



HUNT ZONE	2009 Original Tag Allocation Proposal	2009 Final Tag Allocation
Zone 1 - Marble/Clipper Mountains	4	4
Zone 2 - Kelso Peak/Old Dad Mountains	6	6
Zone 3 - Clark/Kingston Mountain Ranges	2	2
Zone 4 - Orocopia Mountains	0	0
Zone 5 - San Gorgonio Wilderness	0-2	1
Zone 6 - Sheep Hole Mountains	1	1
Zone 7 – White Mountains	3	3
Open Zone Fund-Raising Tag	2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	18-20	19

VI. Summary of Primary Considerations Raised in Support of or Opposition to the Proposed Actions and Reasons for Rejecting those considerations:

There were no public recommendations made regarding the proposed changes.

VII. Location and Index of Rulemaking File:

A rulemaking file with attached file index is maintained at:  
 California Fish and Game Commission  
 1416 Ninth Street  
 Sacramento, California 95814

VIII. Location of Department files:

Department of Fish and Game  
 1416 Ninth Street  
 Sacramento, California 95814

IX. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

(a) Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

1. Number of Tags

An alternative was considered which involved issuing fewer tags to take Nelson bighorn rams. The current statutory restriction allows a quota of no

more than 15 percent of the mature rams observed in the designated hunt zones. This is a very conservative harvest ceiling. This alternative was rejected because the demand for bighorn sheep hunting is high, and the proposed quota changes more closely meet program objectives.

An alternative which involved translocating mature rams in lieu of removing them by hunting was considered. Since the Department currently has an active and ongoing bighorn sheep translocation program, relocating additional rams would not improve the program. This alternative would not address the Legislature's policy to provide diversified uses of wildlife, including hunting. Additionally, this alternative would not achieve the project objective of providing public hunting opportunities.

A no hunting alternative also was considered. This alternative would continue the translocation of bighorn sheep to available historical habitat, just as would occur under the proposed project. Under this alternative, it is possible that support for bighorn sheep management programs by interested conservation groups and hunters would decline. This decline could result in reducing the value of bighorn sheep to a segment of the public by unnecessarily preventing the hunting of a limited number of mature rams. In addition, it would not address the Legislature's policy to provide diversified uses of wildlife, including hunting. Therefore, this alternative would not achieve the project objectives.

(b) No change Alternative:

1. Number of Tags

The no change alternative was considered and found inadequate because it would not attain the project objective. Based on the intent of Section 4902 of the Fish and Game Code, and results of population surveys, it is necessary to adjust the number of tags available in all hunting zones as the status of the bighorn sheep populations change.

(c) Consideration of Alternatives:

In view of information currently possessed, no reasonable alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purposes for which the regulation is proposed or would be as effective as and less burdensome to the affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

X. Impact of Regulatory Action:

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result

from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The proposed action will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed action modifies method of take regulations for existing hunts. Given the number of tags available and the area over which they are distributed, these proposals are economically neutral to business.

- (b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State, the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses, or the Expansion of Businesses in California:

None.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

- (e) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

- (f) Programs mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

- (g) Costs Imposed on Any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

## Updated Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Existing regulations provide for limited hunting of Nelson bighorn rams in seven hunt zones. The proposed change adjusts the number of tags based on annual bighorn sheep population surveys conducted by the Department. The following proposed number of tags was determined using the procedure described in Fish and Game Code Section 4902:

<b>HUNT ZONE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF TAGS</b>
Zone 1 - Marble Mountains	4
Zone 2 - Kelso Peak/Old Dad Mountains	6
Zone 3 - Clark/Kingston Mountain Ranges	2
Zone 4 - Orocopia Mountains	0
Zone 5 - San Gorgonio Wilderness	1
Zone 6 - Sheep Hole Mountains	1
Zone 7 - White Mountains	3
Open Zone Fund-Raising Tags	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19</b>

The number of tags allocated for each of the seven hunt zones is based on the results of the Department's 2008 estimate of the bighorn sheep population in each zone. Tags are proposed to allow the take of less than 15 percent of the mature rams estimated in each zone.