

TO: Senator Edward Meyer, Co-chair, Representative Linda Gentile, Co-chair, and  
Members of the Environment Committee  
FROM: Dr. Nan Zyla, President, HARP, Inc. ([skyharp@yahoo.com](mailto:skyharp@yahoo.com)), (860) 767-2196)  
RE: OPPOSE S.B. 1018, An Act Concerning Enforcement of Environmental  
Conservation Laws, Provision to legalize snares  
DATE: March 8, 2013

HARP strongly OPPOSES the provision in S.B. 1018 that would allow the use of  
SNARES.

SNARES HAVE BEEN BANNED IN CONNECTICUT SINCE 1955 with good reason:  
they are terribly CRUEL, INHUMANE AND BARBARIC. Overturning the ban on  
snares would be a throwback to the pre-1955 era, and would be a very bad idea. Snares  
are currently BANNED in Arizona, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Oklahoma,  
Rhode Island, and Vermont. Snares are also explicitly BANNED for use on land in the  
following states: Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina,  
Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Wisconsin.

SNARES ARE INHUMANE: Snares are barbaric, primitive wire nooses. The small  
victims of neck snares may lose consciousness from STRANGULATION after struggling  
for up to ten minutes, but bigger animals, such as coyotes, may SUFFER FOR DAYS or  
die from the damage inflicted days after release! A Wildlife Society study using snares  
concluded that "SNARES ARE NOT HUMANE DEVICES FOR  
TRAPPING...BECAUSE OF THE PROLONGED TIME UNTIL DEATH."

SNARES ARE INDISCRIMINATE: In a published study of SNARES SET  
SPECIFICALLY FOR COYOTES conducted by the Wildlife Society with the USDA,  
researchers found that 91 NONTARGET DEER AND 6 DOMESTIC COWS OR  
CALVES WERE ACCIDENTALLY CAPTURED. The authors concluded that "efforts  
to snare coyotes [should] not be conducted in areas frequented by deer or livestock."

WHAT ARE THE POPULATION NUMBERS FOR COYOTES? WHAT IS THE  
SCIENTIFIC BASIS for this regressive, retrograde idea to allow snares? The title of the  
bill sounds good, but snares cannot be used "for environmental conservation" because  
snares are INDISCRIMINATE in the types of animals caught. What is being "conserved"  
if pet dogs or cattle can be caught in snares?

The company literature for a type of snare called "the Collarum" states that it is "100%  
canine specific," but that "animals other than canines are very unlikely to be caught."  
This contradicts the findings referenced above. It also states, "an unknowing human is at  
little risk." A 1999 study is noted, stating, "70% of coyotes caught showed no significant  
injuries." What was the sample size so we can figure out how many animals 70%  
represents? How many animals make up the 30% WITH significant damage? And how is  
"no significant damage" defined??

Every animal has an important role to play in the ecosystem, either as predator or prey. Coyotes are an important predator, and are valuable in controlling prey species such as deer. Natural selection works to regulate wildlife populations when habitat and food resources can no longer support the “carrying capacity” of a species, and the numbers of that species begin to decline. Using unnatural – and inhumane – methods of killing animals with snares removes the healthiest individuals, rather than those who are aged or sick. Scientific research has shown that when animals such as coyotes are removed from the environment, populations rebound.

DEEP has a financial interest in listening only to the 2% of state residents who hunt or trap because of the sale of hunting or trapping licenses. In contrast, 98% of Connecticut’s taxpayers do not hunt or trap. HARP abhors cruelty, inhumanity, lack of compassion and the promotion of violence in every form, including trapping and using snares.

HUMANE ALTERNATIVES to snares involve individual responsibility in taking actions such as securing trash and supervising pets. Humane alternatives also can include a contraception program, and live-trapping and relocation.