I. Date of Initial Statement of Reasons: September 24, 2013

II. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings:
   (a) Notice Hearing: Date: December 11, 2013
       Location: San Diego, CA
   (b) Discussion Hearings: Date: February 5, 2014
       Location: Sacramento, CA
   (c) Adoption Hearing: Date: April 16, 2014
       Location: Ventura, CA

III. Description of Regulatory Action:
   (a) Statement of Specific Purpose of Regulation Change and Factual Basis for Determining that Regulation Change is Reasonably Necessary:

       1. Number of Tags

       This proposed regulatory action provides for the number of tags for existing zones as a series of ranges. Existing regulations specify the number of pronghorn antelope hunting tags for each hunt zone. In accordance with management goals and objectives, and in order to maintain hunting quality, tag quotas for hunts need to be adjusted periodically. Final tag quotas for each zone will be identified and recommended to the Commission at the April 2014 adoption hearing based upon findings from the annual winter surveys.

       Ranges are necessary because final quotas cannot be determined until survey data are analyzed. Winter surveys are scheduled for January, 2014. Analysis of survey results will be completed by March, 2014. Final tag quotas will allow for a biologically appropriate harvest of bucks and does in the population and will achieve/maintain buck ratios at or above minimum levels specified in appropriate management plans. Administrative procedures and the Fish and Game Code require the Fish and Game Commission to receive proposed changes to existing regulations prior to the time winter pronghorn antelope surveys are completed. The proposed ranges of pronghorn antelope tags for 2014 are presented in the Informative Digest.
(b) Authority and Reference:

Authority: Fish and Game Code sections 219, 220, 331 and 1050.
Reference: Fish and Game Code Sections 331, 713 and 1050.

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

None.

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

Economic Impact Assessment

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

The Department conducted a public scoping session in Sacramento on November 18, 2010. Public input, discussions and recommendations regarding the environmental document and mammal hunting and trapping regulations were taken at that time.

IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

(a) Alternatives to Regulation Change:

1. Number of Tags

No alternatives were identified. Pronghorn antelope license tag quotas must be changed periodically in response to a variety of biological and environmental conditions such as population structure and overwinter survival rates.

(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 pronghorn antelope 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 minimum desired buck to doe ratios which are attained/maintained in part by modifying tag quotas on an annual basis. The no-change alternative would not allow for adjustment of tag quotas in response to changing environmental/biological conditions.
(c) Consideration of Alternatives:

In view of information currently possessed, no reasonable alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

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. The maximum number of tags available in the newly proposed range is at or below the number of tags analyzed in the 2004 Final Environmental Document Regarding Pronghorn Antelope Hunting.

VI. Impact of Regulatory Action.

This proposed action adjusts tag quotas for existing hunts. Given the number of tags available, and the area over which they are distributed, this proposal is economically neutral to business.

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Businesses, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States.

The proposed regulatory 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. Considering the small number of tags issued over the entire state, this proposal is 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; Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment:

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents. Hunting provides opportunities for multi-generational family activities and promotes respect for California’s environment by the future stewards of the State’s resources. The Commission anticipates benefits to the State’s environment in the sustainable management of natural resources.

It is unlikely that the proposed regulation will result in the creation or elimination of jobs within the state, cause the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses or result in the expansion of businesses in California because the overall number of tags issued is small and the resulting hunting effort is spread over a large geographic area.
(c) Cost Impacts on Representative Private Persons/Business.

The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with this 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 pronghorn antelope 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 winter survey results that should be completed by March of 2014. The final tag quotas will provide for a biologically appropriate harvest of bucks and does in specific populations, while allowing for adequate hunting opportunities. The proposed 2014 tag allocation ranges for the hunt zones are as set forth below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunt Area</th>
<th>2014 Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocation Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archery-Only Season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 – Mount Dome</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2 – Clear Lake</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3 – Likely Tables</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4 – Lassen</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5 – Big Valley</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6 – Surprise Valley</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Tables Apprentice Hunt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen Apprentice Hunt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Valley Apprentice Hunt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise Valley Apprentice Hunt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-Raising Hunt</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>