

From: [Cory Gaines](#)
To: [Statewide Initiatives](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Comment for the Title Board regarding Initiative 91, "Prohibit Trophy Hunting"
Date: Friday, October 13, 2023 2:43:38 PM

To the Colorado State Title Board,

My name is Cory Gaines. I am a resident of Colorado living in Logan County.

I am hoping to attend the 10/18 meeting remotely and offer my comment to you there, but as a teacher, I'm not sure if I'll be able to participate. As such, I'm going to send you my comment in written form. If I am able to be remotely at the hearing, I will be referencing this email and will touch on the high spots then.

I'm writing regarding Initiative 91 and some comments that I, as a member of the general public, have regarding the language therein. I think there are some things that deserve some clarity for everyday voters.

I'm not a hunter (I do like to target shoot), so I'm not sure about this, but do people hunt any big cats for meat? I'll be honest and say that I'm guessing they don't. I do know a fair number of hunters and I've never heard of someone hunting big cats to eat them, but if that does happen, what does this initiative say about that practice? In other words, if someone did hunt one of these cats and was intending to eat some or all of it, would this initiative make it illegal?

Second, and perhaps this is defined in some other area of law, but as someone who is not a lawyer, I ask myself where the line is with regard to (and here I quote the [final draft](#) on the Initiative Tracker page) trophy hunting not including " ANY ACT SPECIFIED IN SUBSECTION (2)(a) OF THIS SECTION IF IT WAS CONDUCTED IN THE DEFENSE OF HUMAN LIFE, LIVESTOCK, REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY, OR A MOTOR VEHICLE PURSUANT TO SECTION 33-3-106 AND APPROPRIATE NONLETHAL METHODS HAVE BEEN USED AS DEFINED BY THE COMMISSION, EXCEPT THAT LETHAL MEANS MAY BE USED TO DEFEND HUMAN LIFE"

That is, I wonder the following:

Is there some clarity with regard to how one is to know exactly when a big cat is a threat to human life, livestock, real or personal property, or a motor vehicle?

Is there some clarity with regard to how one is to know what falls under real or personal property or a motor vehicle? This may sound absurd, but if someone is to face a penalty for it, we should examine questions like "can I shoot a mountain lion that is about to scratch my car?"

Is there some clarity here for ranchers regarding when they could kill a big cat that is menacing their, say, sheep? It almost seems by the language above, that a rancher would have to try non lethal means first. Does that apply to a car and a home too?

For ordinary voters to assess whether or not they think this initiative would be appropriate, I think a great deal of clarity is needed as to the boundaries I outline above. My guess is that a

great number of voters are okay with killing a mountain lion or other cat who would harm a human. Some would break on the question of livestock. Others would break on the question of a pet. Still others would break on the question of scratching a car, if that's how they understood the language above.

Additionally, you must consider the language here in the wake of the initiative about introducing wolves. Did the voters then understand that nonlethal means would have to be tried against wolves prior to taking them if they hurt livestock? Would they carry that same thought here? Would they shy from voting for this because they now know about how wolves got handled?

These are questions that need to be answered prior to this going to the public for signatures.
Thank you,

Cory