

Attachment 1

From: [nora coyle](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: trapping animals
Date: Saturday, October 29, 2022 8:58:45 PM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Please stop this tortuous device that is so barbaric and inhumane. Please ban trapping all animals.

Sincerely,

Nora Coyle

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Attachment 2

From: [ANR - FW Information](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: FW: Pro Sportsman Comment
Date: Tuesday, November 8, 2022 8:52:00 AM

From: Matthew <tdrahnied@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 7, 2022 11:31 PM
To: ANR - FW Information <ANR.FWInformation@vermont.gov>
Subject: Pro Sportsman Comment

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Commissioner Herrick,

My name is Matthew Deinhardt, I am a pro sportsman who lives in Louisiana. I provide recommendations and advice to numerous Wildlife Departments across the USA. The reason for my letter is to comment on the updated trapping and other rules I saw in the news. I want to say that I am firmly against using dogs for game except for bear, cougar or squirrel. The reason is these animals can take refuge in the tree and there is no getting blindsided for lack of a better term. The Vermont Bearhounds President is a good one to talk with about how they are able to pick and choose which game animal to take.

The 2nd matter is that I highly recommend Vermont adopt a wanton waste rule for ALL harvested animals within the state's boundaries. Animal waste is a very severe problem and the lack of a wanton waste rule puts Wildlife Departments and Commissioners in a tough spot when forced to defend a story where a hunter or trapper wasted the animal. As a trapper I can attest that I eat 99.9% of what I trap, and if I wont eat it, I dont target that species.

I wanted to comment on is the FWS partnership to assist in understanding the Best Management Practices in regards to furbearers. I want to make a point to exempt the natural and old ways of trapping such as natural material deadfalls, and natural material foot snares. These are traps that regardless of what anybody will say are *Mastery* level of skill and experience to build and set. This is how the native americans trapped animals prior to European contact and should always be left an option for those who wish to study, learn, test, demonstrate and master art of natural trapping. These style of traps have a much higher catch rate than any steel trap could, but they do take longer to setup and are not really portable.

For steel, or any other material trap, I want say a few things. I am a conservationist, trapper, hunter but I also love animals. It is a very emotional moment to take the life of an animal for our consumption and should always be done in the most respectful way possible.

With that said, technology and science have come a long way since Newhouse made this great invention. In my professional opinion, steel traps should all have offset jaws, shock spring and a minimum number of swivels. The offset jaw reduces the pressure put on the animals paw and instead relies on leverage vs brute power of a spring. The shock springs are attached between the trap and the object the trap is anchored to. What this does is prevent the sudden stop of an animal

trying to escape which has a 97% injury rate. The spring takes the momentum and severely reduces sudden stop. The swivels allow full range of movement for the trap, which prevents the animal from twisting it and either hurting its self or getting stuck in a harmful position. All 3 of these things should be a requirement for all steel or other material traps used in Vermont. I am all for rubber padded traps but the current ones out there do not mitigate other factors that would make the rubber padding more comfortable for the animal.

Lastly the entire point of my trap recommendations are because until you conduct your trap check, you cannot guarantee the targeted species is in the trap. If there is a pet, pregnant mom animal, baby animal these are all scenarios where we dont want the animal to suffer potentially permanent damage. In speaking of that I do urge you to partner with the state college, to conduct spring testing. Some specialty trap manufacturers are putting severely way over, highpressure springs that to put it in laymens terms is akin to a boulder crushing a mans hand. These traps that use these springs represent grave danger to any and all life around them, even the trapper setting them. No trap should incorporate spring pressure that great to catch an animal, they simply must become better at their skill and craft.

I want to thank you for your time and consideration, I hope my common sense and reasonable recommendations guide you. I am available if you want to speak, or feel free to email me.

Very Respectfully,

Matthew Deinhardt
495 Morris Road
Deridder, LA 70634
360-951-1648

Attachment 3

From: [Lance Kammerud](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: Trapping!!
Date: Friday, November 11, 2022 3:38:54 PM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Voiceless, Defenseless, Innocent...trapping animals for purposes like killing, injuring or other traumatic reasons is the act of greedy disgraceful coward!!! LET THESE OTTERS AND OTHER WILDLIFE LIVE THEIR LIFE AS THEY DO AS WILD ANIMALS!!

Sent from my iPhone

Attachment 4

From: [DAmico, Gerald](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: BMP Trapping Recommendations
Date: Thursday, December 1, 2022 10:48:10 AM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Issue (3) Body Gripping Traps

Consider changing 12" setback between opening and trap trigger to 6" between opening and trap trigger.

Discussion:

This assumes a conibear type trap set in a cubby. This rule will basically eliminate the use of cubbies on the ground, since it will be very difficult/ impossible to place the trap 12" into a cubby and remove the trap keeper. Also, it will essentially eliminate catching bobcats on the ground since few if any bobcats will stick its head 12" into an 8" hole.

In addition, it's unlikely a dog will put its head 6" into a small cubby.

Jerry D'Amico
Roxbury

Attachment 5

From: [linda cacopardo](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: There is no biological necessity for leg hold traps. Research has shown that prey populations regulate predator populations; when graphed over time [years] the trend is clearly visible. Traps are land mines in the forest with the same effect – they are...
Date: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 8:00:27 AM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

12-2-22

Your Commissioner Herrick,

I am a 72 year old retired Vermonter. My working career ended 9 years ago when I left employment with a local municipal highway department. Contacting you relates to an incident I experienced on the job that also concerns the department you oversee.

One day I was assigned to examine and remove any beaver dams near a town road and volunteer fire department if in my power. As I pursued my assignment I came very close to stepping on a leg trap set to catch beavers. This upset me very much as I had not been informed such a device had been set there. My legs were spared as I identified the trap before I stepped in it.

I am writing to you as I have become aware that the Vt. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife has opposed S.201! These traps are not the civilized intelligent means of preventing beavers and other mammalian wildlife from causing road issues. Trapping for fun is inhumane, cruel and unnecessary in 2022.

I urge you to educate yourself on this concern and reconsider your department's support of leg traps in "managing" Vermont wildlife. Perhaps you think you could educate me on this, but personally I'd prefer you consult professionals such as Skip Lisle if beavers are your main concern.

Leg traps may once have had their place in our society's experience with the natural world, but we're in the 21st Century and I believe we can do better.

Thank you for your attention to this. If it came to a vote I am one who would ban leg traps, and I'll support any efforts in our legislature to do so.

Sincerely,
William B. Corbett



Mr. William B. Corbett
PO Box 68
Saxtons River, VT 05154



WHITE RIV JCT VT 050
02 DEC 2002 PM 2 L

Commissioner Christopher Hendrick
VT. Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
1 National Drive - Davis J
Montpelier, Vermont

05620-3702



Attachment 7

From: Protect Our Wildlife VT <info@protectourwildlifevt.org>
Sent: Saturday, December 17, 2022 10:49 AM
To: Herrick, Christopher; Saunders, Chris; Royar, Kim; Morse, Joshua; Scott, Mark
Cc: Joanne Bourbeau (she/her); Anne Jameson
Subject: For the record
Attachments: POW HSUS GMAD response to VFWD draft Nov 2022 recommendations.pdf

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Hello,

Attached is the formal response from HSUS, Green Mountain Animal Defenders and Protect Our Wildlife in response to the Department's draft recommendations on trapping changes.

We are disappointed that a better outcome for animals was not achieved during this process, but Protect Our Wildlife does not regret putting forth a good faith effort. We can't say we didn't try.

Thank you,
Brenna

Brenna Galdenzi

President

Protect Our Wildlife POW

www.ProtectOurWildlifeVT.org

VFWD draft Nov 2022 recommendations include:

Our responses to VFWD recommendations are below in red:

- All base plates must feature a center chain mount with swivel, with free moving chains that allow mobility for animals caught.
- All traps must be adjustable for pan tension.
- Traps must be anchored with a minimum of 12" and maximum of 18" chain length.
- Foothold traps must be padded or offset, laminated, or have jaws with a minimum thickness of 5/16ths.
- No foothold trap shall be set on land with a spread of more than 6 ¼ inches.

These recommendations were the exact proposals offered by VT Trappers Association and offer little to no improvements to animal welfare, especially in the case of non-targeted animals that are trapped. They're also largely un-enforceable.

- Meat based bait used in conjunction with trapping shall be covered at the time the trap is set. Coverings shall include but are not limited to brush, branches, leaves, soil, snow, water, or enclosures constructed of wood, metal, wire, plastic, or natural materials.

This requirement only restricts "meat-based bait," which is insufficient. For example, the state of Maine's regulation states: "Foothold or killer-type traps must not be set within 50 yards of bait that is visible from above. Bait may be used for trapping if it is completely covered to prevent it from being seen from above, and it must be covered in such a way as to withstand wind action and other normal environmental conditions. Animal matter (e.g., feathers, bone, and fur) meet the definition of bait and visible attractor and must be covered or not visible from above if less than 50 yards from a foothold or killer-type trap."

- No meat-based baited, body gripping traps shall be set on the ground. However, baited body gripping traps with a jaw spread up to and including 60 in2 (up to and including size 220 traps) can be used on land if the trap is placed at least 5' above the ground or placed within an enclosure with openings no greater than 60 in2 and with a trap trigger that is recessed at least 12 inches from all openings. Note:

Body gripping traps of any size set in the water are legal regardless of whether they are baited or not.

*Their recommendation is a far cry to what we recommended. Body gripping kill traps set on the ground using non meat-based bait such as visual (e.g. feathers) or scent lures, as they propose, will still easily trap and kill a curious dog, cat or other non-target animal. And, their proposal says that a kill trap up to and including 7 ½ inches **using meat-based bait** is still allowed on land but with modifications, but the modifications won't prevent non-target capture. For example, a black bear's limb can be caught while trying to access the baited trap in a tree.*

- No traps set in a designated walking or hiking trail bed on any public land.
- No foot traps on or within 25 feet of the traveled portion of a trail on state-owned public land excluding Wildlife Management Areas unless in the water or 5' above the ground.

This does not meet legislative mandate as it does not include the tens of thousands of public lands, including federal land, where the public recreates. Additionally, 25 feet is a grossly insufficient setback, especially near trailheads.

In addition: VFWD has made no recommendation on humane methods of killing trapped animals despite the legislative mandate. Our recommendation is gunshot only. Currently, trapped animals are drowned, bludgeoned, stomped on to crush the heart and lungs (referred to as "chest compression") and choked. VFWD was unwilling to accept our recommendation and has asked for more time to deliberate.

Submitted by:

Joanne, Bourbeau, Humane Society of the United States

Brenna Galdenzi, Protect Our Wildlife

Anne Jameson, Green Mountain Animal Defenders

Attachment 8

From: Rob Mullen <rob@robmullen.com>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2022 11:14 AM
To: Royar, Kim; Herrick, Christopher; Saunders, Chris; Morse, Joshua; Scott, Mark; Bernier, Chris
Cc: Christopher Bray; Amy Sheldon; Brian Campion; Larry Satcowitz; David Kelley; Gerri Huck; Jane Hoffman; Claudia Mucklow; Melissa Hoffman; Protect Our Wildlife; Joanne Bourbeau (she/her)
Subject: VWC response to FWD draft trapping regulation proposals derived from A. 159 Working Group
Attachments: Response to FWD draft proposals per Act 159 WG.pdf

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Dear Kim, Commissioner Herrick, et. al.,

Attached is a PDF of VWC's response to the draft trapping proposals we received last month and which are on the Department's website. Our Board hopes that you will consider also posting our response to those draft proposals. We were disappointed with the draft proposals. However, that notwithstanding, we want to wish you all a sincere Happy New Year, and hope to utilize our shared common ground and sense of community to work constructively with you in the future.

Happy New Year!

Rob

Rob Mullen SAA

Artist: Paint-N-Paddle Studio: www.robmullen.com

Director: WREAF at The Center for Circumpolar Studies: www.circumpolarstudies.org/wreaf/

The Vermont Wildlife Coalition's Response to the VT Fish & Wildlife Department Draft Recommendations for Changes to Recreational Trapping per Act 159, 2022

December 29, 2022

The Vermont Wildlife Coalition (VWC) wishes to thank the Fish and Wildlife Department for inviting us to participate in the trapping Working Group (WG) mandated by A.159. On November 22, we received the FWD draft proposals for improving trapping in Vermont and the summaries of our perceived positions from the WG meetings. Again, thank you.

Regarding the WG process that served as the basis of the draft proposals, there were some issues from our perspective that give some context within which to assess these proposals:

- VWC acknowledges that trapping can perform a role in the protection of human safety, defense of property, conservation, and research. We do not support recreational, hobby, or lifestyle trapping such as is the bulk of trapping practiced in Vermont and which is the main target of the improvements sought in A.159, but as requested, we put that objection aside for the sake of the WG's goals. In our comments below, "trapping" is synonymous with "hobby/recreational trapping."
- WG Composition: While assembling a diverse-spectrum stakeholder group was the goal, and we have no idea of who else was approached and may have declined, the resulting, polarized WG membership was overwhelmingly slanted to groups that are strong proponents of trapping as currently practiced in Vermont (VTA, VFS, FWD, AFWA, FWB), three of which were represented by more than one member of the WG. The voting membership was absurdly weighted 9:3 in favor of recreational trapping.
- Despite having been enjoined to not use the WG as a referendum on trapping, the very opening of the first meeting was a Zoom presentation from AFWA BMP researchers, which while informative in several respects, strayed into boosterism. The most memorable was the arguable contention that most wildlife experts support trapping.
- There were other notable procedural instances of pro-trapping bias that are included as part of the observations below.

Regarding the FWD's draft proposals resulting from the WG, we have some thoughts, reservations, and objections for the record:

1. **Animal welfare and selectivity:** The five bullet points proposed by the FWD are verbatim of what the Vermont Trappers Association (VTA) proposed and from what was said during the WG meetings, are reportedly among the AFWA's BMPs which according to A.159, were to be the "minimum" starting point for Vermont's own mandated BMPs, not necessarily the end result.

Whatever they are, they represent little if any improvement in trapping systems. That these recommendations would now be mandated rather than suggested as is the case with AFWA BMPs is a theoretical improvement, however, not likely a practical one since, according to a VTA member of the WG and possibly others, the AFWA BMPs are already employed by 80% of trappers in Vermont. Anecdotal as that contention is, if it is true, then the VTA was not offering anything other than what most of their members already do. VWC has serious concerns about the AFWA BMPs as inadequate, over-hyped, and totally missing the larger point of gratuitous cruelty, but, nonetheless, agreed to these points in an attempt to get the dialogue moving. The attempt failed.

2. Baits and Lures: proposals to reduce the incidence of non-target “by-catch” including raptors: The FWD proposal again sides completely with the VTA but on an issue on which there was not even reluctant agreement with VWC or POW and HSUS. As the VTA proposed, the FWD proposal would only require meat-based baits to be covered from sight at the time a trap is set. Biologically, the FWD’s insistence on restricting the proposal to “meat-based” bait is puzzling since raptors are sight hunters and any other visible bait (e.g., feathers) would still put raptors at risk, but the VTA asked for that restriction and got it.

3. Body gripping traps: proposals to reduce the “capture” (killing) of “by-catch,” including domestic pets: Except for not agreeing to try to change current law and legalize cable restraint snares, the FWD gave the VTA all that they asked for and more.

Currently, all body-gripping traps with up to an 8”x8” spread are allowed to be set on the ground (larger if 5’ above the ground or in water). In this proposal, both the VTA and the FWD propose to single out meat-based baited body-gripping traps only and not allow them on land. Unless, and this goes beyond what the VTA suggested, such meat-based baited traps are 5’ off the ground or if they are in an enclosure with up to an opening of 60 square inches (7.75” x 7.75” – one-quarter-inch smaller than currently allowed). While the FWD possibly hoped that this would be seen as a compromise, it leaves all other traps, including scent-baited traps on the ground where dogs can easily reach them and many dogs (and any cat) can get 5’ into a tree, especially if driven to it by bait. Such noodly, nibbling measures are not effective attempts to solve the problem of “by-catch” of non-target species or family pets.

Moreover, and disappointingly, there was also a notable parenthetical added to the FWD proposal that may explain the lackluster proposal, *“it is the Department’s position that the capture of domestic pets is a relatively uncommon occurrence.”* This reads like an effort to minimize the issue which is consistent with past statements from FWD personnel that it isn’t even a problem. Such a defense of trapping is callous and inappropriate given the trauma and grief suffered by families, however, few, balanced against the lack of benefit from trapping to Vermont ecosystems or society at large. Bear in mind that a pet “captured” in a body-gripping trap will likely die if not released within minutes. The data for this “position” of the FWD is thin. Leaving aside issues of bias and compliance, no reporting was even required until 2018 – and that, by the legislature, not the FWD or the FWB, furthering the impression that this is not a priority issue for the FWD. Given the cost/benefit ratio, it should be. **[As this was being completed, there has been tragic news of a woman’s dog dying as she desperately tried to release it from a body-gripping trap during a walk in Corinth, Vermont. Her emotional agony and her dog’s physical agony can only be imagined as she had to carry her dying pet,**

still in the trap, back to her car. “Relatively uncommon?” How common does it have to be to become a priority, and for what?]

4. Hiking or walking trail and public highway setbacks: The language of A.159 on this issue directs that rules be made for, “... *the placing of traps for purposes other than nuisance trapping at a safe distance, from public trails, class 4 roads, playgrounds, parks, and other public locations where persons may reasonably be expected to recreate.*” This is largely an issue of, again, pet safety with the goal of reducing the chances of mainly dogs being caught in traps while recreating with their owners.

a. “No traps on designated hiking or walking trail beds on any public land.” This was the VTA’s initial proposal during one of the WG meetings on trail setbacks and even their representative seemed a bit embarrassed after offering it. One might ask why this is even mentioned if there is going to be a setback rule. The answer may be that contrary to the legislative charge of A.159, these draft proposals, in clear violation of the legislative charge, contain no setback rules for foothold traps on most public trails or public areas in the state.

b. “No foothold traps on or within 25 feet of the traveled portion of a trail on state-owned public land excluding Wildlife Management Areas unless in the water or 5’ above the ground.” As was mentioned by VWC’s Chair in the WG meetings, this restriction to state-owned land excluding WMAs, is arbitrary and extreme to the point of rendering any setback useless. Applying to only 3.66% of land in Vermont and only 25% of public lands, such a “safety measure” becomes almost an “attractive nuisance” by creating a false and misleading sense of security by being publicized.

Secondarily, VWC would also point out that the distance of 25 feet is insufficient. Even a well-mannered dog will take a second or two to travel 25 feet to check out a scent-baited trap. Even on lead (*and Vermont has no leash law, though such regulations would arguably create de facto leash laws for hundreds of thousands of Vermonters for the sake of the recreation of a few hundred trappers*), commonly owned Flexi-Leads for larger dogs extend to 26 feet as was clearly communicated at the WG meetings. This proposal is very disappointing.

c. “No body-gripping trap set 50’ from a road or trail unless it is in the water or more than 5’ off the ground or in a dog-proof set (described above).” Finally, maybe a proposal that might have served as a discussion point in the WG meetings. It is a tenth of our proposed 500-foot setback and 5X the VTA’s proposed 10’ setback so there is something to dislike for everyone – a sure sign of a compromise in the offing! Flipping the proportions around to 400 feet less than our proposal (1/5 of our original) and 90 feet more than the VTA proposal (10X their original) yields a 100-foot setback (which is not that far; only 30 – 40 strides for a six-foot human). That might have flown – IF, the “...*road or trail...*” applies to all public trails, Class-4 roads, and public areas per A.159. As it is written, that is vague and would need to be clarified – and made to comply with A.159. Even so, as it is, it is the best attempt at compromise in all these bullet points.

d. “Department agrees to develop brochures for trail kiosks and a video link that will address the release of dogs from a foot old or body-gripping trap.” VWC agrees completely.

e. **“We will also recommend that this will be added to trapper education courses.”** Fine.

5. “Humane Dispatch” Tabled. While the characterization of this action in the draft proposals as having been “unanimous” is technically correct, it ignores the written objections/reservations made by VWC immediately after the meeting in which the vote on this was taken.

Conclusion: VWC entered this Working Group effort with guarded hope for some positive movement toward common ground. Meeting people and talking to them had some positive effects and maybe, in the future, some progress can yet result from those personal contacts. However, regarding the specific charge of the WG under A. 159, in sum, what we found instead was a biased structure, a biased presentation, biased meeting procedures, and biased draft proposals, purportedly distilled from the WG meetings. These biases, throughout this entire process, were exclusively in favor of recreational trapping. As first steps go, this effort resulted in uselessly small baby steps and failed to meet the charge and intent of Act 159.

Sincerely, the Board of the Vermont Wildlife Coalition:

Chair: Rob Mullen

Vice Chair: Dave Kelley

Board member: Gerri Huck

Board member: Jane Hoffman

Board member: Claudia Mucklow

Board member: Melissa Hoffman

Attachment 9

From: [lynn andrews](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: BMP Trapping Regulations
Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 8:52:35 PM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Ban all seasonal sport trapping.

The only permissible trapping should be for threat to person or property in specific instances.

Respectfully,
Lynn Andrews
St Albans Resident

Sent from my iPhone

Attachment 10

From: [lynn andrews](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: BMP Trapping Recommendations
Date: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 7:59:52 PM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

To whom it may concern:

I am OPPOSED to all forms of fur trapping for sport, hobby, tradition, sadistic pleasure, supposed population management and fund raising strategies for VFWD.

I am FOR publicly owned wildlife being publicly protected from fur trappers and fur traps.

Please respond with the public hearing date and time ASAP, as outlined on the VFWD website ad on today, January 3, 2023.

Respectfully,
Lynn Andrews
St Albans resident

Sent from my iPhone

Attachment 11

From: [Wolf Patrol](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: BMP Trapping Recommendations
Date: Sunday, January 8, 2023 11:26:04 AM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Hello,

I am a resident of the town of Orange and a landowner and caretaker for lands that are sometimes trapped. I have reviewed the draft recommended changes and watched the November 28, 2022 presentation and would like to provide my feedback.

First and foremost, an acceptance level of five minutes (300 seconds) for an animal to die in a body-gripping trap will never be accepted by the public as humane. The Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies states that over \$40 million dollars has been spent and thousands of animals have been sacrificed in decades of redundant experiments to develop humane standards. And yet the standard acceptable level of pain experienced by a conscious animal in a lethal trap is 5 minutes? Totally unacceptable in a caring and compassionate society.

Also, the reliance on invasive live animal experiments funded and supported by the fur industry itself (Fur Institute of Canada) is not ethical or socially acceptable to determine standards for animal welfare. The continuing development of best management practices through the ongoing testing of new models of traps on the market equates to even more animal suffering when BMPs require the level of testing conducted by institutions such as the Fur Institute of Canada, all the convince the public that trapping is humane.

As you might be well aware, last month a resident of South Corinth had her pet dog captured and killed in a body-gripping trap that itself adheres to BMP standards. This did nothing to prevent any level of trauma and suffering by both the dog and owner. Vermont is no longer wilderness. It is a state lived in by countless citizens who love to take their dogs out for a walk in the woods. The fact that 13 pets have been trapped in 2022 speaks to the continuing conflict that will exist as long as trapping and other forms of recreation are forced to coexist in Vermont.

Let me also remind you that the social acceptance level of trapping in Vermont is far below what the AFWA said it was in the November 28 presentation. Their sampling is based on data collected from three states, not including Vermont. This is a disingenuous attempt to mislead the Vermont citizenry into believing that a majority of people support trapping in the state. I would like to see a social carrying capacity survey conducted with actual citizens of Vermont before VTF&W endorses the questionable statistics provided by AFWA.

Lastly, I'd like to say that any setback rules for traps should also apply to those set underwater. The Vermont Agency of Transportation contracts with two trappers who regularly set underwater traps for nuisance beaver immediately off roads near culverts. The organization I work for (Sage Mountain Botanical Sanctuary) operates an after school program that regularly takes middle school students to the same beaver colonies that Vtrans sets traps for beaver that could easily not be seen by an exploring child. In addition, I have often seen drivers on route 302 stop to let their dogs out right where underwater traps were placed last October.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this important issue and will continue to provide

feedback in future forums where I hope my concerns will be addressed.

Sincerely,
Rod Coronado
Vermont Wolf Patrol

Attachment 12

From: [Ann Rubright](#)
To: [ANR - FW Public Comment](#)
Subject: BMP Trapping Recommendations
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 4:05:46 PM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Hello,

I am a long time Vermont resident. I live in Reading, Vermont and am writing regarding ACT 159 and it's related statutes.

I totally support the POW, Humane Society, and VWC positions on each of the 4 issues(animal welfare and selectivity, baits and lures, body gripping traps and offsets for hiking and walking. However, I strongly feel that even stronger restrictions should be considered: totally banning body gripping traps as well as legholds (see Rep.Richard McCormicks bill banning leghold traps). I personally have witnessed the suffering of wildlife in the legholds in the past and it is not humane in any way.

I also believe hunting with dogs to tree and catch wildlife is so unwarranted. For trapping and dog use, it is not like we are in the 1800's and need to secure our food sources. It is using inhumane methods to catch and kill. Not skill or patience that a hunter develops him or herself over time and experience as seen with bow or rifle hunting.

I am not against all hunting. I see the value of it in our state for wildlife management and a skill and activity for those who enjoy it to do so humanely and safely.

Hopefully, other residents will weigh in on this issue prior to a final draft and decision.

Thank you very much,
Annie Rubright
Reading, Vt

Sent from my iPad

Attachment 13

Phone Caller: Linda Cacopardo
Sheffield, VT
802-626-3643
Lcardo101@gmail.com

Notes by: Abigail Connolly
Main points to address:

- 68% of Vermonters think we shouldn't have leg hold traps.
- What can the public do to change this.
- How did we reach out to the public about the hearing on trapping.

Notes: 68% of Vermonters think we shouldn't have leg hold traps. Not understanding why if over half of Vermonters think we shouldn't have leg hold traps why we have best practice instead of not having them. What can we do? What can we do to move the Commissioners to move to the feelings of Vermonters. Contacted a legislator. We don't have a referendum to putting something on the ballot. Not how it works in Vermont. At the mercy of the Commissioners. I don't know how to fix this. They had cockfighting and the citizens said no, and they abolished cock-fighting. Setting up landmines in the forest, because it's not target specific. Told lady in licensing. I think we need to be more compassionate human beings and do the right thing, leg hold traps are like land mining the

forest and it's not necessary. We don't have a surplus of bob cats, we are not doing anything really good. We still have laws that deal with problem animals, legal remedies for leg hold traps. Only disappointing thing in Vermont. We are a progressive state. Need to explain to me why we have to have this because I don't get it. Will talk to her legislator about getting a referendum, we don't have that ability in Vermont, it as to come from our leg, Catherine Sims, have met her, maybe we need legislation to make it possible. Would like to know how they reached out to the public about the hearing.

Thank you!

