Economic Impact Assessment
Amend Sections 465 and 472
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Prohibition of Prizes for Take of Nongame Mammals

The proposed regulations will prohibit the offer of prizes for the take of nongame mammals in organized hunting contests. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Statistics on hunter trip-related and equipment expenditures along with published contest hunt days and participant numbers were used to estimate the total economic impact of induced nongame hunting contests throughout the state. California specific multipliers for hunting activity were used to generate the indirect, induced and employment effects of all contest-related direct expenditures.

Nongame hunting contests that offer prizes have been held in a few locations of the state at various times of the year. The most widely known prize induced-contest has been held in Aiden in Modoc County for eight years. Other more informal nongame contests arranged via hunter's forums reportedly occur, such as a monthly coyote hunt held in Taft, Kern County. Newly established annual coyote hunts have also allegedly been initiated, such as the Derby in Prather, Fresno County in 2014.[1] Other species of nongame mammals are reportedly objects of hunting contests, such as squirrels and nongame furbearers including raccoon, gray fox, (red fox, kit fox, pine marten, fisher, mink, river otter, beaver, badger, and muskrat). However we have limited information on whether prizes are typically offered as inducements for these other nongame hunts.

The Aiden prized-induced coyote hunting contest is a two and one half day event that draws around 200 participants from around the state. The length of the other coyote and any other nongame mammal hunt contests and participant numbers is not known. Some may be more local in character and last only a day and others may attract participants to the locale for longer periods.

Baseline Nongame Hunting Contests Economic Impact

Given this information, in the course of one year about 250 resident and nonresident hunters and their traveling companions spend about $140 per day (USFW, 2014) in hunting contest trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures are dispersed to California businesses in the vicinity of and en route to the hunting areas. These direct expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in approximately $48,860 in total economic output.[2] Nongame hunting contests are associated with about $9,630 in labor income or a total of 0.22 jobs in the state.

[1] Chico News & Review, Feb. 13, 2014.

1 Multipliers for Big Game Hunting in California from IMPLAN, MIG Inc.; Median daily expenditure from 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation for California, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Feb. 2014.

Nongame Contest Hunt Impacts

	Economic Output	Labor Income	Jobs/Million $
Direct	$37,500	$5,874	0.15
Indirect	$3,996	$1,304	0.02
Induced	$7,364	$2,447	0.05
Total	$48,860	$9,625	0.22

Impact of Regulation to Prohibit Inducements for Nongame Hunting Contests
Informal assessments of the common motivations to participate in organized hunting contests suggest that the challenge, pursuit, and take of the nongame mammals are the primary compelling inducements. The likelihood of winning a prize appears to be secondary to the principal activity of the hunt itself. With the understanding that for most, the reward of hunting alone trumps any prize offerings, the absence of a monetary or material inducement to participants in nongame hunting contests is not expected to reduce the numbers of hunters traveling to contest locales. Little change in the numbers of hunters and total spending that contributes to the economy while en route and at the hunt destination is expected. Sporting goods, fuel, food and accommodation businesses that support hunting activities should not expect significant changes in annual revenues as a result of the proposed regulation.

A. The Creation or Elimination of Jobs
The statewide impact to the creation or elimination of jobs from the proposed regulation is estimated to be less than one job, given that the volume of contest hunting activity is not expected to change substantially. The California statewide hunting activity employment multiplier generated by IMPLAN is 5.8 jobs per million dollars of spending.

B. The Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses
The Commission does not anticipate any impacts on the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses because the proposed regulation is not expected to reduce or increase the number of hunts or participants to a significant extent.

D. Benefits of the Regulation:

Health and Welfare of California Residents
Hunting provides outdoor recreational opportunities for not only the hunters, but for family and friends who are non-hunting members of the group, and are able to participate in hiking, fishing and other outdoor activities. This regulation change is aligned with the objective of the promotion of ethical sportsmanship practices for current and future generations.

Benefits of the Regulation to Worker Safety
The Commission does not anticipate any impacts to worker safety because the proposed regulation will not affect working conditions.

DRAFT

Benefits to the Environment

It is the policy of this state to encourage the conservation, maintenance, and utilization of the living resources of the state's wildlife under the jurisdiction and influence of the state for the benefit of all the citizens of the state and to promote the development of local California hunting in harmony with federal law respecting the conservation of the living resources of the state.

DRAFT