

Public Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations
For the 2013 Process, and Department Responses to Those Changes

Comment #, Format, Name, Date, Location	Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations	Public Comment:	Department Response:
WILD PIG			
#1 E 8/2012 Gary L	Sections 353, 368	Why not let mountain lions, coyotes, and bears take care of the wild pig population instead of killing them and interfering with the course of the natural world. Why not transplant the wild pigs to areas where there is a need to control wild vegetation that can help control wild fires. It is unnecessary for man to always turn to killing as the easy way out to manage wildlife. The use of firearms is also a problem for wildlife due to lead poisoning. Wildlife biologists can attest to the fact that the eradication of wolves in the lower 48 states has now led to an overpopulation of coyotes. Now man wants to kill the coyotes and pretend they pose a problem when the real problem is mankind's interfering with the natural course of nature.	Fish and Game Code Section 1801 declares that state policies provide diversified recreational use of wildlife, including sport hunting. Furthermore, Title 14, sections 353 and 368 are not being considered for amendments at this time. The public recommendation is rejected because it unnecessarily restricts hunting opportunity and contradicts the Commission's policy regarding limiting the impacts caused by wild pig.
BEAR			
#2 E 5/19/2012 John Adamski	Section 365	Many of us believe Nevada has a Bear Hunting licensing mentality purely driven by hunting groups' pressure and tag fees, and not by real population control science. Furthermore, in all likelihood - Nevada hunters in many regions near California borders are actually killing California bear populations. I ask that you consider beginning negotiations with NDOW to protect our bears in these migration regions.	Section 365 is open for the consideration of amendments to respond to new legislation. This recommendation will require further review for possible consideration at a future date.
DEER			
#3 E 6/7/2012 Greg Castagnoli	Section 360	As with all "original regulations" it is time to look for improvements to the current process of drawing a tag to one of California coveted X- Zones or to look at increasing the number of tags or both.	Tag quotas recommended by DFG 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 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. Tag quotas for the X Zones are set at a level that will not exceed that ABH. Demand for X zone tags

Public Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations
For the 2013 Process, and Department Responses to Those Changes

			has long exceeded the supply of tags; the modified preference point draw system was implemented to help alleviate that by rewarding those who consistently apply. Arbitrarily adding tags to meet hunter demand is not consistent with sound wildlife management practices.
#4 E 9/20/12 Dustin Destruel	Section 360	I am writing you to appeal for the review and possible consideration of a minor boundary change in A zone north unit 160. There is a small pocket of area east of highway 101 Willits and north of highway 20 is included in the A zone hunting region and is divided by nothing else other than a small dirt road and the current situation does not seem to be the best fit. I would like to suggest that the boundary for between A zone No. 160 & B Zone be taken into consideration and possibly moved to where a major landmark becomes the dividing line. My suggestion would be that it be Divided south from Willits along the highway 101 and then east along the highway 20 corridor.	Potential impacts to deer populations under a variety of hunting strategies are identified and analyzed under the current certified Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting (2007). Hunt area (zones), season length, and season timing are three important factors in performing that analysis. Any proposed action which may result in a harvest greater than what was identified, analyzed, and disclosed in the current certified environmental document would require the preparation and certification of a new environmental document. The addition of new area to both the B1 and B3 deer zones would likely result in a higher than disclosed kill for those zones than is identified in the current certified environmental document. Implementation of this regulation change proposal would require the preparation and certification of a new Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting to address those higher kills.
#5 L 10/2/2012 James Codding	Section 360	Supports Comment #4.	see response for #4, above.
#27 L 6/24/2012 Frank Williams, Chair Plumas County Fish & Game Commission	Section 360	Notify successful deer hunters in X6A, X6B, X7A, X7B that elk are present in the area and to act accordingly.	This is not a regulatory change. Although since the implementation of the ALDS system deer tag inserts are no longer mailed with deer tags, this information can be provided on-line and in the Big Game Digest and Big Game Hunting Regulation Booklet.
#28 L 4/30/2012 Donald Scheidt	Section 360, 361	Reduce number of deer tags available.	Tag quota's are developed based on herd population performance parameters and harvest objectives as identified in appropriate deer herd management plans. Arbitrarily reducing the number of tags could unnecessarily restrict hunter opportunity while having no positive impact on the deer population(s) in question.
#30(a) E 7/5/2011 Tom Pella	Section 360	Modify C zone designation to allow for a wider distribution of available tags.	The C zones were designated as "premium" tags in 2010 due to the high demand for limited tags. In these situations, the only equitable way to fairly distribute the tags is through a drawing.

Public Recommendations for Mammal Hunting Regulations
For the 2013 Process, and Department Responses to Those Changes

#32 E 10/30/2012 Chris Muscolina	Section 361	Increase archery hunting opportunities in San Mateo County.	Deer hunting in San Mateo County can currently be done with an appropriate tag (A or AO tags). However, areas for unattached public hunters are limited, structure densities often prevent safe (and legal) discharge of weapons, and there is a strong public opposition in that area to this type of activity. However, the DFG remains committed to increasing hunting opportunity where appropriate and feasible and will work with the author of the recommendation to explore those opportunities.
#33 E 11/13/2012	Section 360	Add separate hunting season for side-lock and iron sight muzzleloading rifles.	DFG has several hunts available already for muzzleloading weapons only (see Section 360 (c)); additionally, muzzleloading rifles are also allowed for use during general method deer seasons.
ELK			
#6 through #25 E 10/24-26/2012 (Various)	Section 364	20 E-mails received in opposition to a proposed Tule Elk Hunt in Sunol, Alameda County.	The Alameda Tule Elk hunt encompasses portions of both Alameda and San Joaquin counties. This hunt was originally adopted in 2010 based on information provided in the 2010 Final Environmental Document Regarding Elk Hunting based on no significant population impacts from removing individual elk at the level identified (0-4 bull elk tags; 0-2 antlerless elk tags). No changes in elk population in the hunt area support a cancellation of the subject hunt.
GENERAL HUNTING			
#29 E 5/22/2012 Dusty Clement	Section 708	It is my firm belief that this [Point] system is in need of some drastic changes as there are just not enough tags to make the system work the way it is currently implemented.	Section not opened for modification in this regulatory cycle.
#30(b) E 7/5/2012 Tom Pella	Section 708	Allow hunters to purchase preference points after the draw and increase the cost of doing so.	Section not opened for modification in this regulatory cycle.
#31 E 12/30/2011 Glenn Sparks	Section 708	Impose time limits for drawing tags in units under 100 tags or less.	Section not opened for modification in this regulatory cycle.
#34 E 11/13/2012 Wayne Childress	Section 353	Allow the use of traditional non-lead bullets in the current non-lead zone.	The regulation in question (Section 353 - Methods Authorized for Taking Big-Game) was implemented in compliance with Section 3004.5 of the Fish and Game Code. Implementing this proposal would require a change in legislation which neither DFG or the Fish and Game Commission has the authority to unilaterally do that.