

---

Institute for Social and Behavioral Science (ISBS)

---

2-2022

## Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Comment Tool on Changes to Trapping Regulations

Jacquelyn Reiss  
*University of Central Florida*

Amy Donley PhD  
*University of Central Florida*

Brian Hall  
*University of Central Florida*

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/isbs>  
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

All rights are held by the respective holding institution. This material is posted publicly for non-profit educational uses, excluding printed publication. For permission to reproduce and/or for copyright information contact the Institute for Social and Behavioral Science, University of Central Florida, <https://sciences.ucf.edu/sociology/isbs/>.

---

### Recommended Citation

Reiss, J., Donley, A., & Hall, B. (2022). Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Comment Tool on Changes to Trapping Regulations. *Institute for Social and Behavioral Science* Retrieved from <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/isbs/>  
21

# FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION COMMENT TOOL ON CHANGES TO TRAPPING REGULATIONS

---

by

**Jacquelyn Reiss, M.A.**

**Amy M. Donley, PhD**

**Brian Hall**



UCF

**Institute for Social and  
Behavioral Science**

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

**February 2022**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>OVERVIEW</b> .....	1
<b>RESULTS</b> .....	3
<b>SECTION I: PERSPECTIVES AND AFFILIATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
CONCEPT I: REQUIRE TRAINING.....	6
CONCEPT II: REQUIRE DATA COLLECTION .....	11
CONCEPT III: MORE STRICTLY REGULATE WILDLIFE TRAP DESIGN, PLACEMENT, AND USE.....	16
CONCEPT IV: MOVE FROM PERMIT RESTRICTIONS TO MORE DETAILED REGULATION .....	22
<b>SECTION III: REGULATION OF SPECIFIC WILDLIFE TRAP TYPES     AND USES</b> .....	<b>28</b>
TRAP TYPE I: FOOTHOLD AND FOOT-ENCLOSED TRAPS.....	28
TRAP TYPE II: BODY GRIPPING TRAPS .....	34
TRAP TYPE III: SNARES.....	39
TRAP TYPE IV: CABLE RESTRAINTS.....	44
TRAP TYPE V: CORRAL TRAPS .....	49
TRAP TYPE VI: CAGE .....	54
TRAP TYPE VII: GLUE TRAP .....	59
<b>SECTION IV: OTHER CHANGES UNDER CONSIDERATION</b> .....	<b>64</b>
PROPOSED CHANGE I: AMOUNT OF TIME ANIMALS MAY BE HELD .....	64
PROPOSED CHANGE II: TIMING OF WILDLIFE TRAP INSPECTION AND DISPOSITION OF TRAPPED WILDLIFE .....	68
PROPOSED CHANGE III: STANDARDIZE HUMANE KILLING OF CAPTURED WILDLIFE .....	72
PROPOSED CHANGE IV: RULE PROVISION DEVIATIONS .....	76
<b>SECTION V: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS</b> .....	<b>81</b>

## OVERVIEW

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) periodically evaluates its existing rules to determine if any changes are needed. The FWC is considering modernizing its wildlife trapping rules to align with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies' (AFWA) Best Management Practices in support of more humane and selective wildlife trapping methods. Wildlife trapping methods and devices have improved significantly since the last time FWC's trapping rules were amended. Modern trapping practices and equipment prioritize animal welfare and are based on decades of scientific research. Also, they include education for people who are trapping wildlife. The changes the FWC are considering would address wildlife trap design and size limits as well as types and usage of wildlife traps to help ensure wildlife trapping is more species selective and humane. The FWC values input. Agency staff actively sought public comment throughout this process and will use comments received to refine the approach to modernizing the trapping rules.

To collect public comments on the modernization of trapping rules and analyze the feedback provided, the FWC and the FCRC Consensus Center contracted with the Institute for Social and Behavioral Sciences (ISBS). Together the FWC, FCRC Consensus Center, and ISBS constructed a comment tool that was comprised of 5 different sections. The first section was developed to understand the affiliations of respondents, including residency, relationship to trapping, and the organizations they are affiliated with. Sections 2-4 outlined proposed changes to trapping requirements and trap types. Throughout sections 2-4, respondents were presented with details highlighting 15 different changes along with 2 Likert-scale questions per change to assess whether respondents believed the change was an improvement compared to current regulations and whether respondents supported each proposed change. In addition to each Likert scale, an open comment box was included for more detailed comments. Lastly, section 5 included two open comment boxes asking respondents what else the FWC should consider and how the changes would impact them.

After the comment tool was finalized, ISBS prepared the comment tool for distribution through Qualtrics survey software. The comment tool was then distributed online to collect comments from the public on the proposed changes to trapping regulations. When the survey was closed, there were a total of 1,082 responses. Of those 1,082 responses, 8 were opened, but not submitted and 241 did not complete at least 1 question outside of section 1 (perspectives and affiliations). Once the incomplete responses were removed, we were left with a total of 833 responses for analysis (Table 1).

Following, ISBS downloaded and analyzed the data both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, the Likert scale responses were analyzed through SPSS to examine the number of respondents who were in favor of the proposed changes verses those who opposed the changes. Next, the comments left in each of the 17 comments boxes were analyzed for common themes to more thoroughly understand the attitudes and opinions of

the respondents. Due to the amount of feedback, two analysts went through all of the comments and each developed common themes based on the respondent’s level of agreement (agree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and no opinion). After the analysts created a group of common themes per level of agreement, they went back and assigned a theme to each comment to better organize and understand the overall attitudes of respondents.

This report highlights the findings from the analysis conducted by ISBS by section and by concept. First, we outline details on the sample characteristics from section 1. Following, we present the results from both the quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis for each proposed change by section.

**TABLE 1. TOTAL SURVEY COLLECTION ATTEMPTS**

	<b>Total</b>
COMPLETED SURVEYS	833
OPENED SURVEY, BUT DID NOT SUBMIT	8
INCOMPLETE SURVEYS	241
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,082</b>

## RESULTS

### SECTION I: PERSPECTIVES AND AFFILIATIONS

To understand the relationship participants had to trapping within the state of Florida, screening questions were asked in section 1 of the comment tool. The first screening question asked participants if they were a Florida resident. If yes, they were prompted with a question that asked which county they lived in. Of the 833 responses, 828 participants responded to this question; 742 respondents indicated that they are a resident of Florida. Of those 742 responses, 650 participants listed the county they live in. Of those responses, 61 of Florida's 67 counties were represented (See accompanying Excel document). The counties not represented by respondents are Franklin, Gilchrist, Glades, Hendry, Taylor, and Union. The most represented counties were Seminole County with 147 participants, Orange County with 81 participants, Brevard with 31 respondents, Palm Beach County with 26 respondents, and Lee and Volusia with 24 respondents each. The list of counties and number of responses per county can be found on the Excel document attached under tab 'List of Counties.'

Respondents were then asked to select the statement that best describes their relationship to trapping. They were given the following response options:

- I am a member of the public who does not use traps.
- I am a member of the public who occasionally uses traps to remove nuisance wildlife from my home or workplace. I do not otherwise use traps.
- I operate or work for nuisance wildlife remove business or pest control business (nuisance wildlife control operator).
- My job is an industry or sector that is not directly related to nuisance wildlife remove. I use traps to remove nuisance wildlife:
  - That is interfering with the operations of a public facility (airport, transportation facility, municipal facility, military installation, or similar).
  - To help manage agriculture or silviculture.
- I trap to help manage imperiled species.
- I trap to help manage game species.
- I Trap for pelts and/or meat

To conduct the analyses the categories above were recoded in to 2 distinct categories, (1) trappers and (2) non-trappers. Those coded as non-trappers selected 'I am a member of the

public who does not use traps.' All other responses were coded as trappers. Of the 833 responses, 818 participants answered this question (see Table 2). Out of the 818 participants, 592 identified as non-trappers, or about 71.1% of the sample, and 226 identified as a trapper, or 27.1% of the sample.

Lastly participants were asked the organizations they were affiliated with. Out of the group of responses from trappers, the most common organization was the Florida Trappers Association. Other organizations included the National Trappers Association, Florida Cattlemen's Association, Florida Farm Bureau Federation, Florida Gulf Coast University, University of Florida, National Rifle Association, Furtakers of America, and Georgia Trapping Association. The most common organizations for non-trappers were Bear Warriors, Animal Legal Defense Fund, Animal Rights Foundation of Florida, ASPCA, humane societies across the state, the Humane Society of the U.S., Sierra Club, and the Center for Biological Diversity. In addition to those common organization, other organizations that were listed are: AZA - Association of Zoos and Aquariums, FAZA - Florida Association of Zoos and Aquariums, the Nature Conservancy, Audubon, Environmental Defense Fund, Florida Wildlife Federation, National Wildlife Federation, Conservancy of Southwest Florida, Florida Wildlife Rehabilitators Association, American Association of Wildlife Veterinarians, World Wildlife Fund, PETA, Pet Alliance of Orlando, and many other.

**TABLE 2. PERSPECTIVES AND AFFILIATIONS**

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<b>NON-TRAPPERS</b>		
I am a member of the public who does not use traps to trap wildlife.	592	71.1%
<b>TRAPPERS</b>		
I am a member of the public who occasionally uses traps to remove nuisance wildlife from my home or workplace. I do not otherwise use wildlife traps.	81	9.7%
I operate or work for a nuisance wildlife removal business or pest control business.	28	3.4%
I work for a government agency and regularly use traps to manage wildlife as part of my job.	7	0.8%
My primary job is not directly related to nuisance wildlife removal, but i occasionally use traps to remove wildlife that is interfering with the safe operation of a public facility (airport, transportation facility, municipal facility, military installation.	4	0.5%
My primary job is not directly related to nuisance wildlife removal, but i occasionally use traps to remove nuisance wildlife to help manage agriculture or silviculture.	19	2.3%
I trap wildlife to help manage imperiled species.	8	1.0%
I trap wildlife to help manage game species.	36	4.3%
I trap wildlife for pelts and/or meat.	43	5.2%
Missing	15	1.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>100</b>



## SECTION II: OVERALL APPROACH

### CONCEPT I: REQUIRE TRAINING

The first change under consideration outlined in section 2 is a training requirement to set or check wildlife traps. Currently, there is not training requirement in place. However, the proposed change would require an online training module reflecting AFWA national training standards and Best Management Practices and a Florida-specific trainings addressing Florida wildlife trapping rules for all trappers. If these changes are made, the FWC believes that people who use traps would better understand and utilize the AFWA BMP's and people trapping would be better informed and equipped on how to follow Florida's wildlife trapping rules. With this more thorough understanding, the FWC believes people using wildlife traps would then be able to achieve more consistent, targeted, and humane outcomes.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes.

Out of the 833 responses, 771 individuals responded to the first Likert-scale question, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."* Of those 771 responses (Table 3), 490 individuals (63.6%), strongly agree that the change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place. Another 121 respondents (15.7%), agree that the change is preferable to what is currently in place.

**TABLE 3. Concept I: Require training**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	490	121	44	38	72	6	771
	<b>63.6%</b>	15.7%	5.7%	4.9%	9.3%	0.8%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	353	191	74	42	78	8	746
	<b>47.3%</b>	25.6%	9.9%	5.6%	10.5%	1.1%	100%

Levels of agreement for this statement were examined based on whether someone identified as a trapper or not (Table 4). In total there were 761 responses to the first Likert-scale question who also responded to the question asking about their relationship to trapping. Of the 761 responses, 546 participants are non-trappers, while 215 are trappers. Table 4 illustrates that about 74% (n=404) of non-trappers strongly agreed that the proposed changes are preferable to the rules currently in place; 84 (15.4%) of non-trappers, selected ‘agree,’ also indicating they believe the proposed changes are preferable to the rules currently in place. While approximately 90% of non-trappers believe the changes are preferable to what is currently in place, only 53.5% of trappers share the same beliefs. Approximately, 36% of trappers and about 6% of non-trappers selected ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘disagree’ suggesting that they do not believe the proposed changes are preferable to what is currently in place.

**TABLE 4. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Opinion	TOTAL
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
Non-Trappers	404	84	24	5	26	3	546	
	<b>74%</b>	15.4%	4.4%	0.9%	4.8%	0.6%	100%	
Trappers	78	37	20	32	46	2	215	
	<b>36.3%</b>	17.2%	9.3%	14.9%	21.4%	0.9%	100%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	482	121	44	37	72	5	761	
	<b>63.3%</b>	15.9%	5.8%	4.9%	9.5%	0.7%	100%	

Next, 746 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Nearly half (n=353; 47.3%) strongly agreed and 25.6% (n=191) agreed (Table 3).

Table 5 examines the level of agreement for the second Likert-scale statement between trappers and non-trappers. Of the 746 responses to second Likert-scale statement, 736 of those participants also responded to the question asking about their relationship to trapping. Out of those 736 participants, 526 identified as non-trappers, while 210 identified as trappers. In total, approximately 428 (81.4%) of non-trappers, selected ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ when asked whether they support the proposed changes to require training. A slight majority (51.9%; n=109) of trappers selected ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ indicating that they support the proposed changes.

**TABLE 5. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	277	151	56	11	26	5	526
	<b>52.7%</b>	28.7%	10.6%	2.1%	4.9%	1%	100%
Trappers	73	36	18	30	52	1	210
	<b>34.8%</b>	17.1%	8.6%	14.3%	24.8%	0.5%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	350	187	74	41	78	6	736
	47.6%	25.4%	10.1%	5.6%	10.6%	0.8%	100%

**Additional Comments on Concept I: Require Training**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250- character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 771 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions for section 2 concept 1, 95 trappers and 205 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, about 43 comments were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 41 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 6 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Alternatively, out of the 205 comments left by non-trappers, 19 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 had no opinion, 16 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 168 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who used the comment box to provide feedback about trap types and trapping in general. Some examples include the following: “Snares shouldn’t be allowed. Glue boards should be used in down spouts not left in the open,” “Coyote population is out of control and needs more efficient methods,” “Please open up trapping with

leghold traps,” “No native species should be allowed to be trapped...,” and “I think live traps should be the only traps allowed.” The next most common themes that were found in the comments of individuals who were in agreement with the proposed changes were comments with suggestions about the change and those noting that the change is a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential. Those with suggestions mentioned working with the Florida Trappers Association to create the training, including non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution in the training, using other states training, and not making it too arduous for current trappers with experience. Additionally, comments were left noting that they believe the rules are better, but they do not support the change because training is not sufficient as more humane solutions are not discussed, like non-removal measures to abate conflict. Lastly, among feedback from those in agreement, respondents mentioned that it should be ensured that these rules abide by science, apply to all trappers, and there should be strong enforcement for rule violations.

#### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers on concept 1 in section 2, the most common theme was participants who support the proposed changes and agreed they are better than what is currently in place but offered suggestions for the change. The majority of suggestions mentioned including non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution training within the proposed online training modules. Other suggestions included making sure the training was free and online only, and using social media to disseminate information on trapping in Florida. In addition to the comments with suggestions, the other most popular theme was non-trappers mentioning that regardless of the changes, trapping is still inhumane or a specific trap (ie: snares, glue traps, leg hold traps) is inhumane and should be banned. These first two common themes were present in 170 of the 235 comments by non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes. Aside from comments with suggestions about the proposed change and those that agreed the rules were better, but still thought trapping or a certain type of trap was inhumane, the other most common comments were from non-trappers who agreed the change was a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential and that there needed to be consistent enforcement of the proposed changes and current rules with strong repercussions for breaking the rules.

#### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that trapping or a specific trap is inhumane and should be banned. Following, non-trappers also mentioned that training should not be mandatory, or mandatory for all trappers, that additional requirements would be discouraging, and that training should not be mandated by the government.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Trappers who were in disagreement with the proposed changes shared similar sentiment. Most of the trappers in disagreement left comments suggesting that there should be a grandfather in date for the training and that experienced trappers have knowledge and/or certification through the Florida Trappers Association and should be exempt from FWC training. Others thought there should be exception for nuisance wildlife trappers or those who have completed training in another state. Other comments from trappers highlighted the fact that the proposed training requirement is unnecessary and some trappers used the comment box to discuss specific trap details (i.e.: let us use steel foot traps, leghold trappers without padding best for coyotes, dog proof traps best for nest predators).

### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Lastly, comments from trappers who did not agree or disagree with the proposed changes suggested that the training should not be mandatory or required for all trappers also suggesting a “grandfathered in date.”

### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Similarly, to comments left by non-trappers in agreement and disagreement with the proposed changes, a majority of comments left by non-trappers who did not agree or disagree with the proposed changes or had no opinion on them indicated that trapping or specific trap types were inhumane and should be banned.

## CONCEPT II: REQUIRE DATA COLLECTION

The second proposed change would make it mandatory for trappers to more consistently collect and report data on their traps. Currently, data collection is limited and only required by those using trap types that require a permit. This proposed change would now require trappers to log information daily about trap types used, types, and numbers of animals by species captures, general location (county), and disposition of captured animal. Once the data were collected, it would be reported to the FWC annually. By expanding data collection and reporting requirements there becomes increased transparency, which would enable the FWC and others to better monitor and assess wildlife trapping in Florida to better inform wildlife management decisions.

Participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree.' 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 755 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

As shown in Table 6, 62.8% of the sample (n=474) selected 'strongly agree' when asked whether the proposed changes were better than the current rules, while only 72 participants (9.54%) selected 'strongly disagree.'

**TABLE 6. Concept II: Require Data Collection**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	474	104	55	43	72	7	755
	<b>62.8%</b>	13.8%	7.3%	5.7%	9.5%	0.9%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	325	114	156	51	67	11	724
	<b>44.9%</b>	15.8%	21.6%	7%	9.3%	1.5%	100%

Of the 755 participants who responded to the first statement, 745 indicated their relationship to trapping. Of those 745 participants, 538 identified as non-trappers, while 207 identified as trappers. Approximately 89.5% (n=476) of non-trappers selected ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ indicating that they believe the proposed changes are preferable to the rules currently in place. While a majority of non-trappers believe adding a data collection requirement is preferable, less than half (45.5%) of trappers believe this change is preferable (Table 7).

**TABLE 7. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	407	69	24	12	23	3	538
	<b>75.7%</b>	12.8%	4.5%	2.2%	4.3%	0.6%	100%
Trappers	59	35	31	30	49	3	207
	<b>28.5%</b>	17%	15%	14.5%	23.7%	1.5%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	466	104	55	42	72	6	745
	<b>62.6%</b>	14%	7.4%	5.6%	9.7%	0.8%	100%

Next, 724 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 6), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 724 participants who responded to the second Likert-scale statement, 325 (44.9%) selected ‘strongly agree’ and 114 (15.8%) selected ‘agree.’

Next, we assessed whether there was a difference in support for the proposed data requirement between trappers and non-trappers (Table 8). While 724 participants responded to the second Likert-statement, 714 responded to the screening questions that asked about relationship to trapping. Of the 714 participants, 516 participants (72.3%) stated that they do not trap, while 198 (27.7%) identified as a trapper. Of those identified as non-trappers, 347 (67.3%) selected ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree,’ indicating that they support the proposed changes requiring more consistent data collection and mandatory reporting.

**TABLE 8. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	267	80	126	14	22	7	516
	<b>51.7%</b>	15.5%	24.4%	2.7%	4.3%	1.4%	100%
Trappers	55	33	27	36	45	2	198
	27.8%	16.7%	13.6%	18.2%	22.7%	1%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>322</b>	113	153	50	67	9	714
	45.1%	15.8%	21.4%	7%	9.4%	1.3%	100%

### **Additional Comments on Concept II: Require Data Collection**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 755 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions for section 2 concept 2, only 79 trappers and 162 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, approximately 37 were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 34 comments were from individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 6 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Out of the 162 comments left by non-trappers, 20 non-trappers disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 had no opinion, 7 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 132 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

#### *Trappers in Agreement*

Of the trappers who left comments that were in agreement or support of the proposed changes, one of the two most prominent themes throughout the feedback were individuals who thought the change was beneficial, helpful, and or essential with a couple comments mentioning data collection as essential or critical for wildlife management. The second



prominent theme present throughout the feedback was participants who were in general agreement but decided to use the comment box as a space for feedback on other issues around trapping, including shedding light on the prevalence of coyotes throughout the state and discussing the importance of education. Participants also left suggestions about the change like making the data available to the public, excluding private landowners from this rule, using drones to collect data, and making sure that the process is simple for people who use traps.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

For trappers in disagreement with the proposed changes, the majority expressed that the change was unnecessary, with some participants mentioning reporting is already required for certain traps, and that this change would create additional burden on trappers. Along those lines, a few trappers mentioned that trapping is already difficult, and this would be discouraging for trappers. Further, some trappers had questions or wanted more information including whether FWC would provide the forms, what the data would be used for, and who would keep the data. Moreover, a handful of trappers either left suggestions about this change including providing forms or log-books for trappers, providing an app for data collection, and an additional group of trappers who left comments used the space for additional comments, including comments on specific traps, like snares, dog-proof traps, and foothold traps. Lastly, the Florida Farm Bureau Federation stated, “It is the position of our members that these changes contradict our member-ratified policy that no regulation should create additional restrictions on agricultural producers, landowners and industry.”

### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

In addition to the trappers who left comments in general agreement and disagreement with the proposed changes, a handful that left comments neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Those that left comments under the neither agree nor disagree category suggested recording may not be needed for everyone, that if it helps gather information then it is okay, and that if it is not burdensome it is okay.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Further, when analyzing the comments left by non-trappers the majority of feedback was left by non-trappers who expressed general agreement towards the proposed changes. For non-trappers in general agreement, the most prevalent theme throughout the feedback was the fact that the FWC should more consistently enforce the rules, fine people for false-reporting, and audit permit holders. Following, the next most prominent theme through the feedback of non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes was non-trappers who provided suggestions about the change or providing additional comments in general including utilizing

an app to increase accessibility of reporting, making it mandatory for all traps, making the information available to the public, and requiring owner ID tags on traps that correlate with reporting. Moreover, a large number of non-trappers agreed that the proposed changes are better, but that trapping should be banned altogether mainly because it is inhumane. Lastly, a handful acknowledged that the change is helpful, beneficial, and/or critical and the last few suggested that special permits should still be required.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, instead of a few very prominent themes that were left by non-trappers who were in general agreement with the proposed changes, there were a number of different themes expressed throughout comments left by non-trappers that were in general disagreement with the proposed changes. Six comments stated that a specific trap or traps altogether were inhumane and should be banned. Five comments discussed that if the proposed changes were implemented there would be too much government control over trapping and that trapping is already too heavily regulated. Other non-trappers mentioned that its highly unlikely accurate data will be reported rendering these changes unnecessary, not realistic, and/or burdensome on trappers themselves, including homeowners.

### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Lastly, for non-trappers who left comments after selecting 'neither agree nor disagree' to both Likert-scale statements, the most common theme was that traps are inhumane, and non-selective, and thus, regardless of these rule changes, they should be banned. Additional comments were left indicating that mandatory reporting would be burdensome, that the current rules were fine, or with questions, including how data would be reported and how useful it would be.

### **CONCEPT III: MORE STRICTLY REGULATE WILDLIFE TRAP DESIGN, PLACEMENT, AND USE**

The third proposed change in section two of the comment tool would more strictly regulate the design, size, and placement of traps. Currently, permits stipulate compliance with AFWA Best Management Practices, for those trap types that require permits. Permits do not currently impose more restrictive state requirements on design, size, and placement of traps. Lastly, trap types that do not require permits are minimally regulated as to design, size, and placement. If the proposed changes were to take effect, all wildlife traps would be required to meet AFWA Best Management Practices in their design, wildlife traps and people using traps would also have to meet additional state requirements (more restrictive than AFWA Best Management Practices) addressing design, size and placement of traps, and certain types of wildlife traps and design features for some types of traps would be prohibited. By implementing these proposed changes, the FWC believes that allowable traps would be less likely to cause injury to animals and allowable traps would be less likely to capture unintended (non-target) animals.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 747 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

As shown in Table 9, 563 participants (75.4%) suggested that the changes under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.

**TABLE 9. Concept III: more strictly regulate wildlife trap design, placement, and use**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	468	95	33	50	93	8	747
	<b>62.3%</b>	12.7%	4.4%	6.7%	12.5%	1.17%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	334	93	141	57	91	11	727
	<b>45.9%</b>	12.8%	19.4%	7.8%	12.5%	1.5%	100%

Another test was run to assess levels of agreement between trappers and non-trappers (Table 10). Out of the 747 participants who answered this question, 205 were identified as trappers, while 532 were identified as non-trappers. The results show that 403 (75.8%) of non-trappers strongly agree that the changes under consideration are preferable to what is currently in place; 63 non-trappers (11.8%) selected ‘agree.’ Although collectively 88% of non-trappers believe the proposed changes are preferable to what is currently in place, only 43.4% of trappers selected ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree.’

**TABLE 10. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	403	63	19	15	28	4	532
	<b>75.8%</b>	11.8%	3.6%	2.8%	5.3%	0.8%	100%
Trappers	57	32	14	34	65	3	205
	27.8%	15.6%	6.8%	16.6%	<b>31.7%</b>	1.4%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	460	95	33	49	93	7	737
	62.4%	12.9%	4.5%	6.7%	12.6%	1%	100%

Next, 727 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 9), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 727 participants who responded to the second Likert-scale statement, 427 selected ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ suggesting that they support the proposed changes.

To further assess levels of agreement, support for the proposed changes to trap design, type, and usage were examined by each participant’s relationship to trapping (Table 11). Of the 727 respondents who answered the second Likert-scale statement, 526 were identified as non-trappers, while 210 were identified as trappers. Of the 526 non-trappers, the majority (81.2%) stated that they supported the proposed changes. Similarly, a majority of trappers, 51.9%, also stated that they support the proposed changes to trap type, design, and usage. Although a majority of trappers stated that they support the proposed changes, almost 40% of trappers did not support the changes, which was indicated by selecting either ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘disagree.’

**TABLE 11. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
	Non-Trappers	277 <b>52.7%</b>	151 28.7%	56 10.7%	11 2.1%	26 4.9%	
Trappers	73 <b>34.8%</b>	36 17.1%	18 8.6%	30 14.3%	52 24.8%	1 0.5%	210 100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	350 47.6%	187 25.4%	74 10.1%	41 5.6%	78 10.6%	6 0.8%	736 100%

**Additional Comments on Concept III: More Strictly Regulate Wildlife Trap Design, Placement, and Use**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Of the 747 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions for section 2 concept 3, only 84 trappers and 158 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, approximately 34 individuals were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 42 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 7 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. On the other hand, out of the 158 comments left by non-trappers, 16 non-trappers disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 had no opinion, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 134 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

### *Trappers in Agreement*

Of the comments left by the 84 trappers in agreement with the proposed changes, the most prevalent comment was that although the participants agreed the proposed changes are better, specific traps are still inhumane, indiscriminate, and should be banned. The traps mentioned included leghold traps, snares, and body gripping traps. Aside from the largest theme noting that the changes are better, but certain traps are still inhumane, the remaining themes were only discussed by 2-3 participants each. That said, a few trappers who were in general agreement with the proposed changes left comments requesting terms and definitions be more clearly defined, requesting additional details, or posed additional questions. For example, asking for delineation when defining nuisance and recreational trapping. Additionally, a few left suggestions about the changes to traps, including that conifer traps should be use for nuisance trapping to ensure target animal is caught, using humane, non-lethal traps only, leghold traps for coyotes and nest predators, and limiting cage traps to 60.5 inches would limit the ability of trappers. Lastly, a few comments indicated that the non-trappers thought the change was beneficial, helpful, and/or essential and other additional comments agreed with the changes, but there should be more control, consistency, and enforcement of the rules.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, out of the 42 comments left by trappers who expressed general disagreement towards the proposed changes, the most common concern discussed was that these proposed changes were more restrictive than AFWA Best Management Practices (BMPs). The next most common comment was by trappers who left suggestions about the change or left additional comments. The few who left additional comments questioned the influence of animal rights groups and lack of trappers involved when these modernizations of trapping rules were created, and an additional comment concerned decreased accountability by limiting special permits. Those who left suggestions about the changes to trap design, placement, and use, mentioned keeping special permits and just adding the modifications proposed, making the changes simple, not relaxing locks, and making sure traps are big enough for larger wildlife. While some trappers proposed suggestions regarding size

restrictions, a large majority of trappers acknowledged that these changes are too restrictive, and it would make it harder to trap or trap safely. Other trappers mentioned that experienced trappers have the best knowledge about trapping and that more regulation is not needed because trappers know what they are doing, trapping is already too heavily regulated, and more regulation is just burdensome and discouraging. In addition to the changes being unnecessary and burdensome, trappers also noted that these changes would not protect animals, nor would they reduce the likelihood non-target animals are caught.

#### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Lastly, of trappers that left comments after selecting 'neither agree nor disagree' for both Likert-scale questions, the most prominent theme was that these changes would make it too difficult to trap invasive species and large species. Additionally, one participant mentioned that these changes are not necessary for all types of traps or required in every situation. Another participant requested more information on the changes, and the last participant noted that AFWA BMPs are the best guidelines to go by.

#### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Next, out of the 134 comments left by non-trappers that were in general agreement with the proposed changes, the most common themes were agree, with other additional comments, agree, but special permits should still be required, agree rules are better, but I do not like a specific trap or trapping in general, and it should be banned, agree, with suggestion about the change, and agree, change is a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential. The most prevalent comments were that either a specific trap or trapping in general should be banned. Some of the specific traps discussed were leghold traps, snares, and conibear traps. For most participants, the reasons behind their feelings about traps and trapping stems from the fact that they believe it is inhumane. A number of participants who mentioned specific traps should be banned stated that many studies show the negative impacts and cruelty of non-selective traps, so they should be banned.

The next most common theme found within the comments left by non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes was that permits should be required to trap with no exception. In addition to the permit, many of these comments suggested a fee to offset the cost of permitted and enforcement. Following, the next theme most present throughout these comments were non-trappers who left suggestions about the changes or additional comments. Some of the suggestions made about the proposed changes to trap design, placement, and use, was that the FWC should use all available science not just base decisions on AFWA BMPs, including local conservation non-profits and farmers associations in developing these changes, doing better than AFWA BMPs, and that traps should have flag/signage to protect children and pets. Many of the additional comments suggest that

these changes should be a bare minimum, “suggest efforts continue assessing advancements in trapping designs that reduce and even eliminate needless suffering,” and require non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution, and FWC members should trap for research only. In short, most of the comments with suggestions indicated that the FWC should follow all available science, not just AFWA BMPs and go above and beyond basic rules set by AFWA to make traps more humane.

Other comments left by non-trappers in agreement included comments just noting that the changes were a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or critical, that there needs to be more control, consistency, and enforcement of the rules by the FWC. Some examples of participants suggesting that there should be more control, consistency, and enforcement of the rules are as follows: regulation is a must, “I fully support this and would suggest that it is strictly enforced, and “impose fines and jail time for those who don’t comply.”

#### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similarly, for non-trappers who indicated overall disagreement with the proposed changes the most common theme was also that a specific trap or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. Similar to non-trappers who expressed general agreement to the proposed changes, the non-trappers who expressed general disagreement to the proposed changes also indicated that a specific trap was inhumane mostly referred to leghold traps and snares. While some participants listed specific traps to ban, the majority suggested banning trapping altogether. Following, the next most common theme amongst these comments was that trapping is already too restricted and there should be fewer regulations. Further, the rules on trapping should not be more restrictive than AFWA BMPs. In alignment with participants who suggested there should be less regulation, some non-trappers also mentioned more regulation can be burdensome and discouraging for trappers and that the rules should just remain as is.

#### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

The last group of non-trappers were those who selected ‘neither agree nor disagree’ to both of the Likert-scale questions. Amongst these participants the most common feedback was also that a specific trap, like leghold traps or snares, and trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned altogether. Other participants suggested that these changes would make it more difficult to trap and reduce the effectiveness of traps used for invasive species and that it was not clear what would and would not be allowable.



## CONCEPT IV: MOVE FROM PERMIT RESTRICTIONS TO MORE DETAILED REGULATION

The last change under consideration in section two is the standardization of wildlife trapping regulations by moving from special permit-based restrictions for some wildlife traps to more detailed and specific rules for all traps. Currently, some types of traps are prohibited in rule, but are frequently allowed by special permit. Permits stipulate intended target species, allowable trap types, and reporting and eligibility is determined by FWC guidelines. However, some trap types are currently allowed in rule and do not require permits. The proposed changes would now require people by rule to register annually, at no cost, to trap. The following would be described in rule for every allowable type of wildlife trap: (1) required design features for each type of wildlife trap and (3) how and where each type of wildlife trap can be used. Additionally, certain types of wildlife traps and certain design features for some types of traps would be prohibited in rule.

In short, people who have completed the required training and have registered could use all allowable wildlife trap types, as long as they follow the requirements in the rule. By implementing these proposed changes, the FWC believes the a few improvements would be achieved. First, wildlife trapping requirements would be clearly defined in the FWC rule. Following, the same trap designs and use requirements would be applied to all users of each type of trap. Next, the use of some types of wildlife traps might increase, while other types of wildlife trap will be prohibited. Lastly, allowable traps would be less likely to cause injury to animals or capture non-target wildlife.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 731 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: "*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*"

As shown in Table 12, out of the 731 participants who responded to the first Likert-scale statement, approximately 69% of the sample strongly agreed (n=389) or agreed (n=115) agreed that the change under consideration is preferable to what is currently in place.

**TABLE 12. Concept IV: Move from permit restrictions to more detailed regulation**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	389	115	58	63	98	8	731
	<b>53.21</b>	15.7%	7.9%	8.6%	13.4%	1.1%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	212	113	212	68	92	9	706
	<b>30%</b>	16%	30%	9.6%	13%	1.3%	100%

When further examining respondent preferences, we found a majority of non-trappers preferred the proposed changes, while trappers were split on whether they preferred the proposed changes or current rules (Table 13). Out of the 524 non-trappers who responded to Likert-scale statement one, approximately 79.2% selected either ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree.’ Out of the 199 trappers, approximately 42.2% (n=84) selected either ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree,’ while 87 (43.72%) selected either ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘disagree.’

**TABLE 13. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	336	79	31	29	43	6	524
	<b>64.1%</b>	15.1%	5.9%	5.5%	8.2%	1.2%	100%
Trappers	48	36	27	33	54	1	199
	24.1%	18.1%	13.6%	16.6%	<b>27.1%</b>	0.5%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	384	115	58	62	97	7	723
	53.1%	15.9%	8%	8.6%	13.4%	1%	100%

Next, 706 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 12), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 706 participants who responded to the second Likert-scale question, 30.03% of the sample (n=212) selected ‘strongly agree’ and the same number of participants also selected ‘neither agree nor disagree.’ In addition to the 30% that selected ‘strongly agree,’ indicating support for the change, 16% (n=113) selected ‘agree.’ Together, 325 participants, or 46% of the sample, supported the proposed changes to permit restrictions.

Of the 706 participants who responded to the second Likert-scale statement, 510 identified as non-trappers, while 188 identified as a trapper (Table 14). Out of the 510 non-trappers, the largest plurality (n=182) selected ‘neither agree nor disagree.’ For trappers, the largest group (about 27%; n=50) selected ‘strongly disagree.’ In addition to the 50 trappers who selected ‘strongly disagree,’ another 35 selected ‘disagree,’ together indicating that about 45% of trappers do not support the proposed changes to permit restriction.

**TABLE 14. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	170	79	182	32	41	6	510
	33.3%	15.5%	<b>35.7%</b>	6.3%	8%	1.2%	100%
Trappers	40	33	29	35	50	1	188
	21.3%	17.6%	15.4%	18.6%	<b>26.6%</b>	0.5%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	210	112	211	67	91	7	698
	30.1%	16.1%	30.2%	9.6%	13%	1%	100%

#### **Additional Comments on Concept IV: Move from Permit Restrictions to More Detailed Regulation**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Of the 731 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions for section 2 concept 4, 65 trappers and 152 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, approximately 20 individuals were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 33 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 9 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. On the other hand, out of the 152 comments left by non-trappers, 43 non-trappers disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 had no opinion, 10 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 98 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

### *Trappers in Agreement*

Amongst trappers who expressed general agreement towards the proposed changes to move away from permit restriction to more detailed regulation the most common theme was suggestions either about the specific changes discussed for this concept or suggestions about the proposed changes in general. Out of the suggestions left, the most prevalent comment was that non-lethal options should be utilized first, and that trapping should be the last resort. Other comments and suggestions mentioned letting trappers determine what is best in the situation, all foothold traps should be allowed, too much emphasis on trap model and design that would make it harder to trap larger animals, limiting the number of traps per person and location, and lastly one participant mentioned they would not mind a fee to help cover costs. Other comments left by trappers are as follows: (1) the change was a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential, (2) participants asking questions for more specific details, including on what would be allowed and not allowed, (3) one comment agreeing that the rules are better, but still do not support the use of steel traps, and (4) concern over limiting special permits that provided critical data and concern over which traps become allowed and used more.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, the most common sentiment shared by trappers who expressed disagreement was that the changes were not necessary. Many questioned why trappers would have to register and pay a yearly fee if trappers already purchased licenses and completed required training. In alignment with trappers who felt these changes were unnecessary, other respondents mentioned that these changes are burdensome and there is too much government interference and regulation and that there should be less regulation not more. Further, one participant who questioned why yearly registration would be required also suggested implementing certification courses. This same participant also shared similar sentiment as other trappers who suggested that the proposed change will only make poachers and trappers avoid special permits. There were quite a few participants who shared this concern and mentioned that there needed to be more oversight and enforcement, not less. Moreover, many trappers offered suggestions or additional comments, which included,

one participant who wanted rubber jaws and offset footholds to be kept in play, while other participants suggested that they were firmly against removing the prohibition on leg hold traps. Lastly, one participant mentioned not restricting owners/trappers in their trap locations and another mentioned that registration may allow protesters to individually target trappers.

#### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

The last group of comments left by trappers that were analyzed were from trappers that selected 'neither agree nor disagree' on both Likert-scale questions. The most common theme prevalent throughout these comments was that the proposed changes were too vague and that they wanted more information. Two other comments suggested that these changes were not necessary, and things are fine the way they are. Lastly, a few trappers left additional comments including: "depends on the situation, too much bureaucracy could easily stifle effective invasive species removal efforts, but some oversight would probably be positive" and that it is tricky because they may lose the use of some traps while gaining the use of other traps that are currently outlawed. This same participant questioned why AFWA BMPs were not used like most other states.

#### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

While the majority of comments left by trappers who expressed general agreement towards the proposed changes included suggestions about the change or additional comments, the two most prevalent themes found in the comments of non-trappers who expressed general agreement towards the proposed changes was that permits should still be required and that a specific trap or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. Specifically, for those who mentioned that permits should still be required, they expressed that permits should be required for anyone who traps and a fee should be charged to offset the cost of permitting and enforcement. Others expressed that removing special permits is premature and there should be more accountability, oversight, and regulation, not less and that there should be no exception for permitting.

Following, the other most common theme found in the comments left by non-trappers who expressed general agreement towards the proposed changes was that a specific trap or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. Not only did these participants mention that they are in humane, but they also stated that they are always non-selective. For those who listed specific traps, the most common were leghold traps, snares, conifer traps, body crushing traps, and drowning traps. Many of these comments mentioned that the FWC should use the best available science and studies that show the negative impact of trapping, not just AFWA.

In addition to the two most common themes, other non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes asked for more details and/or had questions, including would the sources for purchase of allowable traps be provided, what would encourage self-reporting, and who would enforce the new rules? A few participants mentioned that the changes were beneficial, and that it is essential that there is oversight and enforcement of these rules to ensure the desired outcomes. Lastly, a few comments suggested allowing more traps, only trapping invasive species, using non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution methods, and that people should not have to register for traps on their own property.

#### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similarly, out of the 43 non-trappers who were in general disagreement with the proposed changes, the most common theme was that that a specific trap or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. Many of these comments indicated concern that these proposed changes would now allow the use of leghold traps which had been banned since 1972. Aside from the majority of comments that expressed concern about the use of leghold traps and traps in general, others mentioned that special permits should still be required, and that the regulation is not necessary.

#### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Lastly, for non-trappers who selected 'neither agree nor disagree,' the most common comment again was the trapping is inhumane and should be banned. However, additional comments were left asking for more details, implementing a fee for trapping, only trapping invasive species, and concern that certain limitations may result in burdensome oversight, technicalities, fines, and infringement on property owner rights.

### SECTION III: REGULATION OF SPECIFIC WILDLIFE TRAP TYPES AND USES

#### TRAP TYPE I: Foothold and Foot-Enclosed Traps

While section two discussed proposed changes to trapping requirements, section three focused on proposed changes to specific trap types. The first trap addressed in section three is foothold and foot-enclosed traps. Currently, these traps are only allowed by special permit. Eligibility for these special permits is limited to certain users and special permits require traps to meet AFWA Best Management Practices (BMPs), which states that these traps must either have offset or padded jaws (not applicable to foot enclosed traps that do not have jaws). Further, special permits do not currently include restrictions on trap placement, but traps are required to be inspected at least once every 24 hours. Additionally, current use of these traps via special permit also requires mandatory reporting.

However, the FWC has proposed that foothold and foot-enclosed traps be allowed by rule. Although they will now be allowed by rule there are a few requirements that must be met when using these traps. The first requirement is that when using these traps, they must meet the AFWA BMP criteria and have offset or padded jaws (not applicable to foot enclosed traps that do not have jaws). For some targeted species, the maximum trap size that would be allowed by rule is more restrictive than the AFWA BMP criteria. Additionally, these traps should not be placed near dwellings, public use areas, at property boundaries, near carcasses, or in such a way that a captured animal can reach and become entangled in a fence or drown. Lastly, they must be inspected every morning.

If these changes take effect, the FWC believes a number of improvements would be achieved. First, these changes would provide clarity on allowed uses. Second, this change would limit maximum jaw spread reduces unintended (non-target) animal captures. Third, by restricting trap placement there would be a reduction in non-target animal captures, possibility of injury or drowning of captured animal, and landowner/user conflict. Following, implementing a daily morning inspection would reduce the likelihood a captured animal will spend time in the trap during the hottest part of the day. Lastly, these trap types could be used by all holders of the no-cost trapping permit who have completed the required training.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 740 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

As shown in Table 15, out of the 740 participants, the most common selections were either 'strongly agree' or 'strongly disagree.' Approximately 31% of the sample selected 'strongly

agree" indicating that the proposed changes to foothold and foot-enclosed traps are preferable to what is currently in place, while 33.5% selected 'strongly disagree,' suggesting the alternative.

**TABLE 15. Trap Type I: Foothold and Foot-enclosed traps**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	231	115	83	52	248	11	740
	31.2%	15.5%	11.2%	7%	<b>33.5%</b>	1.5%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	186	106	148	51	215	10	716
	26%	14.8%	20.7%	7.1%	<b>30%</b>	1.4%	100%

We then assessed levels of agreement between trappers and non-trappers (Table 16). Overall, there were 730 participants who answered the Likert-scale question and also identified what their relationship to trapping was. Of those 730 participants, 533 identified as non-trappers, while 197 identified as a trapper. We found that 253 non-trappers (47.5%) selected either 'strongly agree' or 'agree' suggesting that they preferred the proposed changes over the current rules. Similarly, about 45.62% of trappers made the same selections also indicating a preference for the preferred changes.



**TABLE 16. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	174	79	56	24	194	6	533
	<b>32.7%</b>	14.8%	10.5%	4.5%	36.4%	1.1%	100%
Trappers	54	36	26	27	50	4	197
	<b>27.4%</b>	18.3%	13.2%	13.7%	25.4%	2%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	228	115	82	51	244	10	730
	<b>31.2%</b>	15.6%	11.2%	7%	33.4%	1.4%	100%

Next, 716 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 15), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 716 participants who responded to the second Likert-scale question, 40.8% selected either ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ indicating that they supported the proposed changes, while about 37% selected ‘strongly disagree’ or ‘disagree’ suggesting that they do not support the changes under consideration.

We also assessed this statement based on each participants relationship to trapping. For both trappers and non-trappers, we found that there was a fairly even split between those who support the proposed changes to foothold and foot-enclosed traps and those who do not. For non-trappers, 208 (40.2%) indicated support for the changes by selecting either ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree.’ Comparatively about 43% (n=81) of trappers made the same selections also indicating support for the proposed changes (Table 17).

**TABLE 17. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	136	72	118	26	161	5	518
	<b>26.3%</b>	13.9%	22.8%	5%	31.1%	1%	100%
Trappers	47	34	29	24	50	4	188
	25%	18.1%	15.4%	12.8%	<b>26.6%</b>	2.1%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	183	106	147	50	211	9	706
	25.9%	15%	20.8%	7.1%	29.9%	1.3%	100%

**Additional Comments on Trap Type I: Foothold and Foot-Enclosed Traps**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 740 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes for foothold and foot-enclosed, 68 trappers and 210 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, about 19 comments were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 47 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, 1 individual had no opinion, and 12 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Alternatively, out of the 210 comments left by non-trappers, 126 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 individuals had no opinion, and 31 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 40 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes was overall support and indication that the changes were beneficial, helpful, and/or critical. An additional participant said that they agreed with the changes except

for the morning checks. Instead of morning checks, that participants preferred a 24-hour check.

### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

The most prevalent comment amongst trappers who selected 'neither agree nor disagree,' was that the prohibition of leghold traps should not be removed. An additional trapper in this category questioned why these changes were stricter than AFWA BMPs. Similarly, another trapper who selected 'neither agree nor disagree' indicated that these changes were too restrictive, and it would become more difficult to safely trap.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

The most common themes left by trappers who expressed general disagreement towards the proposed changes was that foothold traps should remain banned, or be required by special permit only, and that changes are not realistic. Most of the trappers in disagreement left comments suggesting that the proposed changes would make it more difficult to trap and trap safely. These participants mentioned that trap size limits should be determined by species as the proposed restrictions would make it harder to trap larger animals, like coyotes and beavers. Other participants mentioned that padded jaw traps were dangerous and ineffective and that placement restrictions would make it more difficult to trap. Lastly, a handful of trappers questioned why these proposed changes were stricter than the AFWA BMPs and that in alignment with AFWA BMPs only a 24-hour check should be required.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers on foothold and foot-enclosed traps, the most common theme was participants who support the proposed changes was that regardless of the changes, either a leghold traps, specifically, or trapping in general is still inhumane. A few other non-trappers left comments suggesting that special permits should still be a requirement for those seeking to trap animals. Other suggestions included keeping 24-hour checks, allowing dog proof traps, only allowing those who work for the government to trap, and expanding from 5.75 to 6.50 inches since many trappers use 5.85-inch traps. Lastly, some non-trappers were concerned with how the proposed changes and trap requirements would be enforced.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement both Likert-scale questions was the fact that leghold traps and/or trapping in general is inhumane and should

be banned. For non-trappers who expressed general disagreement almost all of the comments discussed the fact that the prohibition of leghold traps should not be lifted because they are inhumane, but other non-trappers also mentioned there should be continual enforcement of the changes, that if these traps become legal than there should be special permits when using them, that animals found in traps should be relocated or killed immediately, not held for an additional 12 to 24 hours, and that changes may be easy to misunderstand or abuse.

#### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

The most common comments left by non-trappers who selected 'neither agree nor disagree' for both Likert-scale questions was again the fact that leghold traps and/or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. Further, others who selected 'neither agree nor disagree' suggested that special permits should still be required and should be required if leghold traps become legal to use.

Furthermore, to see specific comments left by trappers, please see the 'Trappers' tab in the attached Excel sheet. For comments left by non-trappers, please see the 'non-Trappers' tab in the attached Excel sheet.

## TRAP TYPE II: BODY GRIPPING TRAPS

The second trap impacted by the proposed changes is body gripping traps. Currently, body gripping traps are only allowed by special permit in which eligibility is limited to certain users and purposes consistent with FWC guidelines. Special permits currently require traps meet AFWA Best Management Practices (BMP) criteria. Further, there are not any restrictions on trap placement other than the fact that they must be submerged underwater. They are also currently required to be inspected at least once every 24 hours and users are required to report on the usage of these traps to the FWC.

Although body gripping traps are only allowed by special permit at this point in time, the FWC has proposed changes that would now allow these traps by rule, however they must meet AFWA BMP criteria and limit the maximum trap size. For some targeted species, the maximum trap size that will be allowed is more restrictive than the AFWA Best Management Practices criteria. Additionally, they must be fully submerged in water and not placed near dwellings, public use areas, or property boundaries and they also must be inspected every morning.

If these changes take effect, the FWC believes a number of improvements would be achieved. First, it would provide clarity on allowed uses. Second, unintended (non-target) animal captures would be reduced by limiting trap opening size, requiring traps to be submerged underwater, and requiring traps to be positioned with the trigger at the top. Third, restricting trap placement would reduce landowner/user conflicts. Lastly, this trap type could be used by all holders of the no-cost trapping permit who have completed the required training.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 710 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

As shown in Table 18, a majority of participants either strongly agree (n=324, 45.63%) or agree (n=106; 14.93%). On the other end of the spectrum, 21.3% (n=151) selected 'strongly disagree,' with an additional 52 participants (7.3%) selecting 'disagree,' which combined indicates approximately 28.6% of participants suggesting a preference for the current rules over the changes under consideration.

**TABLE 18. Trap Type II: Body Gripping traps**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	324	106	67	52	151	10	710
	<b>45.6%</b>	14.9%	9.4%	7.3%	21.3%	1.4%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	157	153	79	139	148	12	688
	<b>22.8%</b>	22.2%	11.5%	20.2%	21.5%	1.7%	100%

When further examining participants preferences (Table 19), we found that an overwhelming majority of non-trappers prefer the proposed changes over the current rules, while preference amongst trappers was more equally split. Specifically, out of the 512 non-trappers who responded to this Likert-scale question 263 non-trappers (51.4%) of non-trappers, selected 'strongly agree,' and an additional 70 (13.7%) selected 'agree,' both indicating preference for the proposed changes to body gripping taps over the current rules. Only about 48% of trappers stated that they also prefer the changes under consideration over the current rules.

**TABLE 19. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	263	70	52	23	100	4	512
	<b>51.4%</b>	13.7%	10.2%	4.5%	19.5%	0.8%	100%
Trappers	55	36	15	27	50	5	188
	<b>29.3%</b>	19.2%	8%	14.4%	26.6%	2.7%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	318	106	67	50	150	9	700
	<b>45.4%</b>	15.1%	9.6%	7.1%	21.4%	1.3%	100%

Next, 688 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 18), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 688 responses, approximately 45% of participants indicated support for the proposed changes with 22.8% (n=157) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and an additional 153 participants (22.2%) selecting ‘agree.’

Similar to the first Likert-scale statement, we also assessed this statement based on each participants relationship to trapping (Table 20). When assessing levels of agreement based on each individual’s relationship that there was a fairly equal number of trappers and non-trappers who support the proposed changes and a fairly equal amount who do not support the proposed changes. Specifically, we found that 22.5% (n=112) of non-trappers selected ‘strongly agree,’ and 22.3% (n=111) selected ‘agree.’ Together approximately 45% of non-trappers support for the proposed changes. Similarly, 23.3% (n=42) of trappers, chose ‘strongly agree’ and 23.3% (n=42) chose ‘agree.’ Combined, approximately 46% of trappers support the proposed changes.

**TABLE 20. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Opinion	TOTAL
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree		
Non-Trappers	112	111	63	107	99	6	498	
	<b>22.5%</b>	22.3%	12.7%	21.5%	19.9%	1.2%	100%	
Trappers	42	42	16	27	48	5	180	
	23.3%	23.3%	8.9%	15%	<b>26.7%</b>	2.8%	100%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	154	153	79	134	147	11	678	
	22.7%	22.6%	11.7%	19.8%	21.7%	1.6%	100%	

**Additional Comments on Trap Type II: Body Gripping Traps**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 710 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions for section 3 concept 2, 62 trappers and 183 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, about 20 comments were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 41 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 3 comment were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Alternatively, out of the 183 comments left by non-trappers, 122 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 individuals had no opinion, and 25 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 32 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

#### *Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who indicated that these changes are a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential. Additionally, some trappers who expressed general agreement towards the proposed changes stated that these traps are still inhumane and should be banned, that they should be legal in other sets besides submerged, that the new rules would need some clarification, and that these changes should not be free of cost.

#### *Trappers in Disagreement*

For trappers who were in disagreement with the proposed changes, comments indicated a few overall themes including: rules are fine as they are, body gripping traps are inhumane and should be banned, rules are too restrictive, and that the guidelines for these traps would make it more difficult to safely trap and protect animals. For those that indicated the rules are fine as they are, many indicated that the 24-hour check is suitable, this comment coincided with trappers who questioned why these changes were more restrictive than AFWA BMPs. Additionally, in alignment with trappers who suggested that these changes were too restrictive and that it would become harder to trap, some mentioned that it would be hard for larger operations to abide by these rule changes. Lastly, several comments indicated that having the trigger on top would damage a beaver's fur, and thus the trigger should be placed on the bottom.

#### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers on body-gripping traps, the most common theme was that regardless of the proposed changes body-gripping traps and trapping in general was inhumane and should be banned. Most of these comments indicated that these traps were indiscriminate and posed a risk to pets and children. Other participants who also suggested that they support the proposed changes mentioned that if these traps are to be allowed, they



should still require special permits, more in-depth training, and should be checked multiple times per day. Another participant mentioned that if they are to be used that they should follow AFWA and only allow them on dry land on private property or partially submerged on public property. Lastly, a few non-trappers who indicated general agreement toward the proposed changes noted that there should be increased individual accountability, enforcement of the rules, and penalties for those who break the proposed rules.

#### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similarly, the most common themes in the comments left by non-trappers who selected 'disagree' was that body gripping traps and/or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. They also stated that body gripping traps and/or trapping in general is inhumane noting that drowning is not an acceptable form of euthanasia and that if they are to be used special permits should be required. While this was also the most common theme expressed by non-trappers who expressed general disagreement towards the proposed changes, there were also other comments that suggested special permits should be required to use these traps, questioning why the changes were more restrictive than AFWA BMPs, and questioning how these changes would be enforced.

#### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

The majority of comments left by non-trappers who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes was also that body gripping traps and/or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned.

### TRAP TYPE III: SNARES

The third trap impacted by the proposed changes is snares. Currently, snares are allowed by rule with no design requirements and no placement restrictions, however they must be inspected at least once every 24 hours. The proposed changes would prohibit snares that do not comply with the new requirements for cable restraints. If these changes take effect, the FWC believes a number of improvements would be achieved, including improving animal welfare by reducing injuries, reducing unintended (non-target) animal captures and allow for the unharmed release or escape of non-target animals, and keeping captured animals alive.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 728 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

As shown in Table 21, the majority of the 728 participants who responded to the first Likert-scale question either strongly agreed or agreed that the proposed changes to snares are preferable to the rules currently in place. Specifically, 363 participants (49.9%) selected 'strongly agree,' and an additional 97 (13.3%) selected 'agree.' When combined 63.2% of this sample prefer the changes under consideration over the existing rules.

**TABLE 21. Trap Type III: Snares**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	363	97	71	44	98	10	728
	<b>49.9%</b>	13.3%	9.8%	6%	13.5%	1.4%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	177	158	85	134	105	11	670
	<b>26.4%</b>	23.6%	12.7%	20%	15.7%	1.6%	100%

When further examining participants preferences (Table 22), we found the majority of non-trappers prefer the proposed changes, while the majority of trapper prefer the current rules. Specifically, we found that 63.41% (n=312) of the non-trappers, selected 'strongly agree,' and 14.63% (72) selected 'agree.' While approximately, 78% of non-trappers prefer the proposed changes, only about 38% of trappers felt the same.

**TABLE 22. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	312	72	49	16	39	4	492
	<b>63.4%</b>	14.6%	10%	3.3%	7.9%	0.8%	100%
Trappers	45	25	21	27	59	5	182
	24.7%	13.7%	11.5%	14.8%	<b>32.4%</b>	2.8%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	357	97	70	43	98	9	674
	53%	14.4%	10.4%	6.4%	14.5%	1.3%	100%

Next, 670 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 21), which stated: *"I support the change under consideration."* Of the 670 responses, approximately 50% of participants selected either 'strongly agree' or 'agree,' whereas only 35.7% of participants indicated that they do not support the changes under consideration.

Similar to the first Likert-scale question, we also examined support for the proposed changes based on the participants relationship to trapping. We found the majority of non-trappers support the proposed changes to snares, while the majority of trappers do not support these proposed changes (Table 23). More specifically we found that 29.07% (n=141) of the non-trappers selected 'strongly agree' and an additional 25.98% (n=126) selected 'agree.' While over half of non-trappers support the proposed changes to snares, only about 37% of trappers felt the same.

**TABLE 23. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
			Disagree	Disagree			
Non-Trappers	141	126	62	104	47	5	485
	<b>29.1%</b>	26%	12.8%	21.4%	9.7%	1%	100%
Trappers	33	32	22	26	57	5	175
	18.9%	18.3%	12.6%	14.9%	<b>32.6%</b>	2.9%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	174	158	84	130	104	10	660
	45.4%	15.1%	9.6%	7.1%	21.4%	1.3%	100%

**Additional Comments on Trap Type III: Snares**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 728 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to snare traps, 59 trappers and 157 non-trappers left comments. Of the trappers who left comments, about 14 comments were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 37 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 8 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Alternatively, out of the 157 comments left by non-trappers, 68 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 individuals had no opinion, and 30 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 57 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes to snares was that snares are inhumane and should not be used. Some of the individuals who said snares are inhumane did state that the changes are an improvement, but because of how lethal snares are, they should not be allowed by rule. One participant said, “snares often don’t properly position the captured animal; thus, fail to

consistently & humanely kill the animal. Snares set in water are brutal; it can take 9+ mins for an otter to drown. AVMA states ‘drowning is not a means of euthanasia & is inhumane.’” In addition to those who suggested that snares should be banned, other trappers indicated that if they were to be used, they should require special permit. Lastly, other trappers questioned how these rules would be enforced and mentioned that there should be an exemption for snares used on catch poles for alligators, large lizards, and permanently attended by user, and that AFWA BMP allows both cable restraint devices with a relaxing lock and snare with a non-relaxing lock used submerged for beavers.

### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Trappers who selected ‘neither agree nor disagree’ shared similar sentiment as those in agreement with the proposed changes to snares also stating that they are inhumane and should be banned.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, those that expressed general disagreement towards the proposed changes were largely concerned with how these changes to snares would impact their ability to trap. Most of the trappers mentioned that snares left in fence crawl unders are effective for coyotes, for large cattle operation, and for beavers. They mentioned that these changes would render snares ineffective.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers on snares and cable restraints, the most common theme that these changes were better than what is currently in place but respondents emphasized how inhumane and indiscriminate these traps are. Most suggested that these traps should be banned and/or that trapping in general should be banned. In addition, the second largest theme was comments with suggestions. Other comments questioned how changes would be enforced, while simultaneously emphasizing the importance of enforcement. Further, some comments mentioned that they should be checked more than once every 24 hours, and that trapping of non-invasive species should not be allowed.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement and Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers who selected ‘neither agree nor disagree’ and that expressed general disagreement was that snares and cable restraints are inhumane, indiscriminate, and should be banned. Other than those non-trappers who emphasized how inhumane snares are, the remainder of the comments left by non-trappers

who expressed general disagreement towards snares also mentioned that trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned.

## TRAP TYPE IV: CABLE RESTRAINTS

The fourth trap impacted by the proposed changes are cable restraints. Currently, cable restraints are allowed by rule with no design or placements requirements. However, they are currently required to be inspected at least once every 24 hours. Based on the proposed changes by the FWC, cable restraints would continue to be allowed by rule, with a few new requirements. First, they must be made of stranded metal cable and incorporate a relaxing lock, inline swivel, loop size stops, a loop breakaway device, and be nonpowered. Second, they must not be placed near dwellings, public use areas, at property boundaries, near carcasses or in such a way that a captured animal can become entangled or drown. Lastly, they must be inspected every morning, not just every 24 hours. These changes would also directly impact the use of snares.

If these changes take effect, the FWC believes a number of improvements would be achieved. First, they believe the proposed changes would provide clarity and transparency on allowed uses. Following, the new required features would improve animal welfare by reducing the possibility of animals being injured or killed while in the trap. The improved design features would also reduce the change of unintended (non-target) animal captures. They would also now make it a live capture tool. By restricting trap placement, there would be a reduction in unintended (non-target) animal captures, injury or drowning of captured animals, and landowner/user conflicts. Lastly, a daily morning inspection would reduce the likelihood a captured animal will spend time in the trap during the hottest part of the day.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 679 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: "*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*"

As shown in Table 24, of the 679 participants, 344 selected 'strongly agree' and an additional 112 selected 'agree,' thus 67.2% of this sample prefer the proposed changes to cable restraints over the rules currently in place.

**TABLE 24. Trap Type IV: Cable Restraints**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	344	112	58	72	87	6	679
	<b>50.7%</b>	16.5%	8.5%	10.6%	12.8%	0.9%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	169	166	71	154	95	7	662
	<b>25.5%</b>	25.1%	10.7%	23.3%	14.4%	1.1%	100%

We then assessed levels of agreement between trappers and non-trappers (Table 25). Overall, there were 668 participants who answered the Likert-scale question and also identified what their relationship to trapping was. Of those 668 participants, 486 identified as non-trappers, while 182 identified as a trapper. We found that a majority of non-trappers prefer the proposed changes to the rules on cable restraints, whereas trappers indicated preference towards the current rules, although the opinions of trappers were more evenly split. First, 61.1% (n=297) of non-trappers selected ‘strongly agree’ and an additional 17.3% (n=84) selected ‘agree.’ When combined approximately 78% of non-trappers prefer the proposed changes over the current rules in place. Only 37.4% of trappers felt similarly with 22% (n=40) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 15.4% (n=28) selecting ‘agree.’



**TABLE 25. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	297	84	36	32	36	1	486
	<b>61.1%</b>	17.3%	7.4%	6.6%	7.4%	0.2%	100%
Trappers	40	28	21	38	51	4	182
	22%	15.4%	11.5%	20.9%	<b>28%</b>	2.20%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	337	112	57	70	87	5	668
	50.5%	16.8%	8.5%	10.5%	13%	0.8%	100%

Following, 662 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 24), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 662 responses, 50.6% selected either ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree,’ suggesting overall support for the changes under consideration to cable restraints.

Similar to the first Likert-scale question, we also examined support for the proposed changes based on the participants relationship to trapping. Of the 662 responses to the Likert-scale question only 651 identified their relationship to trapping. Of the 651, 478 identified as non-trappers and 173 identified as a trapper. Through this analysis, we found that a majority of non-trappers support the proposed changes with 28.7% (n=137) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 27.6% (n=132) selecting ‘agree.’ Although about 56% of non-trappers indicated support for the proposed changes to cable restraints, only 35.8% of trappers felt the same.

**TABLE 26. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
	Non-Trappers	137 <b>28.7%</b>	132 27.6%	48 10%	115 24.1%	44 9.2%	
Trappers	28 16.2%	34 19.7%	22 12.7%	34 19.7%	51 <b>29.5%</b>	4 2.3%	173 100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	165 25.4%	166 25.5%	70 10.8%	149 22.9%	95 14.6%	6 0.9%	651 100%

**Additional Comments on Trap Type IV: Cable Restraints**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 679 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to cable restraints, 49 trappers and 146 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, 6 comments were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes and 38 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes. Out of the 146 comments left by non-trappers, 103 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 16 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 27 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who said that the changes may not be feasible or realistic. The next most common were suggestions about the change and suggestions on permits and oversight on the permits. Lastly, respondents mentioned that it should be ensured that trappers know how to set the trap properly.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, for trappers who expressed disagreement towards the proposed changes, one of the most popular comments was similar to those left for snares, which was that it would make it more difficult to trap and trap safely. Most of the comments brought up the fact that in order to effectively trap, they need to be able to place these under fences in crawl under for coyotes. Many trappers suggested this was important for large cattle ranches and to protect farm animals. Others mentioned that the changes to size were too restrictive making it difficult to trap animals, including hog. Further, some mentioned that by requiring rubber jaws and offsets animals would be more easily released. In alignment with comments indicating the changes are too restrictive, others mentioned that traps should follow AFWA BMP. Other comments from trappers highlighted the fact that the proposed change is no better than what is currently in place, it is burdensome and does not benefit trappers, and is only being proposed to appease people that do not trap.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers on cable restraints, the most common theme among participants who support the proposed changes was that cable restraints are inhumane and/or trapping in general should be banned. Others felt that a special permit should be required, that there should be more reporting of animals that are trapped, more detail and clarification on how animals may be humanely killed, and non-lethal conflict resolution before the killing of an animal.

### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Similarly, the most common themes amongst non-trappers who selected 'neither agree nor disagree' was that cable restraints are inhumane and/or trapping in general should be banned or with questions asking for more clarity, including on enforcement.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that cable restraints and/or trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned. Following, non-trappers also mentioned there should be continual enforcement of the changes, and that changes may be easy to misunderstand or abuse therefore a better definition of the changes might help.

## TRAP TYPE V: CORRAL TRAPS

The fifth trap impacted by the proposed changes is corral traps. Currently, corral traps are allowed by rule with no design requirements and no placement restrictions, however they must be inspected at least once every 24 hours. The proposed changes would continue to allow corral traps by rule, but with additional requirements. The additional requirements include having a fully open top and they would need to be inspected every morning. If these changes take effect, the FWC believes a number of improvements would be achieved. First, they believe the proposed changes would provide clarity and transparency on allowed uses. Following, requiring a fully open top would improve species selectivity by providing an exit for non-target animals. Lastly, a daily morning inspection would reduce the likelihood a captured animal will spend time in the trap during the hottest part of the day.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes.

A total of 673 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: "*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*" As shown in Table 27, a large majority of the 673 participants prefer the changes under consideration to the rules currently in place. Overall, 54.2% (n=385) of this sample, selected 'strongly agree.' Additionally, 23% (n=155) selected 'agree.' When combined, 76.3%, prefer the changes under consideration.

**TABLE 27. Trap Type V: Corral**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	365	155	58	33	53	9	673
	<b>54.2%</b>	23%	8.6%	4.9%	7.9%	1.3%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	244	207	108	37	54	11	661
	<b>36.9%</b>	31.3%	16.3%	5.6%	8.2%	1.7%	100%

We then assessed levels of agreement between trappers and non-trappers (Table 28). Overall, there were 663 participants who answered the Likert-scale question and also identified what their relationship to trapping was. Of those 663 participants, 483 identified as non-trappers, while 180 identified as a trapper. There was overwhelming preference for the proposed changes amongst non-trappers, with approximately 87% of non-trapper selecting 'strongly agree' or 'agree.' While a large majority of non-trappers preferred the proposed changes over the current rules, only a slight majority of trappers agreed. Amongst trappers, 50.5% (n=91) selected either 'strongly agree' or 'agree,' indicating their preference for the proposed changes.

**TABLE 28. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	311	110	28	13	18	3	483
	<b>64.4%</b>	22.8%	5.8%	2.7%	3.7%	0.6%	100%
Trappers	46	45	30	19	35	5	180
	<b>25.6%</b>	25%	16.7%	10.6%	19.4%	2.8%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	357	155	58	32	53	8	663
	<b>53.9%</b>	23.4%	8.8%	4.8%	8%	1.2%	100%

Next, 661 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 27), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 661 responses, the largest majority indicated support for the proposed changes. Specifically, 244 participants selected ‘strongly agree,’ and an additional 207 selected ‘agree.’ Together, 68.23% of participants support the proposed changes.

Similar to the first Likert-scale question, we also examined support for the proposed changes based on the participants relationship to trapping (Table 29). Of the 662 responses to the Likert-scale question, 651 identified their relationship to trapping. Out of the 651, 475 identified as non-trappers and 176 identified as a trapper. Out of the 475 non-trappers, 200 selected ‘strongly agree’ and 156 selected ‘agree,’ indicating support for the changes under consideration. About 75% of non-trappers support the proposed changes compared to 50% of trappers (38; 21.6% ‘strongly agree’ and 50; 28.4% ‘agree.’)

**TABLE 29. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
	Non-Trappers	200 <b>42.1%</b>	156 32.8%	75 15.8%	18 3.8%	21 4.4%	
Trappers	38 21.6%	50 <b>28.4%</b>	32 18.2%	18 10.2%	33 18.8%	5 2.8%	176 100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	238 36.6%	206 31.6%	107 16.4%	36 5.5%	54 8.3%	10 1.5%	651 100%

**Additional Comments on Trap Type V: Corral**

After the Likert-scale questions, respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 673 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to corral traps, 39 trappers and 120 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, about 17 comments were individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 20 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 2 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Out of the 120 comments left by non-trappers, 13 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 1 individual had no opinion, 7 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 99 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common themes found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes was overall indication that the changes were beneficial, helpful, and/or critical, with suggestions and comments about the use of corral traps, including the fact that open top traps were very helpful to release non-target animals and suggesting that water for the animals should be required to utilize this trap. Additionally, while some trappers in favor of these changes, they weren’t in favor of rules allowing the transportation of hog. Others suggested that checks should be every 24 hours and that if they were monitored

electronically that might not even be necessary. Lastly, some trappers asked questions or mentioned that they need clarification on parts of the proposed changes or terms used throughout the proposed rules.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Trappers who were in disagreement with the proposed changes indicated that the proposed changes would not help trappers, in fact the open top would also allow animals, like hogs, to escape. A few offered their suggestions on how to improve the trap, which included restricting the size of the open top and ensuring it was in the middle, not the sides. Moreover, a number of trappers indicated that the 24-hour check was more than sufficient and mandating that they be checked by a certain time of the day would be difficult for trappers who work other jobs or work overnight. Other comments from trappers highlighted the fact that the proposed change is no better than what is currently in place and the governmental restrictions are too much.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed change, the most common theme was the belief that it is beneficial and helpful. The majority of suggestions posed within these comments mentioned changes to the trap design and an appreciation for the proposed changes. In addition to the comments with suggestions, the other most popular theme was non-trappers mentioning that regardless of the changes, trapping is still inhumane or a specific trap (i.e.: snares, glue traps, leg hold traps) is inhumane and should be banned. The other most common comments were that there needed to be consistent enforcement of the proposed changes and current rules with strong repercussions for breaking the rules and that special permits should be required for all of those that trap.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that trapping is inhumane and should be banned. A few others questioned how changes will be enforced.



## TRAP TYPE VI: CAGE

The concept discussed in this section of the comment tool focuses on cage traps. This type of trap is currently allowed by rule, has no design requirements, no placement requirement, and must be inspected at least once every 24 hours. FWC is seeking to change the guidelines on these traps so that a maximum size would be required and users of this type of trap would need to inspect this trap every morning. The FWC believes that the improvements to this trap would provide clarity on allowed uses, reduce the change of unintended animal capture due to size limitation, and would reduce the likelihood that an animal spends the hottest part of the day in a trap.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. Of the 833 responses to the comment tool, 673 participants responded to the first statement, which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

Of the 673 responses to this Likert-scale question, 57% (n=384) strongly agreed and 18.6% (n=125) agreed, indicating that a majority of participants prefer the proposed changes over the current rules (Table 30).

**TABLE 30. Trap Type VI: Cage**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	384	125	52	44	63	5	673
	57.1%	18.6%	7.7%	6.5%	9.4%	0.7%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	209	180	151	46	62	8	656
	31.9%	27.4%	23%	7%	9.5%	1.2%	100%

We then assessed levels of agreement between trappers and non-trappers. Overall, there were 663 participants who answered the Likert-scale question and also identified what their

relationship to trapping was (Table 31). Of those 663 participants, 481 identified as non-trappers, while 182 identified as a trapper. A majority of non-trappers strongly agree (n=327; 69%) or agree (88; 18.3%) with the proposed changes while 28% (n=51) of trappers strongly agreed or agreed (n=36; 19.8%).

**TABLE 31. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	327	88	33	16	14	3	481
	<b>68%</b>	18.3%	6.9%	3.3%	2.9%	0.6%	100%
Trappers	51	36	18	27	49	1	182
	<b>28%</b>	19.8%	9.9%	14.8%	26.9%	0.5%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	378	124	51	43	63	4	663
	<b>57%</b>	18.7%	7.7%	6.5%	9.5%	0.6%	100%

Following, 656 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 30), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.* Overall, we found the majority of participants indicated that they support the proposed changes with 209 individuals (31.9%) selecting ‘strongly agree,’ and 180 participants (27.4%) of the sample selecting ‘agree.’

Similar to the first Likert-scale question, we also examined support for the proposed changes based on the participants relationship to trapping (Table 32). Of the 673 responses to the Likert-scale question, 646 identified their relationship to trapping. Out of the 646, 471 identified as non-trappers and 175 identified as a trapper. Overall, non-trappers support the proposed changes with 68% (n=327) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 18.3% (n=88) selecting ‘agree.’ A little less than half (47.8%) of trappers indicated they strongly agree (n=51; 28%) or agree (n=36; 19.8%) with the proposed changes.

**TABLE 32. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
			Disagree	Disagree			
Non-Trappers	165	137	127	19	17	6	471
	<b>35%</b>	29.1%	27%	4%	3.6%	1.3%	100%
Trappers	41	42	20	26	45	1	175
	23.4%	24%	11.4%	14.9%	<b>25.7%</b>	0.6%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	206	179	147	45	62	1	646
	31.9%	27.7%	22.8%	7%	9.6%	1.1%	100%

**Additional Comments on Trap Type VI: Cage**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 673 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to cage traps, 58 trappers and 106 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, 18 comments were from individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 36 comments were from individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 4 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Out of the 125 comments left by non-trappers, 13 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 12 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 81 of the comments were from people expressing agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who used the comment box to provide feedback about trap types and trapping in general as well as their opinions on how to regulate. Other trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes left comments with suggestions about the change with a few noting that the change could be tough to enforce and that cages should be checked twice a day. Additionally, comments were left noting that they believe the rules are

better, but they would only support the change if it was not burdensome to trappers, that these traps are widely overused, and that a clearer definition of what the change would do is needed.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Trappers who were in disagreement left comments suggesting that the proposed changes would make it more difficult to trap and trap safely. Specifically, many argued that the changes would be too restrictive to trap larger animals, like coyotes and hogs. Additional comments suggested that they prefer the current rules and there is no need to change them, which includes the sizes of the cage traps and the 24-hour check.

### *Trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

Trappers who selected 'neither agree nor disagree' felt similarly and mentioned that cage traps are overwhelmingly safe and there is no need for restrictions. Some also suggested ensuring that there is water in the cages.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Out of the comments left by non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes for cage traps, the most common theme was participants who support the proposed changes but felt that guidelines needed to be better defined. The majority of suggestions posed within these comments mentioned including non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution as well as more oversight and enforcements of the proposed changes. Other suggestions included, checking cages multiple times a day, following AFWA BMP for trapping, and oversight so that abuse of the traps do not occur. In addition to the comments with suggestions, the other most popular theme was non-trappers mentioning that regardless of the changes, trapping is still inhumane or a specific trap (i.e.: snares, glue traps, leg hold traps) are inhumane and should be banned. These first two common themes were present in the majority of comments left by non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes. Aside from comments with suggestions about the proposed change and those that agreed the rules were better, but still thought trapping or a certain type of trap was inhumane, the other most common comments were non-trappers who agreed the change was a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential, that there needed to be consistent enforcement of the proposed changes and current rules with strong repercussions for breaking the rules, and that special permits should be required for all of those that trap.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that trapping or a specific trap is inhumane and should be banned. They also mentioned there should be continual enforcement of the changes, and that changes may be easy to misunderstand or abuse.

## TRAP TYPE VII: GLUE TRAP

This section on the comment tool asked participants to voice their opinion on the glue trap. Currently the glue trap is not prohibited by rule, there are no design requirements by rule, and no restrictions on placements of the trap. The proposed rule change would prohibit the use of glue traps outdoors. The FWC believes that the proposed change will provide clarity on where this trap can be used, reduce the unintended captures of animals the traps is not seeking to catch, and improve overall animal welfare.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to rank two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. There were 676 responses to the first Likert-scale question (Table 33), which stated: "*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*" Of the 676 responses, 64.4% (n=435) 'strongly agreed' and 13.8% (n=93) agreed that the change would be preferable to what is in place.

**TABLE 33. Trap Type VII: Glue trap**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	435	93	53	31	52	12	676
	<b>64.4%</b>	13.8%	7.8%	4.6%	7.7%	1.8%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	312	163	89	36	49	13	662
	<b>47.1%</b>	24.6%	13.4%	5.4%	7.4%	2%	100%

We then assessed levels of agreement between trappers and non-trappers (Table 34). Overall, there were 667 participants who answered the Likert-scale question and also identified what their relationship to trapping was. Of those 667 participants, 481 identified as non-trappers, while 182 identified as a trapper. Overall, a large majority of non-trappers indicated a preference for the proposed changes over current rules; 74.2% selected 'strongly agree' and 12.7% selected 'agree.' A smaller majority of trappers also expressed agreement

with the proposed change with 36.9% (n=66) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 17.3% (n=31) selecting ‘agree.’

**TABLE 34. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
			Disagree	Disagree			
Non-Trappers	362	62	28	8	25	3	488
	<b>74.2%</b>	12.7%	5.7%	1.6%	5.1%	0.6%	100%
Trappers	66	31	25	22	27	8	179
	<b>36.9%</b>	17.3%	14%	12.3%	15.1%	4.5%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	428	93	53	30	52	11	667
	<b>64.2%</b>	13.9%	7.9%	4.5%	7.8%	1.6%	100%

Next, 662 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 33), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 662 responses, 47.13% (n=312) selected ‘strongly agree’ and 24.62% (n=163) selected ‘agree’ indicating strong support for the proposed changes.

Similar to the first Likert-scale question, we also examined support for the proposed changes based on the participants relationship to trapping (Table 35). Of the 662 responses to the Likert-scale question, 653 identified their relationship to trapping. Out of the 653, 479 identified as non-trappers and 174 identified as a trapper. Overall, both trappers and non-trappers overwhelmingly support the proposed changes. Specifically, about 78% of non-trappers support these changes, with 53% (n=254) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 25.5% (n=122) selecting ‘agree.’ About 52% of trappers indicated support for the proposed changes (n=52; 29.9% ‘strongly agree’ and n= 41; 23.6% ‘agree.’)

**TABLE 35. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	No Opinion	<b>TOTAL</b>
			Disagree	Disagree			
Non-Trappers	254	122	64	12	23	4	479
	<b>53%</b>	25.5%	13.4%	2.5%	4.8%	0.8%	100%
Trappers	52	41	24	23	26	8	174
	<b>29.9%</b>	23.6%	13.8%	13.2%	14.9%	4.6%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	306	163	88	35	49	12	653
	46.9%	25%	13.5%	5.4%	7.5%	1.8%	100%

**Additional Comments on Trap Type VII: Glue Trap**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 676 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to glue traps, 62 trappers and 133 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, 31 comments were from individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 22 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 5 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Of the 133 comments left by non-trappers, 10 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 115 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes was that glue traps should not be used because they are inhumane and indiscriminate. For the trappers who indicated that glue traps should not be used, some agreed with the proposed changes limiting their use outdoors and others felt that there should be a total ban on glue traps. Of the trappers who agreed that these could be used inside, some suggested maintaining a 24-hour trap check and others proposed questions for



consideration or suggested that certain terms needed clarification. One question asked whether small insect specific glue traps could be used outdoors and one comment suggested clarifying the 24-hour trap check.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, the majority of trappers who were in disagreement with the proposed changes argued that glue traps are helpful to catch snails, rats, small iguanas, and mice, so restricting them would make it more difficult to trap. They proposed that instead of totally restricting use, they could be allowed by rule with specific requirements, like being anchored to the ground, only being used outside, or being utilized in a container with small openings for the target animals. Because the changes ultimately made it more difficult for these trappers who use glue traps, they argued that the FWC telling them where they can put a glue trap is too much oversight and regulation.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Similarly to trappers who were in agreement, non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes expressed satisfaction that glue traps would be banned outdoors. These participants expressed that the change is critical for animal welfare. While many non-trappers who were in agreement did indicate that they were satisfied, many still wished that they would be banned altogether because they are indiscriminate and inhumane. Further, many of the comments left by non-trappers in agreement also emphasized that trapping in general is inhumane and should be banned altogether.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Non-trappers who expressed disagreement towards the proposed changes also left comment that were very much in line with non-trappers who were in agreement. The majority of these comments emphasized the inhumane nature of glue traps. Further, these participants mentioned that they were happy with the changes, but that they are not enough noting that glue traps should be banned altogether not just outdoors. While some non-trappers in disagreement focused on glue traps, others also stated that trapping is inhumane and should be banned altogether.

### *Non-trappers who Neither Agreed nor Disagreed*

The most prevalent comments left by non-trappers who neither agreed nor disagreed mirrored the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement and disagreement with the proposed changes. In short, they either noted that glue traps were inhumane, cruel, and indiscriminate and should be banned or that trapping in general was inhumane and should be

banned. Although many of these participants felt that glue traps should be banned altogether, some seemed to be satisfied with banning glue traps outdoors.

SECTION IV: OTHER CHANGES UNDER CONSIDERATION

**PROPOSED CHANGE I: AMOUNT OF TIME ANIMALS MAY BE HELD**

In the fourth section of the comment tool participants were asked to consider the additional changes under consideration. The first concept in this section asked respondents their opinions on the amount of time an animal may be held. Currently any nuisance wildlife being trapped must be relocated offsite or humanely killed offsite within 24 hours of trap inspection. The change under consideration is to shorten the amount of time a person can possess nuisance wildlife for offsite relocation or humane killing purposes. The FWC is proposing that trapped nuisance wildlife that is being relocated offsite or humanely killed must be done within 12 hours of trap inspection. The FWC believes that this would reduce the maximum amount of time an animal spends in a trap or possession of a trapper.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. Of the 833 responses to the comment tool, 686 participants responded to the first Likert-scale (Table 36) which stated: "*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*" Of the 681 responses, 420 participants (61.2%) selected 'strongly agree' and 104 participants, or 15.1% of this sample, selected 'agree.'

**TABLE 36. Concept I: Amount of time animals may be held**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.	420	104	52	44	50	5	11	686
	61.2%	15.2%	7.6%	6.4%	7.3%	0.7%	1.6%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	224	166	162	54	49	4	11	670
	33.4%	24.8%	24.2%	8.1%	7.3%	0.6%	1.6%	100%

Of the 681 responses, 677 participants who responded to the first Likert-scale question also identified their relationship to trapping. Of the responses, 495 identified as non-trappers, while 182 identified as trappers. Overall, non-trappers indicated an overall preference to the proposed changes with 85.5% of non-trappers expressing agreement. More specifically, 70.3% (n=348) selected 'strongly agree' and 15.2% (n=75) selected 'agree.' Similarly, a majority of trappers also indicated preference for the proposed changes although there were a larger percentage of trappers who did prefer the current rules compared to non-trappers. Specifically, 51.6% of trappers selected 'strongly agree' (n=65;35.7%) or 'agree' (n=29; 15.9%).

**TABLE 37. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	348	75	34	12	19	3	4	495
	70.3%	15.2%	6.9%	2.4%	3.8%	0.6%	0.8%	100%
Trappers	65	29	18	31	31	2	6	182
	35.7%	15.9%	9.9%	17%	17%	1.1%	3.3%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	413	104	52	43	50	5	10	677
	61%	15.4%	7.7%	6.4%	7.4%	0.7%	1.5%	100%

Following, 670 participants responded to the second Likert-statement, which stated: *"I support the change under consideration."* Of the 670 responses, 224 participants, or 33.43% of the sample, selected 'strongly agree,' which suggested strong support the changes under consideration (Table 36). Additionally, 166 participants, or 24.8%, selected 'agree.' We also assessed responses to the second Likert-scale statement by each participants relationship to trapping (Table 38). Of the 670 responses to the second Likert-scale statement, 661 of those respondents also identified their relationship to trapping. Overall, we can conclude that the majority of non-trappers generally agree with the proposed changes with 61.3% selecting either 'strongly agree' (n=171;35.3%) or 'agree' (n=126; 26%). Only about 50% of trappers indicated support for the proposed changes with 27.7% (n=49) strongly agreeing and 22.6% (n=40) agreeing to the proposed changes.

**TABLE 38. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	171	126	142	18	20	2	5	484
	<b>35.3%</b>	26%	29.3%	3.7%	4.1%	0.4%	1%	100%
Trappers	49	40	17	35	29	2	5	177
	<b>27.7%</b>	22.6%	9.6%	19.8%	16.4%	1.1%	2.8%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	220	166	159	53	49	4	10	661
	<b>33.3%</b>	25.1%	24.1%	8%	7.4%	0.6%	1.5%	100%

**Additional Comments on Proposed Change I: Amount of Time Animals May be Held**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Out of the 681 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to the amount of time animals may be held, 38 trappers and 118 non-trappers left comments. Out of the trappers who left comments, 14 comments were from individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes and 24 comments were individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes. Of the 118 comments left by non-trappers, 14 were individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 9 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 94 of the comments were in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who used the comment box to provide feedback about these changes, including on animal relocation and the amount of time animals are held after the 24-hour trap-check limit. Comments indicating that animals needed to either be relocated or euthanized right away instead of after an additional 12 hours were the most common.

These respondents suggested that leaving them for an additional 12 hours is still inhumane. Additionally, comments were left noting that they believe the rules are better but they had questions on how the changes help animals. Lastly, among feedback from those in agreement, respondents mentioned that it should be ensured that these rules abide by science, apply to all trappers, and that there should be strong enforcement for rule violations.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Alternatively, trappers who were in disagreement suggested morning checks were too restrictive. They also said the changes would make it more difficult for them to do their jobs for a number of reasons, including the fact that some jobs require animals to be trapped for longer in order to catch a whole family of animals. Others said the 24-hour check is reasonable and most trappers would release or euthanize animals very quickly.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Of the comments left by non-trappers in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common themes were participants who indicated that they support these changes and that the changes would benefit animals and reduce unnecessary deaths. Many suggested that trapping was still inhumane regardless of these changes. Others proposed suggestions and comments similar to trappers, indicating that the fact that animals can be held for up to 12 hours after the 24-hour trap check is still inhumane, or that traps should be checked more than once in the morning. Many others asked for clarification on the changes including a more detailed definition of 'nuisance.' Some of those concerned with animals being held for up to an additional 12 hours suggested immediate release or euthanasia. Lastly, some focused on the fact that all trappers must be held to the same standards and that these rules need to be enforced, although some mentioned the difficulty with enforcement.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that regardless of these changes trapping is still inhumane and that there is no such thing as humane killing. Following, non-trappers also mentioned there should be continual enforcement of the changes, and that changes may be easy to misunderstand or abuse.

## PROPOSED CHANGE II: TIMING OF WILDLIFE TRAP INSPECTION AND DISPOSITION OF TRAPPED WILDLIFE

The proposed change in this section of the comment tool asks participants about the timing of wildlife trap inspection and disposition of trapped wildlife. Currently all wildlife traps must be inspected no less than 24 hours after setting them and captured wildlife must be released, relocated, or humanely killed within 24 hours of trap inspection. The proposed change is to standardize timing in which traps must be inspected. Under the new rule all traps would have to be inspected no later than 11 am each day after the trap is set. Additionally captured nuisance wildlife would have to be released, relocated, or humanely killed within 12 hours of trap inspection. The FWC believes that these improvements would reduce the amount of time a captured animal spends in a trap during the hottest part of the day and facilitates the safe, unharmed release of captured animals.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. 678 participants responded to the first Likert-scale question, which said: "*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*" Of the 678 responses, 411 participants (60.6%) selected 'strongly agree' and 107 participants (15.8%) selected 'agree.'

**TABLE 39. Concept II: Timing of wildlife trap inspection and disposition of trapped wildlife**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change would be preferable to what is currently in place.	411	107	38	39	72	3	8	678
	<b>60.6%</b>	15.8%	5.6%	5.8%	10.6%	0.4%	1.2%	100%
I support the change under consideration	208	174	149	42	71	5	10	659
	<b>31.6%</b>	26.4%	22.6%	6.4%	10.8%	0.8%	1.5%	100%

We then analyzed levels of agreement based on participant relationship to trapping. Of the 678 responses, 677 participants who responded to the first Likert-scale question also identified their relationship to trapping (Table 40). Of the responses, 495 identified as non-trappers, while 182 identified as trappers. Overall, we found an overwhelming majority of non-trappers indicated preference for the proposed changes. Specifically, 71.3% (n=348) selected ‘strongly agree,’ and 16.6% (n=81) selected ‘agree.’ While about 88% of non-trappers seemed to support the proposed changes, the opinions of trappers were a bit more split. Specifically, approximately 35% of trappers indicated preference towards the proposed changes, while about 34% of trappers suggested they preferred the current rules over the proposed changes.

**TABLE 40. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	348	81	24	14	14	3	4	488
	<b>71.3%</b>	16.6%	4.9%	2.9%	2.9%	0.6%	0.8%	100%
Trappers	57	26	14	24	58	0	3	182
	31.3%	14.3%	7.7%	13.2%	<b>31.9%</b>	0	1.6%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	405	107	38	38	72	3	7	670
	60.4%	16%	5.7%	5.7%	10.7%	0.4%	1%	100%

Following, 659 individuals responded to the second Likert scale question, which stated: “*I support the change under consideration.*” Of the 659 responses, a majority indicated overall support for the changes under consideration (Table 39). Specifically, about 32% of the sample selected ‘strongly agree’ and an additional 27% selected ‘agree.’

Lastly, we examined levels of agreement based on each participant’s relationship to trapping (Table 41). Overall, a majority of non-trappers indicated support for the proposed changes. We found 34% (n=162) selected ‘strongly agree,’ and 28.2% (n=134) selected ‘agree.’ This proposed change had less support among trappers with 24.6% (n=43) indicating they ‘strongly agree’ and 22.9% (n=40) who selected ‘agree.’



**TABLE 41. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	162 34%	134 28.2%	132 27.7%	19 4%	17 3.6%	5 1.1%	7 1.5%	476 100%
Trappers	43 24.6%	40 22.9%	14 8%	22 12.6%	54 30.9%	0 0	2 1.1%	175 100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	205 31.5%	174 26.7%	146 22.4%	41 6.3%	71 10.9%	5 0.8%	9 1.4%	651 100%

**Additional Comments on Proposed Change II: Timing of Wildlife Trap Inspection and Disposition of Trapped Wildlife**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Of 675 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to timing of wildlife trap inspection and disposition of trapped wildlife, 51 trappers and 121 non-trappers left comments. Of the trappers who left comments, 10 comments were from individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 37 comments were from individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 4 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Of the 121 comments left by non-trappers, 17 were from individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 1 individual had no opinion, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 97 of the comments were from individuals in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments from trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who used the comment box to say that the changes

needed further clarification. The next most common themes were comments with suggestions about the change and those noting that the change is a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential. Lastly, among feedback from those in agreement, respondents mentioned that there should be policies in place and strong enforcement for rule violations.

#### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Trappers who were in disagreement with the proposed changes shared similar sentiments. Most left comments suggesting that the proposed changes would make it more difficult to trap and trap safely. Other comments highlighted the fact that the proposed change is no better than what is currently in place and that the standard should be AWFA BMP.

#### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Of comments left by non-trappers who support the proposed changes, the most common response was that participants felt that the changes were beneficial. In addition, other non-trappers mentioned that regardless of the changes, trapping is still inhumane. Lastly, they indicated concern about the ability to enforce violations and offered comments on where animals should be relocated.

#### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that trapping or a specific trap is inhumane and should be banned. They also mentioned there should be continual enforcement of the changes, and that changes may be easy to misunderstand or abuse. Another common theme was that the rules are not beneficial to trappers and are no better than what is currently in place.

### PROPOSED CHANGE III: STANDARDIZE HUMANE KILLING OF CAPTURED WILDLIFE

This section of the comment tool asked participants to comment on the proposed change of standardizing humane killing of captured wildlife. Currently the rules do not consistently prescribe the humane killing of captured wildlife. The change would require all trappers to follow guidelines of the American Association of Zoos and Veterinarians or the American Veterinary Medical Association when killing a captured animal. The FWC believes that improvements would only occur if trappers followed the American Association of Zoo Veterinarians or the American Veterinary Medical Association guidelines.

Participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from ‘strongly agree’ to strongly disagree’. ‘No opinion’ and ‘don’t know’ options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. 674 participants responded to the first Likert-scale question, which stated: “*The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place.*”

Of the 674 responses, a large majority supported the proposed changes with about 76% of participants indicating they ‘strongly agree’ (n=414; 61.4%) or ‘agree’ (n=100, 14.8%).

**TABLE 42. Concept III: Standardize humane killing of captured wildlife**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change would be preferable to what is currently in place.	414	100	55	39	56	7	3	674
	<b>61.4%</b>	14.8%	8.2%	5.8%	8.3%	1%	0.5%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	233	162	150	42	59	6	4	656
	<b>35.5%</b>	24.7%	22.9%	6.4%	9%	0.9%	0.6%	100%

Next, we analyzed levels of agreement based on each participant's relationship to trapping (Table 43). Of the 674 responses to the first Likert-scale question, 667 participants also responded to the screening question that asked their relationship to trapping. Of the 667, 486 identified as non-trappers and 181 identified as trappers. Overall, an overwhelming majority (87.7%) of non-trappers indicated preference for the proposed changes. Specifically, 73% (n=355) selected 'strongly agree' and 14.4% (n=70) selected 'agree.' In comparison less than half of the trappers support the proposed changes as 29.3% (n=53) selected 'strongly agree' and 16.6% (n=30) selected 'agree.'

**TABLE 43. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	355	70	29	11	17	2	2	486
	73%	14.4%	6%	2.3%	3.5%	0.4%	0.4%	100%
Trappers	53	30	26	27	39	5	1	181
	29.3%	16.6%	14.4%	14.9%	21.5%	2.8%	0.6%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	408	100	55	38	55	7	3	667
	61.2%	15.0%	8.2%	5.7%	5.7%	1%	0.4%	100%

Next participants were asked to respond to the second Likert-scale question, which stated: "*I support the change under consideration.*" 656 participants responded to this question (Table 42). A majority indicated overall support from the changes under consideration. Specifically, 35.5% (n=233) strongly agreed and 24.7% (n=162) agreed.

Lastly, we examined levels of agreement for the second Likert-scale question based on each participants relationship to trapping (Table 44). Of the 656 responses to this Likert-scale question, 649 identified their relationship to trapping. Of those 649 responses, 475 identified as non-trappers, while 174 identified as trappers. Overall, 66.5% of non-trappers indicated support for the proposed changes compared to 43.7% of trappers. Specifically, 39.8% (n=189) selected 'strongly agree,' and 26.7% (n=127) selected 'agree,' both indicating

support for the proposed changes. In comparison, 43.7% of trappers support these changes, with 23.6% (n=41) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 20.1% (n=35) selecting ‘agree.’

**TABLE 44. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	189	127	121	12	21	2	3	475
	<b>39.8%</b>	26.7%	25.5%	2.5%	4.4%	0.4%	0.6%	100%
Trappers	41	35	26	29	38	4	1	174
	<b>23.6%</b>	20.1%	14.9%	16.7%	21.8%	2.3%	0.6%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	230	162	147	41	59	6	4	649
	<b>35.4%</b>	25%	22.7%	6.3%	9.1%	0.9%	0.6%	100%

**Additional Comments on Proposed Change III: Standardize Humane Killing of Captured Wildlife**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Of the 667 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to standardize humane killing of captured wildlife, 50 trappers and 102 non-trappers left comments. Of the trappers who left comments, 17 comments were from individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 23 comments were from individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 8 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Alternatively, out of the 102 comments left by non-trappers, 23 were from individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 6 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 83 of the comments were from those expressing support for the proposed changes.

### *Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were individuals who used the comment box to provide suggestions about the proposed changes, including requiring trappers to complete a FACA euthanasia course or ensuring that they are trained in the proposer euthanasia techniques. Many others either asked for clarification or posed questions about the changes, including asking how these changes would be enforced. Lastly, among feedback from those in agreement, trappers mentioned that it should be ensured that these rules abide by science, apply to all trappers, and that should be strong enforcement for rule violations.

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Most of the trappers in disagreement left comments suggesting that the proposed changes would make it more difficult to trap and trap safely and that the changes were unrealistic. Others thought that there should be a clearer definition of humanely killing an animal and clarification on what is allowed. Additional comments highlighted the fact that the proposed change is not beneficial to trappers and in turn will be one that is knowingly or unknowingly abused.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme among comments from non-trappers who supported the proposed changes agreed that the change was a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential. The majority of suggestions posed within these comments mentioned including non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution as well as more oversight and enforcements of the proposed changes and a need to clearly define what humane was. In addition to the comments with suggestions, the other most popular theme was mentioning that regardless of the changes, trapping is still inhumane or a specific trap (i.e.: snares, glue traps, leg hold traps) are inhumane and should be banned. Other comments were that there needed to be consistent enforcement of the proposed changes and current rules with strong repercussions for breaking the rules and that the definition of humane killing will allow for better oversight.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similarly to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was that trapping or a specific trap is inhumane and should be banned. They also mentioned there should be continual enforcement of the changes and that changes may be easy to misunderstand or abuse. Moreover, they stated that the changes made for more rules and regulations but did not make for better changes to trapping.

## PROPOSED CHANGE IV: RULE PROVISION DEVIATIONS

The proposed change participants were asked to comment on in this section was to specify under what circumstances deviations of rule provisions would be allowed. Currently special permits are issued to provide for deviations in allowed trap types, sizes, placement, and locations. If the proposed change occurred, a limited set of entities would be eligible to request rule provision deviations for restricted purposes only. The following are allowed to request a deviation: a government entity, a bona fide land management, nonprofit organization, or a private landowner enrolled in an FWC approved state or federal wildlife conservation program using the deviation to achieve compliance with management plan terms that address imperiled species, habitat restoration or other wildlife conservation objectives specified in the management plan. The following purposes would be considered for a rule provision deviation, The recovery or protection of imperiled species listed under Rule 68A-27.003, F.A.C., the restoration of game species as part an FWC-approved state or federal wildlife conservation program management plan addressing a public safety threat, managing, or controlling non-native or invasive species. The FWC believes that these improvements will bring transparency to those that use traps and that the public would be able to examine requirements in the rule more easily. This would also allow for flexibility for unique trapping circumstances.

Overall, participants were asked to respond to two statements using a Likert-scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to strongly disagree'. 'No opinion' and 'don't know' options were also provided. The statements asked participants whether they believed the proposed changes were better than what was currently in place and whether they supported the proposed changes. A total of 645 participants responded to the first statement (Table 45), which stated: *"The change under consideration would be preferable to what is currently in place."*

Of the 636 responses to this question, 53% (n=337) of the sample, selected 'strongly agree' and 17.5% (n=111) selected 'agree' indicating a strong preference for the proposed changes over the current rules.

**TABLE 45: Concept IV: Rule provision deviations**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
The change would be preferable to what is currently in place.	337	111	81	41	52	9	14	636
	<b>53%</b>	17.5%	12.7%	6.5%	8.2%	1.4%	2.2%	100%
I support the change under consideration.	172	165	177	44	48	9	14	620
	27.7%	26.6%	<b>28.6%</b>	7.1%	7.7%	1.4%	2.26%	100%

Next, we analyzed levels of agreement for the first Likert-scale question based on each participant’s relationship to trapping (Table 46). Of the 645 responses to the first Likert-scale question, 639 participants also responded to the screening question that asked their relationship to trapping. Of the 639, 464 identified as non-trappers and 175 identified as trappers.

Of the 639 responses, over 80% of non-trappers indicated preference for the proposed changes, compared to only 39% of trappers. To break these numbers down further, among non-trappers, 62.9% (n=292) selected ‘strongly agree,’ and 17.9% (n=83) selected ‘agree’. Among trappers, 23.4% (n=41) selected ‘strongly agree’ and 15.7% (n=27) selected ‘agree.’



**TABLE 46. Change is preferable to what is currently in place by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	292 <b>62.9%</b>	83 17.9%	46 9.9%	14 3%	16 3.4%	6 1.3%	7 1.5%	464 100%
Trappers	41 <b>23.4%</b>	27 15.7%	35 20%	26 14.9%	36 20.6%	3 1.7%	7 4%	175 100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	333 52.1%	110 17.2%	81 12.7%	40 6.3%	52 8.1%	9 1.4%	14 2.2%	639 100%

Next, 629 individuals responded to the second Likert-scale question (Table 45), which stated: *“I support the change under consideration.”* Of the 629 participants who responded to the second Likert-scale statement, a majority indicated that they supported the proposed changes by either selecting ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree.’ Specifically, 27.3% (n=172) of the sample selected ‘strongly agree,’ and 26.2% (n=165) selected ‘agree.’

Lastly, we examined levels of agreement for the second Likert-scale question based on each participant’s relationship to trapping (Table 47). Of the 645 responses to this Likert-scale question, 623 identified their relationship to trapping. Of those 623 responses, 475 identified as non-trappers, while 169 identified as trappers. Among from non-trappers, nearly 60% indicated support for the proposed changes, with 30.4% (n=138) selecting ‘strongly agree’ and 29.1% (n=132) selecting ‘agree.’ Among trappers, the most common response was ‘neither agree nor disagree’ (n=38;22.5%).

**TABLE 47. I support the change under consideration by trappers vs. non-trappers**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK	No Opinion	TOTAL
Non-Trappers	138 <b>30.4%</b>	132 29.1%	137 30.2%	20 4.4%	14 3.1%	6 1.3%	7 1.5%	454 100%
Trappers	31 18.3%	33 19.5%	38 <b>22.5%</b>	23 13.6%	34 20.1%	3 1.8%	7 4.1%	169 100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	169 27.1%	165 26.5%	175 28.1%	43 6.9%	48 7.7%	9 1.4%	14 2.2%	623 100%

**Additional Comments on Proposed Change IV: Rule Provision Deviations**

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through a comment box with a 250-character limit, which stated: *“If you have any additional comments on the rule change above, please provide them in the following textbox.”*

Of the 636 respondents who answered at least one of the two Likert-scale questions on the proposed changes to rule provision deviations, 39 trappers and 86 non-trappers left comments. Of the trappers who left comments, 13 comments were from individuals who were generally in agreement with the proposed changes, 24 comments were from individuals who generally disagreed with the proposed changes, and 2 comments were from individuals who neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed changes. Of the 86 comments left by non-trappers, 13 were from individuals who disagreed with the proposed changes, 2 were from individuals that had no opinion, 11 neither agreed nor disagreed, and 60 of the comments were from individuals in agreement with the proposed changes.

*Trappers in Agreement*

The most common theme found in the comments of trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes were providing feedback about these changes and trapping, including not killing native species to increase game species, and making the data public. Others noted that these guidelines must be very clear and some asked questions, like how university research would be used. Other comments mentioned that it should be ensured that these

rules abide by science, not allow special permits, and to allow special blanket permits for specific trap types for professional trappers who have many contracts at once (i.e.: for hog trapping snares and foot snares).

### *Trappers in Disagreement*

Trappers who were in disagreement with the proposed changes left comments suggesting that the proposed changes would make it more difficult to trap because they were too restrictive. The Florida Farm Bureau Federation specifically stated that there should be an exemption for large agricultural operations, while others suggested exemptions for nuisance trappers. A number mentioned that it was too much control and an infringement on land-owner rights.

### *Non-trappers in Agreement*

Non-trappers who the proposed changes generally felt that guidelines needed to be better defined. The majority of suggestions posed within these comments mentioned including education, training, and oversight/enforcements of the proposed changes. Other suggestions included a definition of what nuisance is and permits for housing and other living associations. In addition to the comments with suggestions, the other most popular theme was mentioning that regardless of the changes, trapping is still inhumane and should be banned. Other comments agreed the change was a good idea, beneficial, helpful, and/or essential while others sought clarification on the definition of a nuisance wildlife animal.

### *Non-trappers in Disagreement*

Similar to the comments left by non-trappers who were in agreement with the proposed changes, the most common comments left by non-trappers in disagreement was the fact that trapping or a specific trap is inhumane and should be banned.

## SECTION V: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

After the Likert-scale questions respondents were provided the opportunity to give additional feedback through two comment boxes with a 700-character limit each. The questions asked were: “*What else should the FWC consider as it develops modernizations to trapping rules?*” and “*How would the changes under consideration affect you?*”

Of the 833 respondents, 108 trappers and 316 non-trappers responded to the comment boxes in section V.

### *Feedback on Question 1 from Trappers*

Both trappers and non-trappers provided many suggestions in response to the first question posed in section five, which asked participants what else should the FWC consider as it develops modernizations to trapping rules. Overall, trappers suggested that the FWC should keep the rules as they currently are. They argued that trappers know what they are doing and too much regulation makes their jobs harder, which is something many trappers touched on in the second question in section five. Many trappers felt this way because they believe the proposed changes will make it harder to do their jobs, thus they posed the following suggestions: (1) keeping a 24-hour trap check, (2) allowing larger traps for larger animals, (3) allow snares other than those with relaxing locks, as relaxing locks can do more harm than good, (4) a grandfather in date, (5) drop permit requirements for steel traps, (6) consider relaxing rules on non-lethal traps, and (7) dropping the requirements for larger personal properties and large agricultural operations. While a majority of trappers indicated that the rules are fine as is some did indicate that a few of the proposed changes could be helpful including the training requirements and eliminating special permits.

Alternatively, some advocated for less regulation all around. Many of these comments mentioned allowing more lenient rules for coyotes and invasive species and opening trapping for game management. Other suggestions included, (1) greater consideration on trapping and euthanizing invasive reptiles, (2) allow the taking of red/gray fox. relaxing rules around bobcat release, (3) consider animal welfare and the conservation of native species (4) courses on humane wildlife conflict resolution should be provided, (5) making sure trainers for educational courses offered are qualified, (6) allowing trappers to have a grace period to adjust if these rules are implemented. While most trappers emphasized more lenient rules, a couple advocated for twice a day trap check and prohibiting the use of steel traps, snares, and cable restraints. Lastly, the Florida Farm Bureau does not want changes implemented because it will make it harder for farmers and ranchers to manage nuisance species.

### *Feedback on Question 1 from Non-trappers*

While trappers suggested loosening regulations, overall non-trappers argued that traps should be banned, and if not, there should be more strict regulation and enforcement. First, a majority of feedback from non-trappers suggested banning trapping, or banning specific traps that are inhumane, including foothold and foot-enclosed traps, body-gripping traps, snares, steel traps, and glue traps. Other comments mentioned restricting the location traps are allowed by banning them the use in Florida panther and black bear habitats. However, other non-trappers suggested that there should be stricter regulation around trapping, especially when using lethal traps. For example, some of the comments suggested requiring permits and fees for all trapping or just traps that are lethal and cause direct harm. Others mentioned increasing enforcement, increasing staffing for enforcement, and increasing penalties for rules violations. Additionally, other non-trappers mentioned that the FWC should move to integrate non-lethal wildlife conflict resolution methods, including a training course, require that traps have ID registration, consider relocation instead of euthanasia, and to require traps be checked twice daily. A number of non-trappers mentioned that there needs to be better, more clear language used by the FWC. Examples of this include improving the definition of nuisance and clearer trap check times. Lastly, some trappers just mentioned that the FWC should consider wildlife, but overall expressed support for the changes.

### *Feedback on Question 2 from Trappers*

While both trappers and non-trappers left feedback on question 1, there were no non-trappers who left feedback on question 2. That said, a large proportion of trappers indicated that the changes would make it harder to trap because the proposed changes would limit the effectiveness of the traps that they use. More specifically many said that it would be harder to trap larger animals like coyotes, which harm turkey and deer, and harder to trap invasive species and nuisance wildlife. Because it would be harder to trap and there would be more restrictions and time constraints, most of the trappers indicated that they would be less productive, which would harm their business and limit their income. Further, because it would become harder to trap some trappers mentioned that they would have to hunt animals more instead of safely and effectively trapping. Additionally, other trappers mentioned that some of these restrictions are not feasible for large properties and large agricultural operations. Similarly, some trappers suggested that it was too much agency overreach, the changes would be costly for trappers to adapt all their equipment, that they would not trap anymore, and that the changes would effectively make them a criminal.

Alternatively, some trappers indicated that the changes would have a positive effect on them. Many said that the proposed changes were all more humane and improvements to the current rules. Trappers who said that these changes would positively impact them said the

changes were beneficial and that they would spend more time trapping and to continue to have a successful career or better manage natural resources and their property. Lastly, some said that the proposed changes to traps, like allowing footholds, would make trapping more effective and more cost effective to remove nuisance species.