

Julie Patterson-Hunter

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 10:52 AM
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Alison Lehman; Alison Barratt-Green; Jeffrey Thorsby; Chris de Nijs
Subject: FW: vote NO on the beekeeping proposal, SR 19-0337.

District 4 resident

Julie Patterson Hunter, CCB
Clerk of the Board

-----Original Message-----

From: JAD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 10:36 AM
To: bdofsupervisors <bdofsupervisors@co.nevada.ca.us>; AGDept <AGDept@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: vote NO on the beekeeping proposal, SR 19-0337.

Hi

This letter is to strongly urge the Board to vote NO on the beekeeping ordinance proposal, SR 19-0337. There are several critical problems with this; primarily this ordinance would give the author a monopoly in our county for Apiary Locations. The author of the proposal has 'slipped in' clauses which would benefit only himself- not the bees, not the 'sustainability of our local environment', and certainly not any beekeeper EXCEPT FOR THE AUTHOR OF THE PROPOSAL, by restricting EVERY OTHER BEEKEEPER EXCEPT HIMSELF. This underhanded tactic has many local beekeepers - people who draw their entire livelihood from honey bees- very upset that we are just a few votes away from being 'locked out' (only to see the author of the proposal benefit because he can claim each of his COMMERCIAL sites as 'research')..

I am self-employed in the bee business. I conduct research on a daily basis in my hives and can produce astounding results: I would not be counted as 'doing research' because I do not have an outside academic group funding or guiding my operation.

Further, the Board's findings, Exhibit A part D, was cause for both wincing and laughter upon reading. If we recall our introduction to Biology from 10th grade, we know that while pollinating a plant, a pollinator is not risking "significant reduction in honey production and pollination", but rather is stimulating the plant to PRODUCE MORE THE FOLLOWING SEASON AS A RESULT OF HAVING BEEN POLLINATED!! This is basic knowledge and that the Board has "found" that local beekeepers are in "imminent threat of deleterious overstock of the local landscape" is highly questionable - until one realizes that the author of this proposal has made these unethical, untrue and panic-inducing claims of 'imminent threats' and 'deleterious overstock' and that this is an "urgency ordinance necessary for the immediate preservation of the public health, safety and welfare".

I am in support of a sensible BUT FAIR limit to work with; this Proposal is neither sensible nor fair.

Abusing the Board's and the Public's trust by exaggerating or inventing 'threats' gives local beekeepers a bad name and I urge the Board to strongly consider rejecting this Proposal.

Very Best Regards,
John Dunay
[REDACTED]