

International Wildlife Conservation Council Subcommittee Meetings
September 26, 2018
8:30-11:30 am

Committee members present:

- Bill Brewster (Chair) - former U.S. Congressman from Oklahoma
- Jenifer Chatfield (Vice-Chair) - congressional Science Fellow & ACZM board
- Ivan Carter - Founder of Ivan Carter Wildlife Conservation Alliance
- Jeffery Crane (alternative member) - president, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation
- Cameron Hanaes - author and bow-hunting enthusiast
- Peter Lewis Horn II - author and outfitter
- Mike Ingram - Founder & Chairman of El Dorado Holdings, Inc.
- John Jackson - President of Conservation Force
- Keith Mark - Host of MacMillian River Adventures
- Olivia Opre - Wildlife conservationist, show host, and travel consultant
- Erica Rhoad - Director of hunting policy, National Rifle Association
- Denise Welker - Sport hunting enthusiast
- Todd Willens - Assistant Deputy Secretary of the Interior
- Rowena Watson - Foreign Affairs Office, U.S. Department of State

USFWS Facilitator: Eric Alvarez

Notetakers: Emma Gorenberg & Kara Dziwulski

Introduction - Subcommittee Meeting Rules:

Eric Alvarez

- Cannot have the full committee together at one time or would be against FACA rules - that is why it is split into 2 sessions
- Anyone can attend, the chair can recognize someone for a comment, however, only committee members can vote
- Chairs of subcommittees can have a conference. Sub-committees can also call on someone to provide information to them (technical experts)

Conservation Subcommittee

Chair: Denise Welker

Other Subcommittee Members:

Ivan Carter

Bill Brewster

Jenifer Chatfield

Peter Horn

Chris Hudson

John Jackson

Olivia Opre

Rowena Watson (Department of State)

Opening statement: Human-wildlife conflict is a priority for conservation and community involvement should be emphasized

Highlighted the 24lion (<https://www.24lions.org/>) conservation story:

- Conservation success story implemented and funded by hunting outfitters in Mozambique
- Hunting community has reclaimed 2.5 million acres of viable lion habitat
- Efforts started in 1995, when loss/lack of infrastructure meant that subsistence agriculture and poaching was the only food source
 - By engaging the community, areas can recover
 - WWF started looking at data and herd numbers, which have increased with community engagement and anti-poaching, which are equally important
 - A purely anti-poaching effort doesn't work, communities need to be engaged so that they see value in their wildlife (e.g. evidenced by current issues with rhino poaching)
 - Part of their conservation model is distributing meat back to the community to decrease subsistence poaching
- The lion is an iconic species, and the hunting community is being blamed for demise, but habitat degradation and human-wildlife conflict (due to cattle predation) are the underlying causes of lion declines
- Apex predators were not returning to the landscape naturally, so put a researcher on the ground to ask:
 - Why did the lions disappear?
 - Is the current habitat viable to support them (habitat pressures & what resources available)?

- A combination of research and community engagement has led to conservation progress and success in Mozambique
 - 6 males and 18 female, free-ranging lions were introduced into an engaged community (15 collared and monitored animals)
 - When 1 was snared, tribal uproar occurred against the poacher, resulting in the largest sentencing yet. Emphasises the need for community engagement - this happened because poaching became personal for the people in the community.
 - Now, 2 females are pregnant and the program is successful
- The program was based in an ecologically broken community
 - 130 local jobs created by building hunting community around return of the lions to the community
 - When you protect community for the lion you increase security for other species, the tribal economy also improves
- Oxford predator forecast models are supportive of increases in wildlife numbers
- Central goal is to represent how the lions are contributing to the community – requires shaping of the story to show how an apex predator would be helpful
 - This model for world exposure has succeeded in Rwanda with gorilla efforts
- There is a desire for **key performance indicators (KPIs)**, which respond to the importance of the need to *measure* how their projects are impacting the ecosystem
- Tribal partnership is usually overlooked but is critical to the program's success

Comments:

- Who is getting to see the results from this study?
 - Nat Geo will be doing a spread on this - have Nat Geo correspondent focusing on the community engagement aspect
 - Cabela's Family Foundation financially supported the study.
 - Lions were originally supposed to come from Zimbabwe in 2017, but the government put a stop on all international game movement (still banned today). To comply with donor satisfaction, they went to South Africa and found free-range populations (Kruger, Kalihari game reserves), identified by genetics, and introduced them. None were farmed lions.
- The total world-wide wild lion population is not well documented – 20,000 is an understatement which does not include total lion populations in Tanzania and Mozambique. Believe 30,000 is more accurate. Must be cautious when presenting numbers.

- Could an annual anniversary party provide positive press for how hunting is improving these communities?
 - Be open about the number of pregnant females, and the number of animals poached
 - Want to establish a following based around website
 - Similar idea works successfully in Rwanda - annual baby gorilla naming ceremony. Considered an honor to attend. Given, the public support for these animals it is very hard for people to lay a hand on them without punishment.
- Has bringing back the apex predator helped the habitat become a better place?
 - Because the lions are there (in Tanzania) there is no cattle present which has prevented the evidence of human-wildlife conflict
- Public has put lions on a pedestal but don't really understand the true conservation issues they are facing
- First study of it's kind surveying an area before and after apex predator introduction
 - Byron Du Preez (zoologist researcher) is trying to now quantify the role that these lions are playing for help of the ecosystem developing and implementing KPI's.
 - **Goal for KPI's to provide framework to measure the impact of conservation efforts.**
- **Has USFWS or any other government agency provided any funding to this study?**
 - No, and comments on the current lack of grant money available for most big cat species - especially lions.
 - Comment from State Department: Cannot say "no government assistance" if didn't ask for it (which they didn't)
 - Been trying to pass a "big-cat act" for decades but can't get it passed by congress. ESA does not support foreign species, etc. Might be a chance to get money from USAID
 - Does the State Department have any grants for cats like lions?
- What was the policy for bringing in the lions?
 - No policy in place when program initiated, it is a "learning by doing" based on previous models in Zimbabwe and South Africa
 - They worked extensively with ANAC (equivalent of fish and game) to get permits, develop veterinary protocols, and expedite customs and immigration (as lions can only be sedated for 10.5 hours total).
- How many lions can the area support? At what point will the population hit carrying capacity and allow for hunting?

- Not sure. Scientific investigation is ongoing to monitor this, using models to predict this. Acknowledge that might need to be adjusted in the future for potential disease outbreaks, drought, etc.
- Key is bringing in researchers who can measure this and re-introduce this model across Africa
- Biggest lesson from this is the necessary relationship with tribal communities for successful conservation. Also, can't just re-introduce animals like this and walk away. Constant management. Also, increased anti-poaching patrol costs.
- Recognition that they do have a unique piece of property and a unique circumstance that wouldn't work everywhere
- **Conservation Force has drafted an 8 page document on the benefits of lion hunting (peer reviewed), available soon**

Potential Proposed Recommendations for Full Committee:

- **Congressional funding for lions**
- Important to highlight where the money came from for 24lion study so public knows know the reason why all of this happened is because of the hunting community. This model was only successful because a sustainable-use model is at the foundation

Enforcement/Trafficking Subcommittee

Chair: Ivan Carter

Other Committee Members:

Bill Brewster

Jenifer Chatfield

Peter Horn

Denise Welker

Rowena Watson (Department of State)

Opening Statement: How does the pursuit of trophy-hunting as a whole positively contribute to anti-poaching efforts, as it is the greatest threat to African wildlife?

- How does the hunting model through anti-poaching lead to more animals and healthier ecosystems?
- Desire for a potential mandate for a bonafide anti-poaching team in every location where trophy hunting is allowed
- There needs to be world education in place to understand the difference between poaching and hunting
- How can the hunting model lead towards anti-poaching and conservation?
- Real world examples of how the import of trophies has led to anti-poaching on the front line and habitat conservation then it is important.
- Use KPIs to determine what anti-poaching approach is best (e.g. identify cost per arrest for anti-poaching efforts, what anti-poaching efforts are actually successful). Create a lesson plan to train others (e.g. series of exams) and coach people on how to build capacity across Africa. Even potential to rent anti-poaching dogs.
 - Ivan Carter Wildlife Conservation Alliance currently does this with 49 different African countries though SA University.

Comments:

- How would we define bonafide?
 - Would need to be year-round, people would need to get official training, KPI's developed, and measurable education outcomes
- Need to get the public to differentiate commercial poaching and subsistence poaching for bushmeat.
 - Bushmeat can be consumed to save people's families
 - There is a need for a healthy alternative food source to prevent subsistence poaching

- When elephant hunting in Botswana stopped, there was loss of meat, jobs, and revenue going directly to local communities.
 - How do you replace that protein resource to the community so they don't turn to subsistence poaching?
 - Meat distribution must be a part of anti-poaching efforts
- **Proposal: If you are a hunting outfitter you should only receive an export permit if there is a trained anti-poaching effort in place.**
 - Need for 3rd party accreditation process that could be tracked for prosecution purposes, that is uncomplicated and encompasses (1) community benefit via a meat distribution plan and (2) an anti-poaching team
 - Efforts must be market-sustainable
- How would the accreditation costs be paid?
 - Ultimately an additional cost for the hunter - but technically they are already paying for it anyhow.
- **How does the import of an elephant trophy lead to anti-poaching?**
 - **Through an accreditation system that would easily allow you to know the outfitter is enhancing the population in the wild through anti-poaching**
 - **Accreditation needs to be credible and accepted by U.S. Importing Authorities (USFWS) - only way this would be viewed as valuable for an outfitter implement and a hunter to participate in is to know it would result in being able to import their trophy into the U.S. without question**
 - **Key species will still require close monitoring by USFWS in import process**
 - **Country will issue the export permit CITES requirement. Are they doing the enhancement, non-detriment? If we see this accreditation would this give USFWS the stamp to sign off on the import?**
- Does accreditation program need to be created by a 3rd party or group of entities separate from conflict of interest?
 - Program can't come from someone with a "dog in the hunt" - if so, credibility would suffer
- **Does an outfitter who is spending millions of dollars yearly on anti-poaching vs. an outfitter that does nothing to stop poaching deserve equal ability to import?**
 - Ideally, no. Another reason for anti-poaching accreditation
- **Issue does not lie with exporting - no desire to change current permitting process in Africa. The true issue lies with the U.S. and the USFWS' importing criteria**

- **Believe USFWS needs to look into who specifically is doing their job on an area-by-area determination (not country-by-country or animal-by-animal determination)**
- **Ultimate goal is import of the trophy. If importation can not occur, people will spend their money elsewhere.**
- Who is going to be the person monitoring that people are meeting the accreditations?
 - Needs to be an independent third-party. Can't rely on governments or the outfitters to monitor the accreditation.
 - Do not want a "smoke and mirrors" game - people technically meeting the accreditation requirements without actually putting in the work.
 - Potential for universities (e.g. SA Wildlife College) to provide these accreditation training programs, but ultimate responsibility is on the hunting groups to make sure these accreditations stick. Self-policing by professional hunting associations.
 - Need to have proprietary or won't have long-term credibility. Can't just have one company implementing the accreditation - more like a group of businesses responsible for accrediting
 - **Want to get the point where USFWS can trust this accreditation so much it can be viewed almost like a high school diploma**
- African governments policing the hunting would need to buy into the accreditation as they have to issue the export permits
 - They would probably want input on the accreditation components and how it is implemented. **Won't help USFWS if the exporting countries themselves don't buy into it. This would give more credit on the export permit - because of this not sure a third party system will work?**
- **There is a need to prove to the general public that every animal imported into the country has benefited the species in the wild through anti-poaching**
 - Mandate this? How?
 - Boots-on-the-ground and meat distribution - how do we quantify this?
 - Also want public to say the import contributed to science, not just money getting passed around
 - **You might be able to market this accreditation effectively if the people who go through this accreditation get import permits**
 - **There is currently no standard to prove where the good conservation is coming from**
- Public needs to be aware of the fact that hunting feeds local communities - people in these communities can't just go to the local supermarket for food

- North American model of hunting was created around the idea of making sale of game meat illegal. **Can we get African governments to make sale of bushmeat illegal or at least decrease the bushmeat market?**
 - *Comment from State Department:* There is a large diaspora outside of Africa that are receiving bushmeat (e.g. Europe and U.S.), and the market is complex (involves security issues, wildlife trafficking) and international. bushmeat isn't just getting harvested to feed the African communities. There is also a cultural component to bushmeat. A very complex issue - it might be appropriate to approach African governments
 - Technically, the meat distributed by hunters is also considered bushmeat so need to stress the difference between legal and illegal bushmeat
- **What can be done about trophy imports to show these trophies are leading to important conservation initiatives?**
 - **Need a legitimate way to identify and quantify it - KPI's**
 - **Eventually, hope the default would be that an import is approved, with prevention of import a rare occurrence**

Potential Proposed Recommendations for Full Committee:

- Can the bushmeat market be made illegal by African governments in an effort to reduce poaching?
 - Would require legal protein alternatives
- **Anti-poaching importing requirements**

Communication Subcommittee

Chair: Olivia Opre

Other Committee Members:

Bill Brewster

Jenifer Chatfield

Keith Mark

Erica Rhoad

Rowena Watson (Department of State)

Opening Statement: The IWCC was brought together to draft a palatable message for the public regarding hunting. How do we educate and change public perception of hunting and its role in wildlife conservation? Facts don't work, emotions are the driver.

- **Not sure if USFWS can launch an educational (e.g. "Got Milk") campaign about sustainable use of wildlife with a pro-hunting stance? Believes the goals of this idea would fit with the USFWS mission**
 - USFWS has Pittman-Robertson Act - money that is contributing to important conservation - is important for the public and younger generations have awareness
 - *Comment from State Department:* It is one thing for USFWS to provide information to the public; however, it is another thing to promote. Make clear what is supported and what is the policy.

Comments:

- Message-crafting has to occur amongst hunting organizations
- **Eric Comments: There is a big push at the moment for USFWS to provide money and conservation implementation back to the States**
 - **Do not see the USFWS being able to be a promoter, but maybe the States could?**
 - **Better handled at the state level - AFWA state coordinators?**
- **States could provide support for domestic hunting however, USFWS could help raise awareness and support for international hunting**
 - **Could recommend to the secretary that the USFWS develop a platform for this?**
 - Recommendations need to be pointed but not overly strong as they will become a target for animal rights organizations. That is why they think it is important to highlight stories like 24lions - real conservation success stories - funded by hunting outfitters and supported by science

- Can National Geographic etc. be utilized to reach the public?
 - Messages originating from within the hunting community will be easily discounted. Also, no need to “preach to the choir.”
- How can international governments be utilized?
 - How can you highlight how other countries manage their wildlife?
 - Corruption is an overarching problem
 - Importance of the perception that U.S. trophy hunters are operating within the international framework of best practices - only work with legitimate countries - need for transparency!
- **Advantageous for USFWS to develop simple, transparent, standards that trigger automatic and default import (somewhat guaranteed)**
 - Development of a 3rd party, voluntary, accreditation program (that cannot be hijacked) would be very beneficial in helping this point.
 - A similar model has been successful in the timber industry where there are 2 different accreditation programs available: 1) implemented by timber companies and 2) implemented by environmental companies. In the end, the companies agree to comply with both accreditations.
 - As outfitters get certified, can this trigger country-wide efforts?
 - How do we deliver it? Where does initial funding come from?
 - **Start it as a voluntary outfitter certification (easy to track the dollars) and eventually maybe a country can get a certification. Hope that it would build on itself to the point where USFWS can without a doubt approve import permits.**
- **Believe that the U.S. courts are currently requiring non-detriment - with clarification that this is actually a CITES requirement not a U.S. domestic requirement**
- *Comment from State Department:* It is always hard to prove across the board where money actually goes. Not just unique to controversial issues like hunting - similar problems with food aid funding
- Initial communication and messaging should focus on how diligent the IWCC was in fact-finding efforts to support its recommendations
 - Messaging should be piecemeal but built into larger framework and vision
 - There is a need to emphasize the diversity of views that went into consensus - American views can't always be applied worldwide
- Emphasis on fact-finding and reporting versus predetermined views and consensus - do not want any pre-determinations, only recommendations
 - Recommendations should not seem one-sided
 - *Comment from State Department:* How much latitude does this council have?

- **Eric Alvarez reminded council that they do not have a sole voice in public communications. Any communications from the IWCC must go through the Secretary and DOI Publicity Office**
- Council believes elephant trophy debacle has tied the committee's hands (understandably)
- *Comment from State Department:* There is ambiguity about what can be released and reported out (e.g. press release). Keeping public updated on reporters and speakers is important. Council may want to comment on communication incidences and efforts that were not successful as well as those that were successful. Agrees there is not clear public understanding between legal trophy hunting and poaching.
- Need a concise and transparent message and transparency - they have very simple solutions that might work in developing countries.
- Is there a need for an official press release?
 - **Eric Alvarez commented on the process and that Department of Interior would need to review the statements along with Department of State**
 - Entities cannot speak on behalf of the Council, but can report what was discussed
 - Agreement among Council about the benefit of having an official statement from the Committee even if it has to be reviewed
 - ***Comments from State Department:* Isn't there a precedence regarding advisory councils? Commented that messaging might be delayed due to upcoming Anti -wildlife trafficking conference in London. As conference will most likely address trophy hunting in the U.S. and ivory ban, wouldn't be surprised if DOI would want to wait for a statement until after this meeting.**
 - Desire for a purely factual release with links to digital media shared
 - *Comments from State Department:* Will probably come down to whether these committees are allowed to have communication - might just have the ability to provide link to the official record
- Statement needs to be accessible to a variety of press
- Videos shown at the Committee Meeting will be available on IWCC website
 - Dallas Safari Club funded introductory video presented today, but not endorsed by them
 - SCI is developing a video but not endorsed by them
- Committee member mentioned that he has met with 3 wildlife conservation organizations supportive of the role of hunting in conservation whether or not it is part of their public message

- These organizations recognized the conservation work being done by Namibia
- HSUS refused to meet but shared desire to make a presentation at the Council meeting
- **What is the Department of Interior wanting from the Council? Just recommendations for the Secretary?**
- What is the comprehensive plan to disseminate the recommendations of the Council and the decisions of the Secretary?
 - How do members as a hunting entities outside of the Council contribute to the messaging after final decisions are made and the Council disbands?
- What are the central components for the way the Council and the hunting community communicates?
 - Trigger words? What should be avoided vs. emphasized?
 - 10 commandments for communication
 - Shouldn't use messaging that is exclusive (e.g. hunting is the only tool contributing to wildlife conservation)
- **Recommendation that more moderate conservation groups should be invited to speak at the next meeting to talk about topics including human-wildlife conflict, anti-trafficking, etc.**
 - IFAW, WCS, WWF were suggested

Potential Proposed Recommendations for Full Committee:

- Set up a conference call to figure out the strategy for delivering a message from the Council and information dissemination after the Council disbands
- Following the Council meeting, there is a release on presentations given and statements made that are purely factual and without prejudice
 - The purpose of the Council is to accumulate information that is transmitted to the Secretary and to the public

Policy Subcommittee

Chair: Chris Hudson

Other Committee Members:

Bill Brewster

Jenifer Chatfield

John Jackson

Keith Mark

Erica Rhoad

Rowena Watson (Department of State)

- What can be achieved and when?
- What was learned in the first 2 IWCC meetings and what recommendations have resulted?
- If the Council does not have the support of the Secretary and the President, what is the purpose and the future?
 - This question is dependent on the 2018 midterm elections
 - Previous Council recommendations (e.g. Hunting Conservation Council) didn't seem to amount to any real changes
 - How will the policy recommendations get implemented?
 - Sheehan's resignation has left them with no leadership as IWCC was his idea not the Secretary's
 - How does the Secretary intend to utilize IWCC
 - Will be meeting with Deputy Assistant Secretary, David Bernhardt, tomorrow at 2pm to hopefully answer this question
- First time there is a president, president's sons, a Secretary, and a director that understand the value and understand trophy hunting however, the current message from the White House is to limit communications on trophy hunting
 - Need to know if Council is supposed to simply "sit and look pretty"
- **Can IWCC make lower-level policy recommendations such as making the permitting system electronic which would benefit everything (not just trophy imports)?**
 - **Current process is ridiculous and in need of modernization**
 - **Comment from State Department: will require monetary allocation**
- **Current USFWS Permitting system is broken**
 - **Believe nobody knows what to do - including USFWS**
 - Animal rights groups are currently happy since no permits are being processed
- **Too much discretion in the Permits Office at USFWS**
 - Creates volatility for businesses

- Policy recommendations about streamlining and discretion currently occurring at the Permit Office
- Low-regulation environment should support the U.S. hunter, which is opposite of the current policy that intends to thwart the trophy-hunting business
- Discretion needs to be taken away from permitter's - should be "must-issue permit" system in place for both ESA and CITES (given certain criteria are met)
- Foreign species permitting:
 - Why are we permitting foreign species anyhow?
 - Suggestions that foreign permitting should be prioritized
 - *Comment from U.S. State Department:* What is the rationale for foreign permits to be prioritized?
 - ESA does not provide benefits for foreign species - no chance of saving a foreign-listed species through permitting
 - Instead of trying to target permitting, look at policy affecting foreign species
- Current practice at USFWS of actively not processing permits in the first place.
- Need to know from USFWS what their needs are and the cost?
 - Individuals have the ability to go to the Appropriations Committee with this
 - Political reality is that there are no sources of new funding
 - Are there efficiencies that can be better managed to allow for these updates?
 - Can it be justified that creating a new system will reduce costs in the future (e.g. prevent future employment needs)?
 - *Comment from State Department:* Do not want to give a recommendation that will gut something else.
 - *Eric Alvarez:* Developing permitting automation would prevent the need for additional personnel. In the appropriations world OMB will make decisions in November and decisions in December. Window to get this idea into the budget is small. However, if Appropriations Committee were to ask for clarification from USFWS we could provide that. 2020 is now getting locked into place so 2021 is the soonest. No instant gratification.
- CITES COP 2019 - can IWCC comment on CITES?
 - U.S. has the potential to be a world leader, is the U.S. currently respected? Is CITES corrupt?
 - Failure of polar bear at past COP was embarrassing for the U.S.

- Need a clear leader to help build the U.S. strategy for CITES so it is successful
 - **What is the window of getting species proposals on the agenda?**
 - **Proposed agenda items: flip in policy regarding the trade of rhino horn; economies of trophy-hunting - investment vs. top-down orders from U.S.- investment by U.S. hunters**
 - **Who is leading the USFWS contingent, what are they proposing, and what is IWCC's role in terms of CITES?**
 - **Eric Alvarez: Federal register notice of U.S. CITES species proposals will be published soon**
 - ***Comments from State Department:* What is your menu in terms of what your committee can comment on? USFWS has the lead at CITES and they undergo their own interagency consultation process. State Department is also involved. Wildlife Trafficking Task Force will also need to be vetted. Any big change would require jumping through more hoops than just USFWS'.**
- **What if the Committee members individually were to make proposals for CITES species listings?**
 - Can't do it as a whole because Council technically can't have a voice
- ***Comments from State Department:* Certain topics and certain species at CITES required additional clearance given their role in international crime (e.g. rhino horn).**
 - **If addressing poaching, wildlife use, and wildlife conservation you could be taking on a whole other security element that is larger than just CITES.**
 - **Changes in policy will require clearance**
- Comments that legalization in rhino horn trade would prevent the illegal trade
 - ***Comments from State Department:* No data on that. U.S. position is not likely to change on the desire to keep rhino horn trade illegal.**
 - Clarification that the Secretary likely would not want to legalize sale of rhino horn before midterms, so not a good focus for the IWCC recommendations
 - Recognition that even though illegal poaching of rhinos can impact the numbers available for trophy hunting - believe this is a larger and more complicated issue that IWCC would like to take on
- Comments about successful recovery of the white rhino. Do not view management of white-tailed deer and other mammals different from management of the rhino.
 - A use-based community + application of science = conservation for (almost) all species

- **Opportunity for an SES liaison position to be created between the USFWS and State Department**
 - Had spoken to Sheehan about this need before he stepped down
 - Would be an advocate/first source for permitting issues, confiscation issues, and CITES strategies
 - This is why it is a USFWS policy issue, not a conservation issue
- ***Eric Alvarez:* Political reality is that approval is needed at multiple levels when it comes to the permitting process (e.g. federal register). Not simply a USFWS issue. Also, trophy permits are a very small subset of the total permit types issued by our office. We issue approximately 40,000 permits/year so there is an importance not to limit recommendations for change in the process to just trophy hunting needs (would also look self-serving) - for example, suggest to remove duplication between ESA and CITES permits.**
- **Perception that trophy permits are relegated to least priority “bottom of the pile” by USFWS**
 - **Inefficient government service**
 - **No one should wait 17 months for a bontebok permit**
- Recommendations need to reflect political realities

Potential Proposed Recommendations for Full Committee:

- Electronic permitting
- Seizure rules