

265 FSOR Attachment A

Number	Name	Comment(s)	Response
1	Mr. Randall Cleveland, P.E.A.C.E. Letter dated 1/25/2016	<p>Opposed to proposal:</p> <p>A. Commission regulations should only benefit game and not hounds that hunters use in the taking of game.</p> <p>B. Allowing GPS collars and tree switches puts all wildlife at an unacceptable risk.</p> <p>C. GPS collars and elimination of tree switches will increase the number of houndsmen in the field and the use of hounds, and there will be impacts to non-target species.</p>	<p>Opposition noted.</p> <p>A. The Commission is responsible for regulating all aspects of hunting in California. Fish and Game Code section 203 empowers the Commission to regulate the “manner and means of taking”. Since “take” includes hunting and pursuit (Fish and Game Code section 86), it is appropriate for the Commission to adopt regulations governing the use of GPS collars and tree switches since dogs are lawfully used in the pursuit of certain game.</p> <p>B. There is no evidence that changing the type of collar a hunting dog can wear from one technology to another improves the likelihood of encountering and taking game (i.e., fair chase). The use of the hunting dog is to: track game, find game that has been killed or wounded, and to aid the hunter in finding the kill. The use of dogs for hunting several different species is currently lawful and nothing currently prohibits the use of radio tracking collars to track dogs while hunting. Under this regulatory change, the GPS collar could be used by a hunter to replace the 50 year old technology of radio tracking collars which are inconsistent, less accurate and less reliable to follow in remote valleys and hills. This proposal was made to assist in the retrieval of lost and/or injured dogs, dogs that may wander out of zones or onto private property and does so more quickly, using current technology. Allowing a dog to be tracked more quickly will likely reduce the possible impact of dogs pursuing non-target species. If a dog is pursuing a non-target species, the hunter can more quickly find and stop that dog from the pursuit. Also, the use of GPS improves the hunter’s ability to determine the dog’s location, providing better control of the animal and decreasing the potential for the dog to enter roadways, restricted areas or private property.</p> <p>C. There will be no change in the amount of take that will be authorized for deer and pig hunting from previous years by this regulatory change. There is no evidence that the number of houndsmen will increase by this change. This regulation only deals with a change in the types of collars that can be used. As to non-target species, hounds are trained to track specific legal game animals such as deer and pig and other legal prey as provided in existing hunting regulations. The use of GPS collars does not increase the likelihood that other ‘non-target’ animals will be pursued. In fact, in the event a dog pursues a non-target species, it can be located more quickly using a GPS collar rather than existing outdated and ineffective technology. The use of dogs to pursue any animal not authorized by the Fish and Game Code or the California Code of Regulations has been and will continue to be a violation of law and should be promptly reported to Department Law Enforcement.</p>

265 FSOR Attachment A

<p>1</p>	<p>(Cont.) Mr. Randall Cleveland, P.E.A.C.E. Letter dated 1/25/2016</p>	<p>D. Out of state hunters will come to California to hunt and train their dogs E. The Commission needs to comply with CEQA when adopting this regulations F. Hound hunting is unpopular and adversely impacts the non-hound hunting experience. G. Hounds maul non-target deer H. The regulation will allow GPS collars to be used in dog training.</p>	<p>D. This regulation does not change the number of out-of-state hunters who can come to California to hunt. Similarly, this regulation does not change any regulations about dog training. This regulation merely changes the technology that can be used for dog collars. E. The Commission prepared and filed a Notice of Determination (NOD) for this action. The Commission does not need to prepare a separate CEQA document for this regulation because simply changing the type of collar hunting dogs may wear does not have the potential to result in a direct or indirect physical change in the environment. The underlying hunting types where dogs are allowed have been evaluated for environmental impacts in environmental documents and those documents are part of the administrative record for the relevant hunting type. For example, the impact of dog hunting was addressed in the Final Environmental Document for Deer Hunting. F. While some people are opposed to the use of dogs while hunting, the use of dogs is still legal for certain species in California. There is no evidence that the use of hounds adversely impacts the hunting experience for hunters not using hounds. G. While it is possible that untrained dogs could maul non-target deer (e.g. does and fawns), dogs are specifically trained to not maul animals they are pursuing. H. This regulation does not change California's regulations having to do with dog training except that it will now allow dogs to be trained wearing GPS collars. The provisions of the Fish and Game Code and the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, specify the requirements for training, the legal and illegal uses of dogs, and those public lands in California that hunters with hounds may legally enter whether to train or hunt. It is believed that this change in regulations will improve control of untrained dogs because they can be located more quickly than if the untrained dogs were wearing radio/telemetry collars. Under existing law, dogs cannot be trained using big game mammals including deer except during deer season when the trainer has a deer tag. In this instance only one dog per hunter may be trained during general deer season. (Title 14, CCR Section 265(b)(6)(E). Further, all dogs used while engaged in hunting (that includes dog training) must be under the physical control of the owner. (FGC 3008) This proposed regulation will not change this legal requirement except to improve a hunter's ability to do so.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Sue Williamson Ojai Wildlife League Email dated 1/28/16</p>	<p>Opposed to proposal: A. There is no need for the regulation because deer and pigs don't climb trees; other mammals will become targets. B. Dogs should be trained before being used to hunt. C. Opposes the use of dogs in hunting.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. A. This regulation does not change the authorized species that can be hunted using dogs. Dogs are currently lawfully used to hunt deer, pig and other species. It will continue to be a crime to use dogs to hunt bear and bobcat; this regulation does not change that. See also the response to #1B, C. B. Se response to #1H above. C. See response for #2 A above.</p>

265 FSOR Attachment A

<p>3</p>	<p>Marilyn Jasper, Chair Public Interest Coalition Letter dated 1/27/2016</p>	<p>Opposed to proposal: A. Commission must consider significant impact of regulation; B. Regulatory change is not “reasonably necessary” and is arbitrary. C. Out of state hunters D. Impacts to non-target species E. Collars don’t allow hunters to respond quickly enough F. Collars will not reduce “waste”. G. Collars do not control dogs. Dogs must be trained before release. H. Opposes hunting with dogs in general. I. GPS collars will not reduce lost dogs and this should not be a priority for the Commission J. Tree switch ban should be retained K. Commenter made several recommendation for other regulations regarding the use of dogs.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. A. The Commission considered the proposed regulation at 3 public meetings and has evaluated all public comments received. The Commission has determined that updating the technology that can be used for hunting with dogs does not have a significant impact because it does not affect hunter success, provides greater control over dogs limiting impacts on non-target species, and better protects hunting dogs. B. This regulatory change is necessary because technology has changed since the ban on GPS collars was enacted. Also, the species for which dogs can be used to hunt has also changed. See also response for #1A and 3A above; C. See response to #1D above D. See response to #1B, C above. E. This comment suggests that collars do not allow for immediate intervention in the event that it is required and suggests opposition to the use of dogs in hunting in general regardless of collar type. The commenter is correct that in either case, GPS or radio/telemetry, immediate intervention is difficult unless the hunter remains with his/her dogs. The use of GPS collars will make intervention occur more quickly if needed and will be more reliable since radio/telemetry signals can be lost in certain areas. F. The prohibition on waste applies to the hunter in the field regardless of the method of take and regardless of whether dogs are used. (Fish and Game Code section 4304) There will likely be less waste with more reliable technology. G. See response to #1 H above. H. This regulation does not change how or when dogs can be used in hunting, therefore this comment is outside the scope of this regulatory change that updates the types of collars that may be worn. I. The Commission disagrees that GPS collars will not reduce lost dogs. The Commission received testimony that current non-GPS collar technology can be unreliable in remote locations. See also response to #1A above. Finally, the law has and will require that dogs be in the physical control of the dog owner while hunting (FGC 3008). J. The ban on tree switches was eliminated because the only big game animals that can be hunted using dogs are deer and pigs, neither of which can be treed. It will still remain illegal for dogs to be used in the pursuit of bear and bobcat, and if a hunter using dogs treed a bear or bobcat, it would be illegal for that hunter to advise a non-dog hunter that a bear or bobcat had been treed by his/her dogs and available for harvest by that non-dog using hunter. The Department’s Law Enforcement Division supports this regulatory change. K. Comments unrelated to this regulatory proposal have been noted.</p>
----------	---	--	---

265 FSOR Attachment A

4	Ernie Jay Email dated 1/28/2016	<p>Opposed to proposal: A. DFW & the FGC should not modify laws that are intended to preserve wildlife;</p> <p>B. Eliminates fair chase and will allow non-dog using hunters to harvest treed bear/bobcat; C. Hounds will maul non-target deer. D. Untrained dogs E. Opposes the training of dogs to fight F. Only trained hounds should be released; GPS collars are no substitute for training and have other consequences.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. A. DFW and FGC have been identified as trustee agencies regarding wildlife issues and as such have responsibilities to amend, interpret or make specific regulations within their authorities to ensure the intent of the law is achieved. GPS collars can aid in environmental protections by more quickly allowing intervention when non-targeted species are pursued, intervention if the dog strays from permitted hunt areas and aids in recovery of a permitted game that has been killed or wounded. Additionally, GPS collars may provide law enforcement with an electronic trail in the event a hunter or poachers are suspected of violating regulated hunt zones or seasons. See also response to #1A above.</p> <p>B. See response for #1, B, C and 3 J above.</p> <p>C. See response for #1 G above.</p> <p>D. See response to 1 H above. E. Other than the use of certain types of collars, dog training in general is beyond the scope of this regulatory change. F. The Commission agrees that trained hounds should be used and collars are not a substitute for good training. Its regulations provide detailed constraints on how dogs will be trained for use in hunting. The only regulation being proposed here is a change in technology that will improve a dog's welfare. See also response #1 H.</p>
5	Carol Tasco Email dated 2/05/2016	<p>Opposed to proposal: A. Impact to people enjoying the forest.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. A. The use and enjoyment of the public is not affected by this change to GPS equipment technology.</p>
6	Carla Bollinger Public Land Alliance Email dated 2/08/2016	<p>Opposed to proposal. A. wildlife is stressed proposal is an "easy kill" method and can result in over kill.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B and C above.</p>
7	Lori Steinhauer Email dated 2/08/2016	<p>Opposed to proposal A. not reasonable or fair.</p>	<p>Opposition noted. A. See response for #1 B and C above.</p>
8	Carol Lindberg Email dated 2/08/2016	<p>Do not allow the use of GPS collars on deer.</p>	<p>This proposal is to allow the use of GPS collars on dogs while hunting legal game animals including deer, not placing them on deer.</p>

265 FSOR Attachment A

9	Anne West Letter dated 2/08/2016	Opposed to proposal. A. Opposed to use of dogs in hunting deer and otherwise	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B
10	Patricia McPherson Grassroots Coalition Email dated 2/09/2016	Opposed to proposal A. The process of killing with dogs is inhumane.	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1 B, C and H. above. It is illegal for dogs to be used to kill deer so they are not used in the “process” of killing.
11	Bonnie Freeman Santa Barbara County Parks Commissioner Email dated 2/10/2016	Opposed to proposal because hunting should not involve the use of technology	See response for #1 B, C above. This proposal will allow the substitution of newer, more reliable technology (GPS) than the form currently permitted (radio/telemetry). The existing regulation authorizes a form of technology.
Oral Comment	Marilyn Jaspar, Public Interest Coalition Public Testimony 2/11/2016 FGC meeting	A. Referenced letter dated 1/27/2016 (#3) B. GPS erodes ‘fair chase’ C. Hunters should train themselves and dogs better.	A. See responses for #3, above. B. See response for #1, B C. See response for #1, H
Oral Comment	Josh Brones, Sportsman’s Alliance/Al Taucher Conservation Coalition Public Testimony 2/11/2016 FGC meeting	Supports change – A. GPS does not limit fair chase. B. Modernize regulation to support dog welfare And easier retrieval lost/injured dogs.	Support noted A. See response for #1, B and C. B. See response for #3, A
Oral Comment	Lori Jacobs, California Houndsmen for Conservation Public Testimony 2/11/2016 FGC meeting	Supports change	Support noted

265 FSOR Attachment A

Oral Comment	Sally Baron, National Open Field Coursing Association Public Testimony 2/11/2016 FGC meeting	Supports change	Support noted
Oral Comment	Bill Gaines, California Houndsmen for Conservation Public Testimony 2/11/2016 FGC meeting	Supports change	Support noted
Oral Comment	Sharon Ponsford California Council of Wildlife Rehabilitators Public Testimony 2/11/2016 FGC meeting	Opposed to proposal: A. Impacts to non-target species; B. Houndsmen need to better train their dogs and they won't need this technology.	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, C above; B. See response for #1,H above.
12	Dale M. Heckman Letter dated 2/13/2016	Opposed to proposal.	Opposition noted.
13	Courtney Fern, California State Director, The Humane Society Letter dated 3/02/2016	Opposed to proposal: A. Eliminates fair chase; B. Welfare of hounds being used.	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B above; B. See response for #2, A above.
14	Jake O'Rourke Email dated 3/09/2016	Opposed to proposal: A. No scientific data (study) to support change; B. Eliminates fair chase; C. Impacts to non-target species.	Opposition noted. A. The proposal was a result of a recommendation made at the FGC's Wildlife Resources Committee; B. See response for #1, B above; C. See response for #1, C above.
15	Erica Stanojevic Email dated 3/20/16	Opposed to proposal.	Opposition noted.
16	Sandra Zaninovich Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B B. Hunting is legal in the State, including the use of hounds for some species. GPS collars do not affect legal hunting.

265 FSOR Attachment A

17	Kali Zulu Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
18	Marsh Cassidy Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: Cruel and heartless	The use of dogs for hunting is not the subject of the proposed regulations. The regulations only propose to allow the use of GPS collars. GPS collars improve the ability to locate hunting dogs; it does not affect the legal hunting of game animals.
19	Mary K. O'Brien Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: A. General opposition to hunting.	Opposition noted. A. Hunting is legal in the State of California. This comment is outside the scope of the proposed rulemaking.
20	Marlena Niemann Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
21	Deb Keidrauk Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: C. Fair chase D. Ethical Hunting	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
22	Lora Stone Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
23	Rosalind Bresnahan Email dated 3/25/16	A. Urge a no vote on ending the current ban. B. Hunting is not a legitimate sport.	A. Opposition noted. B. See response for #19, A
24	Donna Thornbury Email dated 3/25/16	General opposition to killing deer.	See response for #19, A
25	Cindy Sunley Email dated 3/25/16	A. General opposition to hunting with dogs; B. Hunters sneak around C. All dogs should be leashed.	A. Hunting with hounds is legal in the State of California. The proposal only addresses the use of GPS collars and treeing switches. This comment is outside the scope of the proposed rulemaking. B. Hunters that use GPS will create an electronic trail and time stamp that may be used by enforcement if they are charged with illegal hunting; and C. Tethered or leashed dogs run the risk of injury to both the dog and the handler.
26	Sharon Anton Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed to proposal: A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	Opposition noted. A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
27	Danny Marsh Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote	Opposition noted.
28	Sharon Hill Email dated 3/25/16	Opposed reg. allows dogs to chase deer, pinned until owner shoots	A. See response for #25, A

265 FSOR Attachment A

29	Sandra Norell Email dated 3/25/16	No hound hunting	A. See response for #25, A
30	Anne Frost Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote based on perception of hunting with dogs.	Opposition noted. See response for #25, A
31	Yolanda Alarcon Email dated 3/25/16	Stop allowing GPS collars on hounds.	Opposition noted.
32	Yvette Oyabe Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote based on perception of hunting with dogs	Opposition noted. See response for #25, A
33	Salma Kelly Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote based on opposition to hunting.	Opposition noted. See response for #25, A
34	Bob Rice Email dated 3/25/16	Request vote to retain the ban.	Opposition noted.
35	Ann Downey Email dated 3/25/16	Questioned the ethics of deer hunting with dogs.	See response for #16, B
36	Ann Graves Email dated 3/25/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
37	Teri Yazdi Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote based on immoral practice.	Opposition noted.
38	Penelope Preston Email dated 3/25/16	Questioned the ethics of deer hunting with dogs.	See response for #16, B
39	Elena Ennouri Email dated 3/25/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
40	Anne Barr Email dated 3/25/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B. B. See response for #16, B
41	Emily Sawyer Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote A. unethical use of dogs to hunt.	Opposition noted. A. See response for #16, B

265 FSOR Attachment A

42	Leonard Farr Email dated 3/25/16	Request NO vote A. unethical use of dogs to hunt.	Opposition noted. A. See response for #16, B
43	Karen Wyatt Email dated 3/25/16	Requested NO vote.	Opposition noted.
44	Chuckster515 Email dated 3/25/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
45	Peter Hennessy Email dated 3/25/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
46	Elizabeth Wiley Email dated 3/26/16	Opposed to GPS as an unfair advantage in hunting.	See response for #1, B
47	Andrea Sreiber Email dated 3/26/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
48	Elisabeth Bechmann Email dated 3/26/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
49	Vicki Escotto Email dated 3/26/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
50	Michael Sawyer Email dated 3/27/16	Request NO vote.	Opposition noted.
51	Bruce Elliott Email dated 3/28/16	Request NO vote.	Opposition noted.
52	Rae Tory Email dated 3/28/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
53	Cristian Contreras Email dated 3/29/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B

265 FSOR Attachment A

54	Shelley Nunemaker Email dated 3/29/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
55	Jil Boatright Email dated 3/30/16	No to GPS collars for hound hunting.	Opposition noted.
56	Trina Hunner Email dated 3/30/16	A. Keep ban on GPS collars and tree switches B. safety of wildlife and humans C. keep hunting fair and ethical.	A. Opposition noted. B. See response for #1, B C. See response for #16, B
57	Ernie Jay Email dated 3/30/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting C. Clarification of statement from his 2/11/16 comments.	A. See response for #1 B B. See response for #16 B C. The use of GPS does not aid in the actual hunt, but in dog recovery.
58	Ben and Janet Fiore Email dated 3/31/16	No free-for-all of unlimited GPS collars on dogs.	Regulations (not being considered for change in this rulemaking) restrict the number of dogs a hunter may use, from one to three, depending on the game.
59	Sharon Reeve Email dated 3/31/16	A. Vote no, as it will give potential poachers the advantage. B. A pack of hounds can easily overtake deer.	A. GPS will actually allow law enforcement officers an electronic footprint of where a poacher has been. B. California law only permits one dog per hunter, in hunting deer.
60	Megan Robbins Email dated 3/31/16	A. Disagrees with using GPS B. Stop the practice of deer hound hunting.	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #16, B
61	Randall Cleveland P.E.A.C.E. Letter dated 3/31/16	Commenter repeats concerns from 1/25/16 letter. 29,200 members opposed to allowing GPS hound hunting, upon request.	See responses for #1. Opposition of PEACE and the members is noted.

265 FSOR Attachment A

62	Joan and Jack Anderson Email dated 4/01/16	A. Refuse to allow hunters GPS or radio controlled collars. B. Tracking deer is unethical hunting.	Opposition noted. B. See response for #16, B
63	Anne West Email dated 4/01/16	A. Fair chase B. Ethical Hunting	See response for #1, B See response for #16, B
64	Mya Shone and Ralph Schoenman Email dated 4/01/16	Urge a NO vote of GPS collars.	Opposition noted.
65	Louise Gregg Email dated 4/02/16	Using GPS collars for deer hunting is unsportsmanlike.	See response for #1, B See response for #16, B
66	Ilana Bollag Email dated 4/07/16	Don't allow GPS on hounds for deer hunting.	Opposition noted.
67	Sandra Sterling Email dated 4/10/16	Please vote NO on amendments to Sec. 265.	Opposition noted.
68	Marilyn Jasper Public Interest Coalition Letter dated 3/31/16	Repeats comments provided in Comment #3. A. Since hounds are now limited to pigs and deer that don't climb trees then change is not necessary. B. Change may create loopholes in law allow illegal take of bear and bobcats by hiding dogs after treeing. C. Radio telemetry or tracking collars are legal and capable of locating hounds. D. Dog welfare should be the responsibility of the dog handler.	A. Tree switches may be used in legal pursuit of non-game animals. B. It is unlawful to engage in illegal hunting or other activities precluded by law. Violators should be reported to Law Enforcement. C. Radio telemetry collars are less accurate, take longer to respond, are often unusable in some terrains, and do not provide an electronic footprint that may be used by law enforcement. D. Dog handlers requested the proposed change to provide better means for controlling where the dog is in relation to private property or if by chance they are pursuing non-target species. GPS provides more accurate information over radio telemetry collars to see when a dog may be approaching private property.

265 FSOR Attachment A

<p>68</p>	<p>(Cont.) Marilyn Jasper Public Interest Coalition Letter dated 3/31/16</p>	<p>E. Under CEQA public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives which would substantially lessen the significant effects. F. Wildlife Officers should be equipped with electronic devices that will allow them to receive both radio telemetry and GPS collar signals in order to monitor hounds. G. At minimum a DED [CEQA] needs to be prepared to deal with potential impacts. H. Alternative to reduce lost dogs is to ban deer hound hunting. I. Without studies, baselines and a DED the No Change Alternative is the most reasonable. J. The proposal may create economic impact of DFW law enforcement efforts and violations to other code violations such as poaching and lack of proper training.</p>	<p>E. GPS collars are an alternative to radio tracking collars which should lessen the effects of dogs with no, or limited and delayed signals as to the location. F. Wildlife Officers have technology available to investigate GPS electronic trails if a violation is suspected. G. Alleged impacts are based on the general use of dogs in hunting, or on speculation of violating these hunting laws. No change is proposed to the current regulations dealing with training or hunting with dogs, other than to allow hunters the option to replace radio telemetry collars with GPS collars. This regulation of hunting equipment does not alter the final determinations made in the approved Environmental Document H. Banning use of dogs in hunting goes beyond the scope of reasonable alternative since the merits of hunting with dogs was not being considered. I. Commissioners studied the issue, heard testimony and in some cases even went on field trials to witness firsthand dogs with GPS collars before voted unanimously that the proposal was the most reasonable. J. DFW law enforcement was part of the review process before the proposal was accepted by the DFW and does not concur with the comment. It is the opinion of the Law Enforcement Division that the examination of GPS collars and equipment may actually benefit game wardens and result in a more efficient investigation with more substantial evidence.</p>
-----------	--	--	--

265 FSOR Attachment A

69	In Defense of Animals Email Petition Approximately 798 petitioners (Attached as CD) one example copy attached.	The petition sets forth objections to the amendment of Section 265 because of: A. Allowing GPS for hunting, affording hunters undue advantage, B. finding lost dogs is only an excuse for desecrate wildlife, C. giving poachers easier methods to illegally hunt. D. CA should join the states that prohibit the use of dogs for hunting. E. cruelty to animals,	Opposition noted. A. Hunting with hounds is legal in California, whether or not GPS is used hunting with hounds is legal. B. GPS will enable the houndsman to locate lost dogs. The proposal is concerned only with the use of GPS and/or tree switches not eliminating hound hunting. C. Poaching is an illegal activity which should be reported to Law Enforcement D. The use of dogs for hunting is legal in California. E. Cruelty is an illegal activity which should be reported to Law Enforcement
Oral Testimony	Josh Brones, Sportsmen's Alliance Public Testimony 4/14/2016 FGC meeting	A. GPS collars are more advanced technology for finding dogs and keeping them safe. B. Aids Law Enforcement. C. Better control by owners than without GPS	A. See response for #1, B above B. See Response #25 B C. See response for #1, B above.
Oral Testimony	Sharon Ponsford California Council Wildlife Rehab. Public Testimony 4/14/16 meeting	A. Disagrees with allowing GPS. B. Dogs will go after non-targeted species. C. No dog hunting, care more about wildlife	A. Opposition noted. B. See response for #1, B above. C. See response for #3,H above.
Oral Testimony	Steve Johnson Public Testimony 4/14/16	Supports the proposal. A. GPS aids in finding dogs and their welfare.	Support noted. A. See response for #1, B above

265 FSOR Attachment A

Oral Testimony	Marilyn Jasper, Public Interest Coalition Public Testimony 4/14/16	A. Urged the Commission to select their recommendations for Section 265. B. Allow more time for further review of CEQA. C. Existing laws provide houndsmen with control of their dogs, or they should use leashes.	A. See the responses to #68. B. See response to #68, G C. See response #25, C.
Oral Testimony	Bear Metcalf Public Testimony 4/14/16	As a disabled houndsman, having GPS collar on his dogs would benefit in finding the dogs more quickly.	Support noted.
Oral Testimony	Matt Davis Public request 4/14/16	Requested commission permit him to have people who supported proposals including GPS, stand.	FGC Chair Sklar granted his request.
Oral Testimony	Keli Hendricks, Project Coyote Public Testimony 4/14/16	A. Free ranging hounds make it difficult on prey, and non-target species and disturb ground nesting birds, B. The hunters should have their dogs tethered.	A. See response for #1, B above B. See Response #25 C
Oral Testimony	Fauna Tomlinson, California Council Wildlife Rehab. Public Testimony 4/14/16	A. GPS gives hunters a non-fair chase advantage B. Dogs should not be used in hunting. C. they should use leashes	A. See response for #1, B B. See response for #3, H C. See Response #25, C

265 FSOR Attachment A

Oral Testimony	Kimberly Richard, Democrats of Napa Valley, Public Testimony 4/14/16	Finds comfort in knowing she can find her pet dogs with GPS so hunters should have the same option.	Support noted.
Oral Testimony	Rick Bullock, APECS Public Testimony 4/14/16	Supports all proposals including GPS.	Support noted.
Oral Testimony	Lori Jacobs, California Houndsmen for Conservation, Public Testimony 4/14/16	A. GPS makes recovery time for dogs minimal. B. Using tethers on dogs in the wilderness is impossible.	A. See response for #1, B above B. See Response #25, C
Oral Testimony	Bill Gaines, CA Houndsmen Public Testimony 4/14/16	A. With regard to GPS, it does not offer any advantage to a hunt, but to the recovery of the dogs and helps handlers stay out of public property or roads. B. Lack of GPS and treeing switches made sense in pursuing bear, but because dogs no longer can pursue bear the restriction is no longer needed.	A. See response for #1, B above B. See response for #3, J above