

2-16-18

Testimony to the Board of Game by

Dan Dunaway

Dillingham Alaska

Dear Members of the Board, thank you for holding your meeting in Dillingham.

I am testifying for myself today, tho I sit on the Nushagak AC and the Bristol Bay Federal Rural Advisory Council.

I want to address proposals 57, 144, 148.

57 Definition of Community or Group for community hunts:

I **SUPPORT** this proposal or something very similar.

While GMU 17 does not currently have community or Tier 2 hunts, there may be a time in the future when these options will be considered. I want to see the best possible definitions in place.

I have heard of the abuses regarding both Tier 2 and the current community hunts. With a good definition there may be interest in creating community hunts in GMU 17 that work.

I believe "community hunts" were adopted to reflect the long time practices, traditions and needs of historic villages and communities. To the dismay of many, the definition was quickly stretched and distorted so now there are about 80 groups meeting the "technical" definition, but many do not fit the average citizens' concept of a conventional community.

I have some concern how or who will vet this or any new definition. I wonder if there are definitions used by government agencies for the rendering of services or allocation of funds might provide some guidance. Communities as identified in subsistence surveys might be another source to consider. I support a definition that is clear, fair, not burdensome, and yet does not create artificial groups that only meet the letter of the law.

144 ATVs in the Mulchatna Controlled Use Area:

I **OPPOSE**

I believe the current regulations were originally requested by local users to protect habitat and wildlife populations. Further, local residents and the AC worked hard over a couple board cycles to create the current hunting corridors in this area to assure better hunting opportunities for locals and to protect the moose and caribou populations.

Allowing ATVs into this area flies in the face of those efforts and likely would result in swift reductions of game populations and habitat damage. When there is no snow, one can see examples of ATV damage right around Dillingham where the tundra has increasing numbers of muddy rutted trails forming in just the last few years.

148 Positioning game or hunters with a snow machine.

I oppose a regulation that will allow or result in the legal chasing of caribou. I prefer to allow hunters to position themselves but not position the animal. I am less concerned for wolves.

I hunted the Nushagak Peninsula twice last year about two weeks apart. On my second trip the animals were far more spooky and would run far and wildly at any sight of a snogo. They would do this from a far greater distance than on my first hunt. This raised my concerns for the health of the animals and unborn calves.

As we enjoy ever higher powered machines and sophisticated equipment we need to recognize how it affects our game populations. Practices that may have been common in the past might be excessive today.

People of the area have significantly changed their practices in other local hunts. For example, a few years before I moved here in 1989, the people of the Nushagak and Togiak areas decided to quit shooting moose out of season and quit shooting cows. Rather quickly, this change resulted in healthy, even booming moose populations that expanded to Togiak and Goodnews for the benefit of all.

We need to rethink our use of snogos for caribou.

However, I also appreciate the concerns of hunters. When I was out last year, I feared I might be accused of chasing when just by driving over a ridge I might accidentally cause caribou to flee.

I think a better definition of "positioning" is needed. Is driving straight at animals at a high rate of speed for several minutes acceptable? It would be nice to have a regulation or better yet, an enforcement policy that clearly articulates what constitutes acceptable positioning practices.

Thank you.