



Proposed Actions and Reasons for Rejecting Those Considerations:

Comments received from the public regarding proposed amendments to sections 360(a), 360(b), 360(c), and 361, concerning deer hunting, are included in Attachment A along with the Department's responses.

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:

The levels of harvest (quotas) are subject to analysis based upon the Updated 2015 Deer Harvest and Population Estimates. There is no reasonable alternative to the proposed action.

(b) No Change Alternative:

Retaining the current number of tags for the zones currently listed in regulation was determined to be the best alternative based on the present 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. For the 2016-17 season the "No Change Alternative" is the proper level of 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 purposes for which the regulation is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in

implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

- (d) Description of Reasonable Alternatives That Would Lessen Adverse Impact on Small Business: None

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. The proposed action considered adjusting tag quotas for existing deer 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 and to the state's environment. Hunting provides opportunities for multi-generational family activities and promotes respect for California's environment by the future stewards of the State's resources and the action contributes to the sustainable management of natural resources.

The proposed action will not have significant impacts on jobs or businesses within California and does not provide benefits to worker safety.

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

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with this 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 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 because 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 most recent Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

Deer: § 360(a) A, B, C, and D Zone Hunts Tag Allocations			
§	Zone	Current 2015	Proposed 2016 [Range]
(1)	A	65,000	30,000-65,000
(2)	B	35,000	35,000-65,000
(3)	C	8,150	5,000-15,000
(4)	D3-5	33,000	30,000-40,000
(5)	D-6	10,000	6,000-16,000
(6)	D-7	9,000	4,000-10,000
(7)	D-8	8,000	5,000-10,000
(8)	D-9	2,000	1,000-2,500
(9)	D-10	700	400-800
(10)	D-11	5,500	2,500-6,000
(11)	D-12	950	100-1,500
(12)	D-13	4,000	2,000-5,000
(13)	D-14	3,000	2,000-3,500
(14)	D-15	1,500	500-2,000
(15)	D-16	3,000	1,000-3,500
(16)	D-17	500	100-800
(17)	D-19	1,500	500-2,000

### Benefits of the regulations

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 annually modifying the number of tags. The final values for the license tag numbers will be based upon findings from the annual harvest and herd composition counts.

### Non-monetary benefits to the public

The Commission does not anticipate non-monetary benefits to the protection of public health and safety, worker safety, the prevention of discrimination, the promotion of fairness or social equity and the increase in openness and transparency in business and government.

### Consistency with State or Federal Regulations

The Fish and Game Commission, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202 and 203, has the sole authority to regulate deer hunting in California. Commission staff has searched the California Code of Regulations and has found the proposed changes pertaining to deer tag allocations are consistent with Sections 361, 701, 702, 708.5 and 708.6 of Title 14. Therefore the Commission has determined that the proposed amendments are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations.

### Update

**At its April 14, 2016, meeting in Santa Rosa, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the final tag allocations in subsection 360(a) for the A, B, C, and D Hunt Zones indicated in the table below. As a result, the tag quotas are not changed from the prior year and there is no necessity for amending the regulation.**

**There have been no changes in applicable laws or to the effect of the proposed regulations from the laws and effects described in the Notice of Proposed Action.**

§	Zone	Current 2015	2016 Final Tag Allocations
(1)	A	65,000	<b>65,000</b>
(2)	B	35,000	<b>35,000</b>
(3)	C	8,150	<b>8,150</b>
(4)	D3-5	33,000	<b>33,000</b>

§	Zone	Current 2015	2016 Final Tag Allocations
(5)	D-6	10,000	<b>10,000</b>
(6)	D-7	9,000	<b>9,000</b>
(7)	D-8	8,000	<b>8,000</b>
(8)	D-9	2,000	<b>2,000</b>
(9)	D-10	700	<b>700</b>
(10)	D-11	5,500	<b>5,500</b>
(11)	D-12	950	<b>950</b>
(12)	D-13	4,000	<b>4,000</b>
(13)	D-14	3,000	<b>3,000</b>
(14)	D-15	1,500	<b>1,500</b>
(15)	D-16	3,000	<b>3,000</b>
(16)	D-17	500	<b>500</b>
(17)	D-19	1,500	<b>1,500</b>