

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR REGULATORY ACTION

Amend Section 363
Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR)
Re: Antelope

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

II. Date of Final Statement of Reasons: April 18, 2014

III. 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

IV. Update:

No modifications were made to the originally proposed language of the Initial Statement of Reasons.

Existing regulations provide for a specific number of tags (tag quotas) for antelope in specified zones. The originally proposed language changed the number of tags to a series of tag ranges. The originally proposed language has been modified to establish specific tag quotas from a range for each hunt zone. Quotas were established following the completion of surveys and data analysis to determine population sizes. At its April 16, 2014 meeting in Ventura, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the final tag quotas identified in the table within the Updated Informative Digest.

V. Summary of Primary Considerations Raised in Support of or Opposition to the Proposed Actions and Reasons for Rejecting Those Considerations:

No public comments, written or oral, were received during the public comment period.

VI. 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

VII. Location of Department files:

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

VIII. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

(a) Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

1. Number of Tags

No alternatives were identified. Pronghorn antelope license tag quotas must be changed periodically in response to a variety of biological and environmental conditions.

(b) No change Alternative:

1. Number of Tags

The no-change alternative was considered and rejected because it would not attain project objectives of providing for hunting opportunities while maintaining pronghorn antelope populations within desired population objectives. Retaining the current tag quota for each zone may not be responsive to biologically-based changes in the status of various herds. The no-change alternative would not allow for adjustment of tag quotas in response to changing environmental/biological conditions.

(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, would be as effective and less burdensome to the 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.

IX. 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. Considering the small number of tags issued over the entire state, this proposal is 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:

None

- (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, Government Code:

None

- (h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None

Updated Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Existing regulations specify the number of pronghorn antelope hunting tags for each hunt zone. The final tag quotas provide for adequate hunting opportunities while allowing for a biologically appropriate harvest in specific populations. The proposed tag allocations are as set forth below.

No other modifications to the original proposal were made. Pursuant to its April 16, 2014 meeting, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the above referenced changes and final tag quotas as proposed.

2014 Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocations						
Hunt Area	Archery-Only Season		General Season			
	Buck	Doe	Period 1		Period 2	
Buck			Doe	Buck	Doe	
Zone 1 – Mount Dome	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zone 2 – Clear Lake	1	0	10	0	0	0
Zone 3 – Likely Tables	10	0	40	0	35	0
Zone 4 – Lassen	5	0	30	0	30	0
Zone 5 – Big Valley	1	0	10	0	0	0
Zone 6 – Surprise Valley	1	0	10	0	0	0
Likely Tables Apprentice Hunt	N/A		5 Either-Sex		0	
Lassen Apprentice Hunt	N/A		5 Either-Sex		0	
Big Valley Apprentice Hunt	N/A		1 Either-Sex		0	
Surprise Valley Apprentice Hunt	N/A		4 Either-Sex		0	
Fund-Raising Hunt	N/A		2 Buck			