

Supplemental information to Proposal 57

I am submitting this RC due to the fact that military obligations are keeping me from testifying in person. This RC is to expand on my comments (PC120) regarding proposal 57. I have a lot of experience training and hunting with versatile hunting dogs. I use dogs to point and retrieve upland birds, retrieve waterfowl (including, puddle ducks, sea ducks, geese, brant and cranes), track wounded big game, retrieve small game (such as rabbits) and also for retrieving predators and other game defined in Alaska as "fur animals".

The Alaska Trapping Regulation booklet allows for a dog to be used to retrieve a dead furbearer but the small game regulations do not. The small game and trapping regulations should be more aligned and should allow for the ethical recovery of shot game no matter what type. My dogs are excellent at recovering crippled waterfowl in a thick marsh and are just as good at tracking and retrieving wounded hare (which is currently legal in Alaska) fox, coyote, etc.

Last year, I shot a big fox that I called in. The fox moved as I shot and I hit it far back on the body. The fox took off and I called up my dog who had been laying behind me. I sent the dog on the track and he tracked that fox 200 yards before retrieving it back to me. I know how far he went because he was wearing a GPS collar. I would likely not have recovered that fox without a dog and it would have gone to waste. I also used my dogs to retrieve dead coyotes and raccoons last year.

It must be remembered that proposal 57 is for the purpose of recovering fur animals that have already been shot, NOT for pursuing them prior to shooting.

In summary, there is no downside to using a well trained hunting dog to recover all manner of valuable game whether it be feathered, or furred.

Please refer to attached photos.

Sincerely,

Mike Harris

