

“Public Comments and Responses for Mammal Hunting Regulations 2013”

Comment #, Format, Name, Date, Location	Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations	Public Comment:	Department Response:
ARCHERY EQUIPMENT AND CROSSBOW REGULATIONS – Section 354			
7, Terry Lampier, Nevada County 1/7/13, by Telephone to Department Staff (no written records)	Section 354	Raises concerns that the proposed change allows for night hunting.	This regulatory change does not allow night hunting. Allowing the use of arrows with lighted nocks is intended to improve the recovery of animals in low light situations within legal hunting hours.
DEER – Sections 360 and 361			
1, L, Col. Donna Williams, Undated (date stamped 12/14/12), Fort Hunter Liggett	360(a),(c)	Military recommendations for deer hunting seasons and tag quota's.	Due to identification of specific dates surrounding the Columbus day holiday in the current (2007) environmental document regarding deer hunting, the Department is unable to change the season dates for J10 and G8 as requested. However, existing regulations allow for the Commanding Officer, with Department concurrence, to change the adopted date as needed to accommodate base operations. Since the requested tag quota change did not result in a higher than analyzed for/disclosed kill in the current environmental document regarding deer hunting but rather was just a change in the tag allocation between military and public hunters, the Department accepted the recommendation and made the change as requested.
2, E, Randy Arellanes, March 4, 2013	Section 360(a)	Implement a 3 point or better antler restriction for the southern end of the A zone.	The Department disagrees with the recommendation to implement a three-point or better antler restriction in this area because it is inconsistent with sound management practices. California eliminated 3 point antler restrictions in 1990 in order to reduce waste due to illegal killing of forked-horn bucks and to reduce harvest pressure on older age class bucks. The result of the change was that fewer forked horn bucks were killed by mistake and left in the field during the season and more large antlered bucks remained in the herd post season. The recommendation would cause an unnecessary waste of illegally killed forked horned bucks and require the Department to reduce tag quota's to compensate for increased kill.
3, L, G. Kent Webb, 4/2/13, San Jose	Sections 360, 361	Reduce deer tags due to declining deer populations; make up lost revenue by expanding to two tier pricing system. Provide complete harvest data on website.	Tag quotas recommended by the Department are established in conformance with management objectives contained within individual deer herd management plans. Herd performance data is usually collected in the fall, after the season for the zone has

“Public Comments and Responses for Mammal Hunting Regulations 2013”

Comment #, Format, Name, Date, Location	Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations	Public Comment:	Department Response:
			<p>closed and in the spring in order to determine over-winter survival and recruitment. An allowable buck harvest (ABH) is calculated using individual herd performance data. Based on this process, the Department does not believe that further reductions in tag quotas are warranted.</p> <p>The Department is unable to determine what the recommendation regarding a two tier pricing system means; the Department currently has different prices for resident and non-resident hunters and it is unclear if this is the system referred to by the author or if they were speaking about another system to be developed.</p> <p>The Department agrees with the recommendation regarding keeping more current information on the web-site. Unfortunately, due to accelerated deadlines, a change in harvest reporting methodology, and decreasing personnel resources have resulted in delays in providing this information to the general public via the web-site. This deficiency is being addressed; information requested in the letter has already been posted on the web. Additionally, the Department will be embarking on the development of new deer management plans, in cooperation with all Californians who are interested in this subject, in Summer, 2013.</p>
4, E, Todd Stevens, 4/9/13	Sections 360, 361	Split tag revenue from sale of antlerless tags with county that approves/holds the doe hunt. Make hunters choose a weapon - bow or rifle - to avoid overcrowding and have more "quality hunts".	<p>While certainly a novel and intriguing idea, the Department is unaware of any statutory authority that would allow splitting tag revenue with a county holding an antlerless hunt. In our experience, financial reasons play no role in the decision made by the County Board of Supervisors in question. Rather, those decisions appear to be based primarily on public testimony provided by constituents that appear to be morally opposed to the killing of antlerless deer. Additionally, financial reward should not be a factor in the implementation of these hunts; they should only be conducted where biological factors indicate they are warranted.</p> <p>As many of the deer hunts already require hunters to choose a weapon type (for example, additional archery and muzzleloader</p>

“Public Comments and Responses for Mammal Hunting Regulations 2013”

Comment #, Format, Name, Date, Location	Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations	Public Comment:	Department Response:
			<p>hunts), CDFW assumes the author is referring to the general season hunts where a hunter can use any of the authorized methods of take identified in Section 353, T14, CCR. The recommendation is rejected, as general season tag quotas are based on herd performance factors and management objectives, and making hunters choose a weapon would not necessarily result in a decrease in available tags, avoidance of any perceived "overcrowding", or help achieve existing management objectives. Indeed, many deer hunters have expressed an opposite opinion and are pleased that the CDFW allows them to choose their weapon rather than making that choice for them.</p>
BIGHORN SHEEP – Sections 362 and 708.9			
<p>5, E, Robert Moore, California Bowmen Hunters, 11/23/2012, N/A</p>	<p>Section 362</p>	<p>Create an archery-only hunt opportunity</p>	<p>The Fish and Game Commission has adopted regulations to provide for the sport hunting of not more than 15% of the mature Nelson bighorn rams in a single management unit, based on an annual estimate of the population in each management unit. Hunters have the opportunity to apply in any hunt zone and use any method of take as described in 353 and 354 Title 14, CCR for taking bighorn sheep, this includes archery equipment. Limited hunting opportunities exist for Nelson bighorn sheep in California; not restricting tags by method of take maximizes the opportunity for consumptive utilization by all hunters and their preferred method of take. An analysis of hunters over the most recent years shows that the demand for an archery tag is very low. Only two hunters in the last three years have successfully harvested a ram using archery equipment. At least two others began their hunts with archery equipment and switched their method of take to rifle during the season. Therefore, the Department does not recommend an archery-only hunt opportunity due to a low hunter demand for the proposal and the associated decrease in hunting opportunity for hunters wanting to use other general methods (firearms).</p> <p>According to Fish and Game Code, Section 4902 (d) the purpose of the fund-raising tags is to raise funds for programs and projects to benefit Nelson bighorn sheep. The recommendation is rejected because a general method of take fund-raising tag appeals to a</p>

“Public Comments and Responses for Mammal Hunting Regulations 2013”

Comment #, Format, Name, Date, Location	Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations	Public Comment:	Department Response:
			broader audience, maximizing interest and potential revenue.
6, O, Rick Bulloch, California Outdoor Heritage Alliance, 4/17/13, Commission Meeting	Section 708.9	Supports increase in non-resident tag allotment for bighorn sheep hunting.	Accepted. This is the Department's current recommendation.
PRONGHORN ANTELOPE – Section 363			
		No public comments were received.	
ELK – Section 364			
		No public comments were received.	