

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FGC](#)
Subject: Opposition to proposed changes & Ban of hunting with dogs 2015
Date: Friday, September 05, 2014 8:05:36 AM

Fish and Game Commission,

Please note that I am writing to voice my complete opposition to the 2015 changes and ban on mammal hunting, and hunting with dogs.

Sport hunting in California is already over regulated and does not need further governmental regulations. Sporting dogs have a long history of providing a team approach to providing food as well as sporting events and companionship. Banning the use of hunting with dogs would have a vast and negative effect in the economy of this state. The fiscal impact would include but not be limited to: hotel, Restraunt, vehicle & RV sales, insurances, small business owners who raise game for sanctioned hunting hunt tests and field trials, the sale of fire arm and ammunition, retail clothing, animal food companies for both canine and upland game bird growers.

Please consider my concerns and defeat any and all changes to the Ban on mammal hunting and proposed and ban of hunting with dogs 2015.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FGC](#)
Subject: Opposition to Wildlife Resources Committee Agenda
Date: Thursday, September 04, 2014 10:05:28 PM

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION:

I totally oppose any changes that would prohibit the use of dogs for the pursuit and taking of wildlife. This is wrong to be even discussing stopping the use of dogs on all mammals or wildlife. Those of us working with our dogs to hunt or participate in dog sporting activities are supporting our dogs' breed and instinctive nature, and are doing so responsibly.

Please record my opposition to the Meeting Agenda on September 17 in Sacramento, CA at the Wildlife Resources Committee, Fish and Game Commission, State of California:

3. DISCUSSION OF IDEAS RELATED TO POSSIBLE AMENDMENT OF MAMMAL HUNTING 2015 REGULATIONS (SECTIONS 360, 361, 362, 363, AND 364, TITLE 14, CCR)

Submitted by:

Sandra Sue Mocco

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FGC](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Amendment re Mammal Hunting -- OPPOSED
Date: Thursday, September 04, 2014 8:59:33 PM

Gentlemen (and ladies, if there be any) on the Fish and Game/Wildlife Commission:

I refer to Agenda Item No. 3 of the coming meeting of 17 September 2014: "Discussion of Ideas Related to Possible Amendment of Mammal Hunting 2015 Regulations." This would possibly include a total ban on the use of dogs in hunting mammals of any type.

I am strongly opposed to any revisions or amendments to hunting regulations that would forbid the use of dogs in hunting. The need for such a draconian measure has no basis in fact.

Please disregard the proposals brought by HSUS, PETA, and similar groups.

Thank you, Mrs. C.B. Berto, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FGC](#)
Subject: Re: 9/17/14 Agenda Item 3. DISCUSSION OF IDEAS RELATED TO POSSIBLE AMENDMENT OF MAMMAL HUNTING 2015 REGULATIONS
Date: Thursday, September 04, 2014 9:50:03 AM

Then, kindly place the comment as advisory on CA-17 discussions.

Thank you,

Garril Page

On Sep 4, 2014, at 7:49 AM, FGC wrote:

Item #3 Is an annual review of Big Game regulations as they pertain to Sections 360, 361, 362, 363 and 364 - take (season/quotas) for deer, elk, antelope and big horn sheep. The use of dogs aren't referenced.

From: Garril Page [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 6:58 PM
To: FGC
Subject: 9/17/14 Agenda Item 3. DISCUSSION OF IDEAS RELATED TO POSSIBLE AMENDMENT OF MAMMAL HUNTING 2015 REGULATIONS

Dear Committee Members:

re Sept 17 Meeting, Wildlife Resources Committee, Agenda Item #3.
DISCUSSION OF IDEAS RELATED TO POSSIBLE AMENDMENT OF MAMMAL HUNTING 2015 REGULATIONS (SECTIONS 360, 361, 362, 363, AND 364, TITLE 14, CCR)

Please, abandon this foolish idea of a total ban of hunting with dogs. The outrage with which this proposal is being greeted is reminiscent of the Mandatory Spay & Neuter folly foisted upon a defenseless CA legislature some years ago, AB1634. That did not end well for the proposals sponsors, as you may recall.

The outrage over this Hunting Amendment is justified. Like all total ban proposals, this is an ill-conceived, poorly-articulated reactive appeal using emotional hype on an uninformed populace. There is a place in our society for working dog breeds just as there has been for hundreds of years.

I add my voice in support of those opposing this overly-restrictive proposal and hope you will make short work of consigning it to the Dead file.

Thank you for considering my opinion,

Garril Page, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]