I. Date of Initial Statement of Reasons: December 15, 2009

II. Date of Pre-Adoption Statement of Purpose: March 23, 2010

III. Date of Final Statement of Reasons: April 26, 2010

IV. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings:

(a) Notice Hearing: Date: February 4, 2010
Location: Sacramento

(b) Discussion Hearings: Date: March 4, 2010
Location: Ontario

Date: April 8, 2010
Location: Monterey

(c) Adoption Hearing: Date: April 21, 2010 (Teleconference)
Location: Sacramento

V. Update:

No modifications were made to the originally proposed language of the Initial Statement of Reasons.

Pursuant to its April 21, 2010 meeting in Sacramento, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the regulation changes as proposed.

VI. Summary of Primary Considerations Raised in Opposition and in Support:

No (other) 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
IX. Description of Reasonable Regulatory Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

(a) Alternatives to Regulation Change:

1. Number of Tags
   No alternatives were identified. Bighorn sheep license tag quotas must be changed periodically in response to a variety of biological and environmental conditions.

2. Number of Fund-raising Tags
   No alternatives were identified. Bighorn sheep fund-raising tag numbers 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 bighorn sheep 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 desired percentage harvest levels on an annual basis. The no-change alternative would not allow for adjustment of tag quotas in response to changing environmental/biological conditions.

2. Number of Fund-raising Tags
   The no-change alternative was considered and rejected because it would not attain project objectives of providing for hunting opportunities, and ensuring proper distribution of the hunting effort. The no-change alternative would not allow for the adjustment of numbers of fund-raising tags in response to changing environmental/biological conditions, would limit optimizing program revenue, and would not distribute hunter harvest to ensure that no more than 15 percent of the mature rams are harvested in each 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.

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 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.
Existing regulations provide for the number of bighorn sheep 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 survey results that should be completed by March, 2010. The final tag quotas will provide for adequate hunting opportunities while allowing for a biologically appropriate harvest of bighorn sheep. The following proposed number of tags was determined using the procedure described in Fish and Game Code Section 4902:

Pursuant to its April 25, 2007 meeting, the Fish and Game Commission adopted the proposed language changes and specific tag numbers for each zone as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUNT ZONE</th>
<th>2009 Tag allocation</th>
<th>2010 Tag allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 - Marble/Clipper Mountains</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2 - Kelso Peak/Old Dad Mountains</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3 - Clark/Kingston Mountain Ranges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4 - Orocopia Mountains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5 - San Gorgonio Wilderness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6 - Sheep Hole Mountains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7 – White Mountains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Zone Fund-Raising Tag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>