator Manendo:**

Can you repeat what you said about coyotes in California attacking people?

**Mr. Sullivan:**

I can send you reports about the urban coyote problem in California. This is a problem in Las Vegas, but not occurring on as great a scale. The problem is escalating. Coyotes attack and kill hundreds if not thousands of pets. There were attacks on 36 people. One of these attacks culminated in the death of a small child.

**Robert Gaudet (Nevada Wildlife Federation, Inc.):**

The Nevada Wildlife Federation is the State's oldest nonprofit conservation and educational organization. Sportsmen founded this organization in 1951. It is the leading voice affecting priceless resources such as wildlife, wetlands, lakes,

streams, forests and rangelands. We represent the views of hunters, trappers, fishermen and all who care deeply about wildlife. We support S.J.R. 11. This privilege is not guaranteed by our State Constitution.

**John Ridgeway:**

I am not a hunter, trapper or outdoor sportsman. For reasons previously stated, I fully support S.J.R. 11.

**Riley Manzonie:**

I am an outfitter in our State. I have been an outfitter for over 17 years. I have helped more than 400 hunters harvest wildlife and bring in almost \$3 million in revenue. I support S.J.R. 11. I hope to know I have a future in hunting, trapping or fishing in our State.

**Jason James:**

I come from a large family in the Elko area. This amendment is important for future generations. I support S.J.R. 11.

**Dave Gowan:**

I have been a resident of Elko County for 35 years. I am an outfitter. I support S.J.R. 11 because of the attacks on hunting, trapping and fishing. Our wildlife and its future is threatened. I would like to see science-based management of wildlife rather than emotion brought by anti-hunting groups. This bill will improve the legislative situation.

**Bob Brunner (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):**

I support this legislation. We have a long history and tradition of hunting, trapping and fishing. This bill will enhance that tradition.

**Andrew Zaninovich (Backcountry Hunters and Anglers):**

The Backcountry Hunters and Anglers support S.J.R. 11.

**Kevin C.K. Baily:**

I am an angler, educator and fly fisherman. I can speak for all fly fishermen when I say I am in favor of S.J.R. 11. It seems redundant to need to put into law an amendment that says it is all right to hunt and fish. To have hunting be a right is a special thing and it is also a privilege.

**Tom Smith (Truckee River Fly Fishers; Federation of Fly Fishermen):**

I am on the board of directors for the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife. I represent the Federation of Fly Fishermen as their conservation representative. I have spent more than 39 years in the conservation and education of fishing in our State. I support S.J.R. 11. For those against this measure, on an opinion poll there were 189 people for this measure and 15 against. In 1844, John Fremont came through our State and his group nearly starved because there were no game animals available.

**Gil Yanuk (Friends of Nevada Wildlife):**

Hunting, trapping and fishing during our recent economic downturn have provided food and sustenance to many Nevada families. These families could be on welfare if it was not for the ability to hunt, trap or fish. They can take care of their families in this manner. We support S.J.R. 11.

**Tracy Truman:**

I am a member of the Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife and other wildlife organizations. I am a lifetime Nevada resident. I ask that you join the other states to adopt this legislation.

**Tony Perkins:**

I support S.J.R. 11.

**Rich Gibbons:**

I have lived in Nevada for 15 years and Elko County for the last 4 years. I support S.J.R. 11.

**Justin Alanis:**

I am a long-time resident and I support S.J.R. 11.

**Antonio Mendive:**

I am a Native American and I support S.J.R. 11.

**Jeff Turnipseed (Nevada Bighorns Unlimited):**

No one would tell anyone here they must buy their fruits and vegetables at the grocery store and that they cannot harvest vegetables themselves. Rather than tell me that I must buy my meat at a butcher shop, fattened up in a pen by steroids, it is a basic right for me to harvest my own meat. This measure does not force anyone to hunt, trap or fish. It allows the public to decide whether

they wish to do so. I cannot understand why anyone would be against this going to the ballot.

**Janine Hansen (Nevada Families for Freedom):**

I am a native Nevadan. The idea of hunting undergirds the right to keep and bear arms. When children have the opportunity to hunt and to learn firearm safety, it helps to preserve the right to keep and bear arms. I have 40 chickens and 23 turkeys. We have a coyote problem. We need to be able to manage these predators. You cannot harvest the coyote pelt when it is shot with a gun versus trapping. It is important to be able to have management tools to deal with predators. We support S.J.R. 11.

**John Wagner (Independent American Party of Nevada):**

We support this bill. I used to be an avid hunter and fisherman. I previously lived in southern California and we had a coyote problem there. We need to manage this problem.

**Doug Martin:**

The state of Vermont Constitution declares:

“The inhabitants of this State shall have liberty in seasonal times, to hunt and fowl on lands they hold, and on other lands not inclosed, and in like manner to fish in all boatable and other waters (not private property) under proper regulations, to be made and provided by the General Assembly.”

This was written in 1777. That state wants to have hunting, trapping and fishing as a right and not a privilege. Idaho has an amendment stating the right to hunt, trap and fish, including by the use of traditional means, are a valued part of Idaho’s heritage and shall forever be preserved for the people in order to preserve these activities under proper regulation. I support this bill.

**Everett Weisner:**

I serve on a wildlife board and I am a resident of Nevada. I support S.J.R. 11.

**Elaine Carrick (NoBearHuntNV.org):**

I appreciate habitat improvements, reseeding projects and hunter involvement. This bill changes the Nevada Constitution and by adding this new section to Article 1, it only benefits a small number of our residents who hunt, trap and

fish. Our Nevada Constitution Declaration of Rights are irrevocable. They include freedom to speak, write and publish, the right of religious freedom, trial by jury and due process of law. The resolution, S.J.R. 11, purports to make a right out of sportsmen activities. This is not in the same category as the rights of all citizens that are guaranteed in our U.S. Constitution. None of these stated rights requires having a license or permit as does hunting, trapping and fishing. Rights stated in the U.S. Constitution are inalienable to all citizens. They cannot be taken away or transferred. In the Nevada Declaration of Rights, Article 1, section 11 it states every citizen has the right to keep and bear arms for security and defense, for lawful hunting and recreational use and for other lawful purposes. Since this allows sportsmen to engage in hunting that is lawful, which infers that a permit is needed to make it so—why is this bill then necessary? Legitimate rights do not need clarification. Legislative Counsel's Digest item 4 of the bill specifically states it does not prohibit the enforcement of any statute or regulation requiring a revocation or suspension of a person's hunting, trapping or fishing license. This language shows that this bill has nothing to do with rights and specifically relates to holders of a license, otherwise, this language would not be needed.

It has been stated that hunting, trapping and fishing are the preferred means of managing wildlife in Nevada. This is probably the preferred method for sportsmen. Is it not best to use the best available science in regard to wildlife management? We have the NDOW. It is staffed with biologists and other professionals who are qualified. Management of wildlife should not be one-dimensional. The resolution attempts to create a right out of an activity which is clearly a privilege. Adding this amendment has nothing to do with inherent rights of all Nevadans. It "muddies" our State Constitution and opens doors for other special interest groups to add their own amendments. For these reasons, I oppose S.J.R. 11.

**Caron Tayloe (Trailsafe Nevada):**

I have lived in Washoe County since I was a child. I own firearms. Due to the language of the bill, I am opposed to S.J.R. 11. Trapping is not the preferred means of managing wildlife. The use of biologists and scientists can assist with wildlife management. Trappers have demonstrated they have a difficult time putting together a self-report and interpreting it. There is no science to support the need for trapping for the fur industry. It is just all about money. It is not about wildlife management. Big spenders at fur sales are from China and Russia. The nontarget data is enough to keep this resolution from being passed. I

oppose using language such as “any traditional method.” The Sierra Club, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Animal Hospital Association, the World Veterinary Association and the National Animal Care & Control Organization have come out against leg-hold traps. Do Nevadans want to put trapping in the State Constitution? There are pictures of dead foxes in traps in Nevada. Is an animal held in a trap for 96 hours the best way to manage wildlife? No, it is not. A few years ago a well-known trapper in southern Nevada posted a training video. It showed him dragging around a weakened bobcat. He was trying to get his dog to attack the bobcat. Is this what this legislation is about?

**Stephanie Myers:**

There is no person threatening to take away any person’s ability to hunt or fish. Why is a constitutional amendment the answer? Wayne Pacelle, President of the Humane Society of the United States stated, “There is no organization threatening hunting or fishing, but there are pandering politicians who want to score points with interest groups, and that’s what we have at work here.”

Trapping is another matter. Why should ethical hunters and fishermen divorce themselves from trappers in no uncertain terms? Trapping is a degrading, brutal, bloody for-profit business. It is not a sport. An animal caught in a leg-hold trap, like my dog Sunshine was, can die a horrible and brutal death. Who would wish this torture for any animal? Trapping is almost unregulated in our State. It is a for-profit business. Why should this be made a right?

The Department of Motor Vehicles registers drivers and we all know driving on our highways is a privilege, and not a right. Is it not the same for sportsmen? It is their privilege to kill our wildlife. It is not their right to kill our wildlife.

Our State Constitution should not be changed to make the bloody business of trapping a right.

**Margaret Flint (Nevadans for Responsible Wildlife Management):**

I have represented animal groups for three Sessions. We have never had a bill brought forth that would prohibit hunting or fishing. The only issue we have ever addressed regarding trapping is public safety. That has gone nowhere. Proponents of this bill have said our organizations are “coming after them,” which is misleading. We strongly oppose S.J.R. 11.

**Leah Sturgis:**

I do not support S.J.R. 11. I come from a family of hunters. My mother was an avid fly fisher. We were here just a day ago with the same people. This bill is unnecessary. We do not need to amend the State Constitution because a small group of people insists that hunting, fishing and trapping be written in as a right. Debating this is a waste of time. Taxpayer money is being wasted. It is a mistake to make hunting and fishing equal to trapping. If trapping is made a right, then it is a right made that allows for the torture of animals. I do not support this, and the majority of Nevadans do not support this either.

Most states that passed the right-to-hunt law did not include trapping. It is a mistake for hunters to want to be put in the same category as trappers. This legislation is likely to fail if it comes to a vote by Nevadans. Trappers have illegally entered my property. My dog's paw was caught in a trap and his bone was fractured. I am uneasy when I walk my dog on my own property. I wonder if there is a trap somewhere. Someone found a conibear trap down by the river where families with children and pets recreate and play. This Committee will not hear the end of these horror stories. It is outrageous to make trapping a right and not a privilege. The only reason trappers get away with so much is that the public has not seen what they do. I aim to change this.

Psychologists say the first sign of sociopathic behavior is cruelty to animals. Any person who enjoys torturing animals should not be granted special rights. If someone slammed a dog's paw in a door and left them for 4 days, it would be considered animal abuse. If a trapper sets a trap and does the same thing, it is legal. Stop wasting taxpayer money and time. Vote no on S.J.R. 11.

**Fred Voltz:**

I would like to dispel some of the information I have heard people state who support S.J.R. 11. Just because other states pass similar legislation does not mean our State needs to do the same. There was \$48,000 in public money spent on a feel-good survey of deer hunters. A scientific sample or survey of State residents with nuanced questions should be performed concerning this bill. We need to talk about what the majority of people want with respect to this wildlife topic. The ballot process is cumbersome and expensive. The purported charitable investments made by wildlife killers and their trade organizations have one objective: to increase and perpetuate killing opportunities. This has nothing to do with a peaceful coexistence with wildlife. If one could ask a question to our wildlife, would they agree the intent of hunters and trappers is a desirable

end? What if tables were turned and wildlife was relentlessly pursuing human beings using advanced technology and unsportsmanlike methods? It has been said that trapping is part of our heritage. Slavery and racial discrimination have been part of our heritage but are not worth perpetuating. Finally, people must protect and shelter their pets. Remove the food sources and wildlife will stay out of urban areas and go elsewhere.

**Joe Johnson (Sierra Club):**

The Sierra Club is opposed to S.J.R. 11. We have a national policy about the trapping of wildlife which is supported by our board of directors. I will read from the policy:

The use of body gripping devices including leg-hold traps, snares and conibear traps are indiscriminate to age, sex and species. They typically result in injury, pain, suffering and/or death of targeted and nontargeted animals. The Sierra Club considers body gripping, restraining and killing traps and snares to be ecologically indiscriminant and unnecessarily inhumane and therefore opposes their use. The Sierra Club promotes and supports humane, practical and effective methods of mitigating human/wildlife conflicts and actively discourages the use of inhumane and indiscriminate methods. The Sierra Club recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples under federal laws and treaties granting rights of self-determination and rights to pursue subsistence taking of wildlife.

We are concerned about the indiscriminant trapping of nontargeted animals.

**Chair Gustavson:**

Letters and written testimony of opposition to S.J.R. 11 have been received from Donald A. Molde, M.D. ([Exhibit E](#)), and Holly Haley, Nevada State Director, The Nevada Humane Society of the United States ([Exhibit F](#)).

**Senator Hammond:**

We enter into the political arena and state positions, pro and con. I urge consideration of S.J.R. 11.



Senate Committee on Natural Resources  
March 12, 2015  
Page 17

**Chair Gustavson:**

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Ellen Walls,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Don Gustavson, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

| <b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b> |                |    |                          |   |
|------------------------|----------------|----|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Bill</b>            | <b>Exhibit</b> |    | <b>Witness or Agency</b> | <b>Description</b>                        |
|                        | A              | 1  |                          | Agenda                                    |
|                        | B              | 7  |                          | Attendance Roster                         |
| S.B. 44                | C              | 8  | Alysa Keller             | Work Session Document                     |
| S.B. 89                | D              | 11 | Alysa Keller             | Work Session Document                     |
| S.J.R. 11              | E              | 1  | Senator Don Gustavson    | Letter of Nonsupport from Donald A. Molde |
| S.J.R. 11              | F              | 1  | Senator Don Gustavson    | Testimony of Nonsupport from Holly Haley  |