I. Date of Initial Statement of Reasons: January 14, 2009

II. Date of Pre-Adoption Statement of Reasons: None

III. Date of Final Statement of Reasons: April 27, 2009

IV. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings:

(a) Notice Hearing: Date: February 5, 2009  Location: Sacramento, CA

(b) Discussion Hearings: Date: March 4, 2009  Location: Woodland, CA
   Date: April 9, 2009  Location: Lodi, CA

(c) Adoption Hearing: Date: April 21, 2009 (Teleconference)  Location: Sacramento, CA

V. Update:

The originally proposed regulatory text of Section 265 was not changed.

VI. 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.

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 Regulation Change:

No alternatives were identified.

(b) No Change Alternative:

The no change alternative would leave outdated language in the regulations that has not kept up with change in equipment for dog collars.

(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.

X. 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.

(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 proposed change is not likely to have any negative economic impact.

(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:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.
Updated Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The dog control zone boundaries descriptions were last amended in 2002. Since that time, various roads and other map features used to delineate the dog control zone boundary have changed. This amendment seeks to update those dog control zone boundary descriptions to utilize current road alignments and designations. To the extent possible, the boundaries were retained in their same location. In some cases, the realignment of road resulted in minor location changes. It is not anticipated that dog handlers will have any unreasonable difficulty in understanding the new boundaries. The boundaries should be more accurate and easier comprehend using commonly available maps.

Throughout the years the dog tracking and electronic retrieval devices have changed with technology. Dog treeing switches (devices consisting of a switch mechanism which results in a change in the transmitted signals when the dog raises its head to a treed animal) used to be made with a mercury switch. These mercury switches are currently illegal to use. There are now treeing switches used that use magnetic devices to activate the treeing switch. The requirement for the switch to be a “mercury switch” needs to be removed and any treeing switch device needs to be illegal.

Treeing switches on dog collars are activated when a dog raises its head to bark at a treed animal. The activated switch sends a signal to the telemetry device the hunter carries. This activation lets the hunter know that an animal is treed. If the treeing switch were allowed, the hunter would have no need to follow the dogs on foot during the chase. The hunter could just wait until the treeing switch went off and walk to the tree and find the treed animal and dogs with telemetry equipment. Without the use of a treeing switch device, the hunter is required to follow the dogs on foot and be with the dogs when an animal is treed or be close enough to hear the barking of the dogs to determine if an animal is treed. The use of treeing switches on dog collars would limit the sporting aspect of fair chase.

(During its April 21, 2009 teleconference call, the Commission adopted the above regulations as proposed.)