

values for the 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.

2. Modify Area Description for South Unit 110.

Due to an inadvertent omission, the counties of Madera, Merced, and Tulare were not included in the South Unit 110 description when the A Zone was split into North and South Units. The proposal includes those counties to accurately describe the full area available to A zone South Unit 110 deer hunters, accurately describe the area for lead ammunition restrictions, and for clarity/consistency when other regulatory sections reference the A zone.

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

Authority: Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202, 203, 220, 460, 3452, 3453, and 4334.
Reference: Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 207, 458, 459, 460, 3452, 3453, and 4334.

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

None.

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

2007 Final Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

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

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

Additionally, in 2000, the Department of Fish and Game 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 tag draw method alternatives. 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, furbearers, including deer 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.

2. Modify area description of South Unit 110

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 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.

2. Modify area description of South Unit 110

The no change alternative was considered and found inadequate to attain the project objectives. The no change alternative would unnecessarily restrict hunter opportunity, would not accurately reflect the lead ammunition restriction recently enacted by the legislature, and may result in confusion when other regulatory sections reference the A zone.

(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.

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.

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 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 Businessmen 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.

None.

- (c) Cost Impacts on Private Persons.

The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person 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) 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 following table. 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 overwinter adult survival, final tag quotas may fall below the proposed range.

Existing regulation inaccurately describe the A zone South Unit 110. This regulatory proposal includes portions of the counties of Madera, Merced, and Tulare in the area description.

Deer: § 360(a) A, B, C, and D Zone Hunts		
Tag Allocations		
Zone	Current	Proposed
A	65,000	30,000-65,000
B	55,500	35,000-65,000
C	8,575	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