

YES on SB 31: Protect Colorado's Wild Cats VALUES OF COLORADO VOTERS

Trophy hunters kill hundreds of mountain lions and thousands of bobcats in Colorado each year. Multiple surveys, polls and economic data analysis show that Colorado voters support prohibiting this practice. SB 31 will prohibit the trophy hunting and trapping of wild cats, upholding the interests of Colorado's wildlife and the public majority.

Surveys and polls consistently show that Coloradans **oppose** trophy hunting of wild cats

- 69% oppose the recreational hunting of mountain lions July 2020
- 72% oppose the trophy hunting of mountain lions December 2020
- 71% oppose the trophy hunting or trapping of bobcats December 2020
- 62% support legislation to end the trophy hunting and trapping of mountain lions and bobcats January 2021

Even a 2019 poll from the pro-hunting National Shooting Sports Foundation found similar results:

66% of Americans oppose hunting animals for a trophy (71% of Westerners) and 65% of all Westerners oppose trapping for recreation, 64% oppose it for fur clothing, and 58% oppose it to make money

Species are worth more alive than dead for Colorado's booming ecotourism industry

Trophy hunters depend largely on funding provided by others (such as from federal taxes) in order to hunt trophy animals.¹ The costs of administering hunting and trapping can exceed the cost from license sales.²

Numbers of wildlife watchers continue to increase nationwide. According to the National Park Service, in 2020:

- Colorado had 6 million park visitors.
- Visitors spent \$392 million in local gateway regions while visiting NPS lands in Colorado.
- Wildlife tourism supported 5,560 jobs, \$204 million in labor income, \$353 million in value added, and \$586 million in economic output in the Colorado economy.³

According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, outdoor recreation in Colorado generated \$9.6 billion for the state's economy in 2020. Of that, hunting, shooting, and trapping combined generated less than 1% of the total outdoor recreation dollars spent in Colorado.⁴

Species like bobcats also have significant ecotourism value beyond their pelt prices. In one study, the authors calculated that a single bobcat in one year's time in Yellowstone National Park was valued at \$308,105, a figure 1,000 times greater than a bobcat's pelt price of \$315.5

Fur trapping has no place in modern society as the fur market is bottoming out

The number of trappers in America is in rapid decline because they have failed to recruit new members; the practice is socially unacceptable, and falling pelt prices mean that trapping is not lucrative.⁶ The number of prominent apparel companies that have announced fur-free policies continues to grow, and it includes Nieman Marcus, Saks Fifth Avenue, Nordstrom, Macy's, Prada, Bloomingdale's, Gucci and Elle magazine.

Fur sales have already been banned in Boulder, Colorado, as well as California, Israel, and the cities of Ann Arbor, Michigan; Hallandale Beach, Florida; and Weston, Wellesley and Brookline, Massachusetts.

Pass SB 31 and ban the trophy hunting of Colorado's wild cats to align our state with the values of its residents

sheets/ORSA%20-%20Colorado.pdf (2020).

¹ Cameron Murray, "Trophy Hunters of Native Carnivores Benefit from Wildlife Conservation Funded by Others," A report for the Humane Society of the United States https://www.humanesociety.org/sites/default/files/docs/HSUS_Trophy-Hunting-Economics-2020.pdf (2020).

² Ibid.

³ "National Park Spending Effects (2020)," https://www.nps.gov/subjects/socialscience/vse.htm (2022).

⁴ Dept. of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis, "Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account, Colorado, 2020," https://apps.bea.gov/data/special-topics/orsa/summary-

⁵ L. Mark Elbroch et al., "Contrasting Bobcat Values," *Biodiversity and Conservation* (2017). ⁶ Javan M. Bauder et al., "Identifying and Controlling for Variation in Canid Harvest Data," *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 84, no. 7 (2020); J. B. Armstrong and A. N. Rossi, "Status of Avocational Trapping Based on the Perspectives of State Furbearer Biologists," Wildlife Society Bulletin 28, no. 4 (2000).