

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FISH AND GAME COMMISSION  
INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR REGULATORY ACTION  
(Pre-Publication of Notice Statement)

Amend Subsection 360(a)  
Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR)  
Re: Deer: A, B, C, and D Zone Hunts

I. Date of Initial Statement of Reasons: September 24, 2013

II. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings:

- |                         |           |                   |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| (a) Notice Hearing:     | Date:     | December 11, 2013 |
|                         | Location: | San Diego, CA     |
| (b) Discussion Hearing: | Date:     | February 5, 2014  |
|                         | Location: | Sacramento, CA    |
| (c) Adoption Hearing:   | Date:     | April 16, 2014    |
|                         | Location: | Ventura, CA       |

III. Description of Regulatory Action:

(a) Statement of Specific Purpose of Regulation Change and Factual Basis for Determining that Regulation Change is Reasonably Necessary:

1. Number of Tags

Existing regulations provide for the number of hunting tags in the A, B, C, and D zones. The proposed regulation changes the number of tags for all existing zones to a series of ranges as indicated in the table presented in the Informative Digest.

The proposed regulation provides a range of tag numbers for each zone from which a final number will be determined, based on the post-winter status of each deer herd. These ranges are necessary, as the final number of tags cannot be determined until spring herd data are collected in March/April.

In early spring, surveys of deer herds are conducted to determine the proportion of fawns that have survived the winter. This information is used in conjunction with the prior year harvest and fall herd composition data to estimate overall herd size, sex and age ratios, and the predicted number of available bucks next season. The number of bucks and does needs to be estimated prior to the hunting season to determine how many surplus bucks will exist over and above the number required to maintain the

desired buck ratio objectives stated in the approved deer herd management plans.

The actual tag numbers for each affected zone will be recommended to the Commission at the adoption hearing in April 2014, and will be selected from the range of values provided by this proposal. These final license tag numbers will be based upon findings from the annual harvest and herd composition counts. However, under circumstances where severe winter conditions adversely effect herd recruitment and over-winter adult survival, final tag quotas may fall below the proposed tag range into the “Low Kill” alternative identified in the 2007 Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

(b) Authority and Reference Sections from Fish and Game Code for Regulation:

Authority: Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202, 203, 220 and 460.

Reference: Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 207, 458, 459 and 460.

(c) Specific Technology or Equipment Required by Regulatory Change:

None

(d) Identification of Reports or Documents Supporting Regulation Change:

[Economic Impact Assessment](#)

(e) Public Discussions of Proposed Regulations Prior to Notice Publication:

The Department conducted a public scoping session in Sacramento on October 11, 2006 and November 18, 2010. Public input, discussions and recommendations regarding the environmental document and mammal hunting and trapping regulations were taken at that time.

Additionally, in 2000, the Department of Fish and Wildlife held a total of twenty-three (23) “Deer Stakeholder” meetings throughout the State. The meetings were open to the public and the Department provided information on a variety of deer management strategies and issues including: Deer Assessment Unit (zone complex) planning and alternative methods for tag drawings. Attendees were asked to participate in a survey and public comment was also received. The Department also conducted four public meetings at which regulation change concepts and specific proposals for mammals (including deer) and furbearers, were discussed, and additional public comment was received.

While these meetings were conducted prior to the establishment of current and proposed regulations, the concepts and proposals which were derived through these meetings are still being implemented as part of the current year regulatory process.

#### IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

##### (a) Alternatives to Regulation Change:

###### 1. Number of Tags

There is no reasonable alternative to the proposed action.

##### (b) No Change Alternative:

###### 1. Number of Tags

The “No Change Alternative” was considered and found inadequate to attain the project objectives. Retaining the current number of tags for the zones listed may not be responsive to yearly changes in the status of the herds. The deer herd management plans specify objective levels for the proportion of bucks in the herds. These ratios are maintained and managed in part by modifying the number of tags. The “No Change Alternative” would not allow management of the desired proportion of bucks stated in the approved deer herd management plans.

##### (c) Consideration of Alternatives:

In view of information currently possessed, no reasonable alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

#### V. Mitigation Measures Required by Regulatory Action:

The proposed regulatory action will have no negative impact on the environment; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed. The maximum number of tags available in the newly proposed range is at or below the number of tags analyzed in the 2007 Final Environmental Document regarding Deer Hunting and related documents.

#### VI. 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 initial 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 adjusts tag quotas 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; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents. Hunting provides opportunities for multi-generational family activities and promotes respect for California's environment by the future stewards of the State's resources. The Commission anticipates benefits to the State's environment in the sustainable management of natural resources.

The proposed action will not have a significant impact on jobs or businesses in California. The proposed action adjusts tag quotas for existing hunts based on herd performance criteria. Given the number of tags historically available, the minimal adjustments in tag numbers that are anticipated for the 2014 hunting season, and the area over which they are distributed (entire State of California); these proposals are economically neutral to jobs or business within California.

- (c) Cost Impacts on Representative Private Persons/Business.

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

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

None

- (e) Other 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

**INFORMATIVE DIGEST**  
**(Policy Statement Overview)**

Existing regulations provide for the number of license tags available for the A, B, C, and D Zones. This regulatory proposal changes the number of tags for all existing zones to a series of ranges presented in the table below. These ranges are necessary, as the final number of tags cannot be determined until spring herd data are collected in March/April. Because severe winter conditions can have an adverse effect on herd recruitment and over-winter adult survival, final tag quotas may fall below the proposed range into the “Low Kill” alternative identified in the 2007 Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

<b>Deer: § 360(a) A, B, C, and D Zone Hunts</b>		
<b>Tag Allocations</b>		
Zone	Current	Proposed
A	65,000	30,000-65,000
B	35,000	35,000-65,000
C	8,150	5,000-15,000
D3-5	33,000	30,000-40,000
D-6	10,000	6,000-16,000
D-7	9,000	4,000-10,000
D-8	8,000	5,000-10,000
D-9	2,000	1,000-2,500
D-10	700	400-800
D-11	5,500	2,500-6,000
D-12	950	100-1,500
D-13	4,000	2,000-5,000
D-14	3,000	2,000-3,500
D-15	1,500	500-2,000
D-16	3,000	1,000-3,500
D-17	500	100-800
D-19	1,500	500-2,000

A minor editorial correction to highway nomenclature was also made.