

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: Pronghorn Antelope

I. Date of Initial Statement of Reasons: September 14, 2014

II. Date of Pre-adoption Statement of Reason: March 26, 2015

III. Date of Final Statement of Reasons: April 17, 2015

IV. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings:

(a) Notice Hearing: Date: December 3, 2014  
Location: Van Nuys, California

(b) Discussion Hearing: Date: February 12, 2015  
Location: Sacramento, California

(c) Adoption Hearing: Date: April 9, 2015  
Location: Santa Rosa, California

V. 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 9, 2015 meeting in Santa Rosa, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the final tag quotas for 2015 identified in the table in the Updated Informative Digest. The quotas for the apprentice hunts and Zones 1 and 6 did not change from current levels. Changes to quotas were made in Zones 2 through 5 within the originally proposed ranges.

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

Responses to public comments, oral or in writing, regarding all proposed 2015-2016 mammal hunting regulations received through April 9, 2015 are included as Attachment A.

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

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. Management plans specify minimum desired buck to doe ratios which are attained/maintained in part by modifying tag quotas on an annual basis. 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 or 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.

X. Mitigation Measures Required by Regulatory Action:

The regulatory action will have no negative impact on the environment; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed. The number of tags proposed is at or below the number of tags analyzed in the 2004 Final Environmental Document Regarding Pronghorn Antelope Hunting.

XI. Impact of Regulatory Action:

This action sets tag quotas for existing hunts. Given the number of tags available, and the area over which they are distributed, this proposal is economically neutral to business.

(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:

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 significant impacts on jobs or business within California and does not provide benefits to worker safety.

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

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business 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, Government Code:

None

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None

## Updated Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Existing regulations provide for the number of pronghorn antelope hunting tags for each hunt zone. This proposed regulatory action would provide for tag allocation ranges for most hunt zones pending final tag quota determinations based on winter survey results that should be completed by March of 2015. The final tag quotas will provide for adequate hunting opportunities while allowing for a biologically appropriate harvest of bucks and does in specific populations. The proposed 2015 tag allocation ranges for the hunt zones are as set forth below.

2015 Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocation Ranges						
<i>Hunt Area</i>	<i>Archery-Only Season</i>		<i>General Season</i>			
			Period 1		Period 2	
	Buck	Doe	Buck	Doe	Buck	Doe
Zone 1 – Mount Dome	0-10	0-3	0-60	0-20	0	0
Zone 2 – Clear Lake	0-10	0-3	0-80	0-25	0	0
Zone 3 – Likely Tables	0-20	0-7	0-150	0-50	0-130	0-50
Zone 4 – Lassen	0-20	0-7	0-150	0-50	0-150	0-50
Zone 5 – Big Valley	0-15	0-5	0-150	0-50	0	0
Zone 6 – Surprise Valley	0-10	0	0-25	0-7	0	0
Likely Tables Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-5 Either-Sex		0	
Lassen Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-15 Either-Sex		0	
Big Valley Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-15 Either-Sex		0	
Surprise Valley Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-4 Either-Sex		0	
Fund-Raising Hunt	N/A		0-10 Buck			

**UPDATE:**

**Pursuant to its April 9, 2015 meeting, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the 2015 tag quotas as follows:**

2015 Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocation						
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	<b>15</b>	0	0	0
Zone 3 – Likely Tables	10	0	40	0	<b>40</b>	0
Zone 4 – Lassen	<b>10</b>	0	<b>45</b>	0	<b>45</b>	0
Zone 5 – Big Valley	1	0	<b>20</b>	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			