

Economic Impact Assessment

Amend Sections 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, and Add Section 364.1
Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR)
Re: Big Game Tag Allocations For 2015

The proposed amendments will set the 2015-2016 Big Game tag allocations for each hunt area. The addition of Section 364.1 will establish tag allocations for the SHARE program. Currently, the season dates and tag quotas are established based on overwinter herd reports and biological assessments made by Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) biologists at the conclusion of the respective species hunting seasons. In early spring, surveys of big game herds are conducted to determine the proportion of young 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. Each year the Department reviews the population status of the subject species and recommends tag quotas based on the above survey data.

A. Economic Impact of Deer, Elk, Antelope, and Bighorn Sheep Hunting

Data from the Department's Wildlife and License and Revenue Branches were used in conjunction with USFWS¹ data to estimate the total economic impact of Deer, Elk, Antelope, and Bighorn Sheep hunters throughout the state. Each year about 175,000 hunters spend about \$1,161 each in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures are dispersed to California businesses in the vicinity of and en route to the hunting areas. These direct expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$263,702,757 in total economic output.² Deer, Elk, Antelope, and Bighorn Sheep hunting is associated with about \$51,947,191 in labor income or a total of 1,170 jobs in the state.

	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$202,390,334	\$31,704,949	803
Indirect	\$21,568,669	\$7,035,943	121
Induced	\$39,743,754	\$13,206,299	247
Total	\$263,702,757	\$51,947,191	1,170

1. Economic Impact of Deer Hunting

§360 (a) Economic Impact of Deer Hunting in Zones A, B, C, and D

Section 360 (a) sets dates and tag quotas for deer hunting in zones A, B, C, and D of the state. The approximately 150,300 deer hunters in these zones alone are estimated to contribute about \$177,443,656 per year in hunting trip-related

¹ USFW, 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation for California, Feb 2013.

² California state-wide multipliers generated with IMPLAN were used to estimate the total economic impacts for all Big Game Hunting.

expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$231,198,695 in total economic output. The combined economic effects of deer hunters in these zones support as many as 1,026 jobs in the state.

Deer Hunting §360(a) Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$177,443,656	\$27,796,990	704
Indirect	\$18,910,110	\$6,168,691	106
Induced	\$34,844,930	\$11,578,488	216
Total	\$231,198,695	\$45,544,169	1,026

§360 (b) Economic Impact of Deer Hunting in Zone X

Section 360(b) sets dates and tag quotas for deer hunting in zone X in the north eastern portion of the state. The approximately 6,351 deer hunters in these zones alone are estimated to contribute about \$5,492,577 per year in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$7,156,506 in total economic output. The combined economic effects of deer hunters in these zones support as many as 32 jobs in the state.

Deer Hunting §360(b) Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$5,492,577	\$860,426	22
Indirect	\$585,342	\$190,945	3
Induced	\$1,078,587	\$358,400	7
Total	\$7,156,506	\$1,409,771	32

§360 (c) Economic Impact of Additional Deer Hunts Specified by §360 (c)

Section 360(c) sets dates and tag quotas for additional deer hunts throughout the state. The approximately 4,871 deer hunters participating in additional hunts are estimated to contribute about \$5,748,926 per year in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$7,490,514 in total economic output. The combined economic effects of deer hunters in these zones support as many as 33 jobs in the state.

Deer Hunting §360(c) Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$5,748,926	\$900,584	23
Indirect	\$612,661	\$199,857	3
Induced	\$1,128,927	\$375,127	7
Total	\$7,490,514	\$1,475,567	33

§361 Economic Impact of Archery Deer Hunting

Section 361 sets dates and tag quotas for archery deer hunting in the state. The approximately 6,120 archery deer hunters alone are estimated to contribute about \$9,034,699 per year in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$11,063,006 in total

economic impact. The combined economic effects of deer hunters in these zones support as many as 39 jobs in the state.

Archery Deer Hunting §361 Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$9,034,699	\$1,048,848	27
Indirect	\$713,524	\$232,760	4
Induced	\$1,314,783	\$436,884	8
Total	\$11,063,006	\$1,718,492	39

2. §362 Economic Impact of Nelson Bighorn Sheep Hunting

Section 362 sets dates and tag quotas for Bighorn Sheep hunting in the state. The approximately 23 Bighorn Sheep hunters alone are estimated to contribute about \$12,339 per year in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$16,077 in total economic output. The combined economic effects of Bighorn Sheep hunters in these zones support as much as .07 jobs in the state.

Bighorn Sheep Hunting §362 Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$12,339	\$1,933	0.05
Indirect	\$1,315	\$429	0.01
Induced	\$2,423	\$805	0.02
Total	\$16,077	\$3,167	0.07

3. §363 Economic Impact of Pronghorn Antelope Hunting

Section 363 sets dates and tag quotas for Pronghorn Antelope hunting in the state. The approximately 243 Pronghorn Antelope hunters alone are estimated to contribute about \$93,077 per year in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$121,274 in total economic output. The combined economic effects of Pronghorn Antelope hunters in these zones support as many as 0.54 jobs in the state.

Antelope Hunting §363 Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$93,077	\$14,581	0.37
Indirect	\$9,919	\$3,236	0.06
Induced	\$18,278	\$6,073	0.11
Total	\$121,274	\$23,890	0.54

4. §364 Economic Impact of Elk Hunting

Section 364 sets dates and tag quotas for Elk hunting in the state. The approximately 415 Elk hunters alone are estimated to contribute about \$269,175 per year in hunting trip-related expenditures. These trip-related expenditures generate indirect and induced effects resulting in \$350,719 in total economic output. The combined economic effects of Elk hunters in these zones support as many as 1.56 jobs in the state.

Elk Hunting §364 Trip-Related Expenditures (resident & nonresident)			
	Output	Labor Income	Jobs
Direct	\$269,175	\$42,167	1.07
Indirect	\$28,686	\$9,358	0.16
Induced	\$52,858	\$17,564	0.33
Total	\$350,719	\$69,089	1.56

Economic Impact of Proposed Changes to § 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, and the Addition of Section 364.1

The existing §360, 361, 362, 363, 364, regulations specify the number of tag allocations by species and zone across the state. The Commission is considering a limited range for the annual update to the tag allocations. The economic impact of the final tag allocation structure was evaluated at the lowest possible number; the median number; and the highest possible number of tags to be adopted by the Commission. The range of tag allocation options do not vary significantly from the allocations adopted for 2014. Section 364.1 will implement a program, (SHARE) that permits the transfer of tags within a zone to private land holders within that zone and is thus considered economically neutral. In total, little change in the current level of direct, indirect or induced economic impact is anticipated.

A. The Creation or Elimination of Jobs

Depending on the final number of tags that the Commission adopts, the statewide impact to the creation or elimination of jobs is expected to be minimal because the difference from the previous year's tag allocation totals will not be substantial enough to impact jobs. The jobs multiplier for big game hunting in the state is about five jobs per million dollars in hunting trip expenditures.

B. The Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses

The Commission does not anticipate any impacts on the creation of new business or the elimination of existing businesses because the proposed regulations are not expected to reduce or increase the number of hunter days to a significant extent.

D. Benefits of the Regulation:

Concurrence with Federal Law:

There are no comparable federal laws.

Concurrence with other Statutory Requirements:

Not applicable.

Health and Welfare of California Residents

Hunting provides outdoor recreational opportunities for not only the hunters, but for family and friends who are non-hunting members of the group, and are able to participate in hiking, fishing and other outdoor activities.

Benefits of the Regulation to Worker Safety

The Commission does not anticipate any impacts to worker safety because the proposed amendments will not affect working conditions.

Benefits to the Environment: Sustainable Management of Big Game Resources

It is the policy of this state to encourage the conservation, maintenance, and utilization of the living resources of the state's wildlife under the jurisdiction and influence of the state for the benefit of all the citizens of the state and to promote the development of local California hunting in harmony with federal law respecting the conservation of the living resources of the state. The objectives of this policy include, but are not limited to, the maintenance of sufficient populations of all species to ensure their continued existence and the maintenance of a sufficient resource to support a reasonable sport use, taking into consideration the necessity of regulating individual tag quotas to the quantity that is sufficient to provide satisfying hunting opportunities. Adoption of scientifically-based seasons, zones, and tag quotas provides for the maintenance of sufficient populations of big-game species to ensure their continued existence.

Other Benefits of the Regulation:

Promotion of Businesses That Rely on Statewide Hunting.

Adoption of scientifically-based seasons, zones and tag quotas provides for the maintenance of sufficient populations of big game to ensure their continued existence and future sport hunting opportunities. Under a normal season state big game hunters contribute about \$202,390,334 in direct revenues to the State's business sector. This is based on California Department of Fish and Wildlife data and the US Fish and Wildlife Service's 2011 national survey data on fishing, hunting, and wildlife associated recreation for California. Adding the indirect and induced effects of this initial revenue contribution and the total benefit to California's economy is estimated to be \$263,702,757 per year. This is equivalent to about \$51,947,191 in total wage earnings to Californians, or as many as 1,170 jobs in the state.