COMMISSIONERS
Jim Kellogg, President
Concord
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Carpinteria
Michael Sutton, Member
Monterey
Daniel W. Richards, Member
Upland
Don Benninghoven, Member

Santa Barbara



CORRESPONDENCE NO. 1 Page 1 of 4

JOHN CARLSON, JR.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
1416 Ninth Street
Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
fgc@fgc.ca.gov

STATE OF CALIFORNIA Fish and Game Commission

September 8, 2009

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 681, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to hybrid animals and plants, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on September 11, 2009.

Please note the dates of the public hearings related to this matter and associated deadlines for receipt of written comments.

Mr. Rob Allen, Enforcement Branch, Department of Fish and Game, phone (916) 651-9953, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,

Sheri Tiemann

Staff Services Analyst

Attachment

TITLE 14. Fish and Game Commission Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 203, 205 and 2120, of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 1002, 2000, 2001, 2116, 2118, 2118.2, 2118.4, 2119-2155, 2190, and 2271 of said Code, proposes to add Section 681, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Hybrid Animals and Plants.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The Department should have as an enforcement tool a general section regulating hybrid plants and animals. A hybrid of two or more species is not a specific species and therefore is not addressed within most regulations or code sections referring to limits, seasons, take, and possession. Potential examples are: a hybrid bass (i.e. largemouth and spotted bass that naturally occurs in a lake), hybrids of restricted exotic cats and non-restricted domestic cats, and hybrid canines such as coy-dogs (coyote and dog).

The mixing of species is expanding as scientific methods improve. Examples of potential problem areas are abalone, fin fish, falconry, waterfowl, aquaculture, and restricted exotic species. The proposal would not only help regulate true hybrids but would help in preventing violators from using a "hybrid defense". The proposal would give the Department flexibility in enforcing various laws and regulations. Nature and science can produce hybrids and an agency which enforces plant and animal laws is placed at a disadvantage if it lacks regulations to reasonably address hybrid issues.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Yolo Fliers Club, Ballroom, 17980 County Road 94B, Woodland, California, on Thursday, October 1, 2009, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the Yolo Fliers Club, Ballroom, 17980 County Road 94B, Woodland, California, on Thursday, November 5, 2009, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before October 29, 2009 at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, faxed or e-mailed to the Commission office, must be received before 5:00 p.m. on November 2, 2009. All comments must be received no later than November 5, 2009, at the hearing in Woodland, CA. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulations as proposed in strikeout-underline format, as well as an initial statement of reasons, including environmental considerations and all information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, John Carlson, Jr., Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244-2090, phone (916) 653-4899. Please direct requests for the above mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to John Carlson, Jr., or Sheri Tiemann at the preceding address or phone number. **Mr. Rob Allen, Enforcement Branch, Department of Fish and Game, (916) 651-9953 has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.** Copies of the Initial Statement of Reasons, including the regulatory language, may be obtained from the address

above. Notice of the proposed action shall be posted on the Fish and Game Commission website at http://www.fgc.ca.gov.

Availability of Modified Text

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Circumstances beyond the control of the Commission (e.g., timing of Federal regulation adoption, timing of resource data collection, timelines do not allow, etc.) or changes made to be responsive to public recommendation and comments during the regulatory process may preclude full compliance with the 15-day comment period, and the Commission will exercise its powers under Section 202 of the Fish and Game Code. Regulations adopted pursuant to this section are not subject to the time periods for adoption, amendment or repeal of regulations prescribed in Sections 11343.4, 11346.4 and 11346.8 of the Government Code. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

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 initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (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 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 proposal recognizes the heritage of animals and plants enabling the Department to maintain control of species, and their hybrids, that it already regulates.
- (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:
 - No significant impact. Possible impact in those that deal in hybrids of restricted species.
- (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. However, undesirable hybrids can be affected and therefore those that commercially deal in such hybrids may be affected.
- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

 None.

((e)	Nondiscretionan	Costs/Savings t	to Local Agencies:
٦	_,		,	

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, Government Code:

None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

Consideration of Alternatives

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

John Carlson, Jr. Executive Director

Dated: September 1, 2009