



STANISLAUS COUNTY FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMITTEE



3800 CORNUCOPIA WAY, SUITE C, MODESTO, CALIFORNIA 95358

THURSDAY, January 22, 2015

Meeting Time: 4:00 P.M.

AGENDA

Call Meeting to Order & Introductions:

The Stanislaus County *Fish & Wildlife Committee (F&WC)* encourages public participation and welcomes the public's interest.

Members of the public may be heard on any item of the Fish and Wildlife Committee's agenda. A person addressing the Committee will be limited to five (5) minutes, unless the Chairperson of the Committee grants a longer period of time. The Committee will allow comments by members of the public on an agenda item only during consideration of the item.

(OPTIONAL) TELEPHONE CONFERENCE DIAL-IN INFORMATION:

Participants may choose to join the meeting by dialing in to the following conference call number: **(209) 552-3710**. You will then be prompted to enter your Conference Number: 89344, followed by the # sign. Please check in with the Chair/Secretary by stating your full name.

Requests for Funds & Project Updates:

1. Approval of the request for funds from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers in the amount not to exceed \$2,300 to purchase fish for the annual *Kids Fishing Fun Day* on Saturday, May 2nd, 2015.
2. Project Update – Jessica Boone, USDA
3. Project Update – Donna Burt, Stanislaus Wildlife Care Center

Correspondence:

1. Notice relating to take emergency action to list the Tricolored blackbird as endangered. *State of California, Fish and Game Commission, 11/25/14.*
2. Notice of Proposed Changes in Regulations. *State of California, Fish and Game Commission, 11/25/14.*
3. Notice of proposed draft environmental document to address potential impacts on lead ammunition for hunting purposes. *State of California, Department of Fish and Wildlife, 11/25/14.*
4. Notice of Public Meetings on Proposal to List West Coast Population of Fisher as Threatened Under Endangered Species Act. *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 11/25/14.*
5. Notice of Public Hearing on Proposal to Designate Critical Habitat for Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo. *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 12/1/14.*
6. Notice of Statement of Proposed Emergency Regulatory Action, *State of California, Fish and Game Commission, 12/16/14.*
7. Notice of Proposed Emergency Action, *State of California, Fish and Game Commission, 12/12/14.*
8. Notice of Proposed Mammal Hunting Regulations for the 2015-2016 season, *State of California, Fish and Game Commission, 1/9/15.*
9. Notice of Proposed changes in Central Valley Salmon Sport Fishing Regulations, *State of California, Fish and Game Commission, 1/9/15.*

Agenda Items:

1. Public Comment(s)
2. Approval of October 30, 2014 Meeting Minutes
3. Wildlife Management Report
4. Fishery Report
5. Wildlife Enforcement Report
6. Wood Duck Report
7. Discussion on conference calls
8. Possible scout group for scout project
9. Rebuilding Quail quizzler at Del Puerto Canyon
10. Old Business
11. Committee Comments

FW Members
Cristen Langner, DFG
Steve Tsao, DFG
Phil McKay, DFG
Ed Ayers
Ed Ayers
Ed Ayers
Ed Ayers

Adjourn: Next meeting – Thursday, April 23, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. (Please notify the Department of Parks and Recreation at 525-6770 to let us know if you will be attending this meeting and/or require special accommodation for the meeting.)

Agendas can also be found online at <http://www.stancounty.com/er/parks/fish-wildlife-committee.shtm> subject to staff's ability to post prior to the meeting. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the main office of the Department of Parks and Recreation, 3800 Cornucopia Way, Suite C, Modesto, CA 95358.



STANISLAUS COUNTY

FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMITTEE



PARKS AND RECREATION

Jami Aggers, Director
Merry Rorabaugh, Asst. Director
Ed Ayers, Chair

3800 CORNUCOPIA WAY, SUITE C, MODESTO, CALIFORNIA 95358



MINUTES

OCTOBER 30, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M.

3800 CORNUCOPIA WAY, 2ND FLOOR, CONFERENCE ROOM

(Agendas can be found online at <http://www.stancounty.com/er/parks/fish-wildlife-committee.shtm>)

COUNTY FISH & WILDLIFE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ed Ayers
Red Bartley (via telephone)
Jim Atherstone (via telephone)
Dave Doubleddee (ALT) (via telephone)
Anthony Maxwell
Ken Meidl

STATE FISH & WILDLIFE REPRESENTATIVE:

Phil McKay

PARKS & RECREATION STAFF PRESENT:

Dianne Parkinson

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Cody Johnsen
Don Vanwey (ALT)
Jason Guignard
Ed Channing (ALT)

GUESTS PRESENT:

Chris Guptill

A. CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS

Ed Ayers called the meeting to order and those in attendance introduced themselves.

B. REQUESTS FOR FUNDS/PROJECT UPDATES

1. The request for funds in the amount not to exceed \$2,500 from the Tuolumne River Trust (TRT) to rent dumpsters for their River Cleanup Events was approved upon motion and second.
 - The TRT 9-99 river clean-up project has been scheduled monthly. It ranges from the 9th Street Bridge to the 99 freeway through downtown Modesto. November 15th will be the 5th clean-up event. This is a collaborative effort to improve waterways and prevent trash and debris from collecting in this area. The goal is to get this more challenging area to become manageable and easier for volunteers to assist on a regular basis. The project is believed to only require the large dumpster rental for this starting phase. The group hopes to lessen the need for this level of trash collection in continuing events. Red Bartley and Phil McKay have had good experiences with this group and support the TRT's river clean-up initiative.
2. All funds issued require a follow-up progress or final update at a following committee meeting.

REPORTER & ACTIONS

Maxwell, Doubleddee,
unanimous approval

C. CORRESPONDENCE**ACTIONS**

The Committee acknowledged the correspondences received, and suggested further action or comment be directed to the corresponding agency.

1. Notice of proposed emergency action, Merced River closure due to drought conditions. *Fish and Game Commission 8/19/2014.*
2. Notice of proposed regulatory action relative to amending 2015 Sport Fishing regulations. *Fish and Game Commission, 8/26/2014.*
3. Notice of proposed regulatory action relative to the prohibition of prizes for the take of furbearers and nongame mammals. *Fish and Game Commission, 9/19/2014.*
4. News Release: Fish and Wildlife Service withdraws proposal to delist Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle from the ESA following scientific review. *Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, 9/23/2014.*

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS**ACTIONS/REPORTER**

No comment was received.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND 2015 MEETING CALENDAR**ACTIONS**

1. Minutes for the July 24, 2014, meeting was approved upon motion and second as written.
2. The 2015 Fish and Wildlife Committee meeting calendar was approved upon motion and second.

*Bartley, Maxwell,
unanimous approval*

*Bartley, Atherstone,
unanimous approval*

F. WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT REPORT**ACTIONS/REPORTER**

1. Mountain lion sightings have been regularly reported in the Denair and Turlock areas, however, within the recent week, there has been no report. The reason for a predator in this area is unknown, as there has been no animal kills reported or any perceived threats. Evidences of paw prints on door handles and human entryways, and non-aggressive reports may inconclusively make this possibly a lost pet issue. This is an odd and abnormal situation. The current location of the animal is unknown. A citizen's concern meeting was held in Denair to discuss community concerns. Local wildlife enforcement is monitoring the situation closely.
2. Oakdale also reported a video footage of a lion goat-kill. Merced county spotted a mountain lion near a dairy. It is uncertain whether the drought is the cause for pushing these animals down into the valley. Kern and Tulare county has been reporting a multiple of bear problems that may have contributed to the valley having numerous mountain lion sightings. The change in bear take regulations may have likely taken an impact on the frequent bear sightings and therefore potentially affecting the mountain lion movements as well.

Phil McKay

G. FISHERY REPORT**ACTIONS & REPORTER**

1. Stanislaus Weir: 1232 salmon
Tuolumne Weir: 44 salmon
2. Water hyacinth is very bad on the Tuolumne and San Joaquin Rivers with complete blockage of the river at many points (see photo on the next page). It appears that the amount of water hyacinth is likely delaying the migration of salmon into the Tuolumne River. (This starts from Carpenter and west.)
3. The Salmon Festival is next Saturday, November 8th in Knights Ferry. FISHBIO will have a booth and also an underwater live video of salmon spawning at the bridge.

Jason Guignard

(continued next page)

Water hyacinth on the Tuolumne and San Joaquin Rivers

**H. WILDLIFE ENFORCEMENT REPORT**

Ryan Detrick is the new lieutenant who took Phil McKay's previous position. He is planning to attend the next meeting to report more details on fine monies. Briefly, there have been two more dairy/pollution cases from the last two reported; two pending and two have cleared.

REPORTER

Phil McKay

I. WOOD DUCK REPORT

No report.

ACTIONS & REPORTER**J. MEMBER APPOINTMENT**

The appointment of Robert Bashaw as an alternate member effective October 30, 2014, was approved upon motion and second.

ACTIONS & REPORTER

*Atherstone, Bartley,
unanimous approval*

K. OLD BUSINESS

No report.

ACTIONS & REPORTER**L. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

No additional comment.

ACTIONS & REPORTER**M. ADJOURNMENT & NEXT MEETING**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting of the Fish and Wildlife Committee will be held on:

*Atherstone, Bartley,
unanimous approval*

**Thursday, January 22, 2015 at 4:00 p.m.
Conference Room, 2nd Floor
3800 Cornucopia Way, Modesto**

Prepared By: Mae Song, Fish and Wildlife Secretary

209-525-6723

Agendas can also be found online at <http://www.stancounty.com/er/parks/fish-wildlife-committee.shtm> subject to staff's ability to post prior to the meeting. Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the main office of the Department of Parks and Recreation, 3800 Cornucopia Way, Suite C, Modesto, CA 95358.

Fund Request Application

Stanislaus County Fish and Wildlife



STANISLAUS COUNTY
FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMITTEE

3800 CORNUCOPIA WAY, SUITE C, MODESTO, CALIFORNIA 95358

Applicant Name Kid's Fishing Fun Day
Agency U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mailing Address _____
City, State, Zip _____
Phone _____ E-mail Norm.A.Winchester@usace.army.mil

Requesting Fund Amount \$ 2,300 Funds needed by 04- 30-2015
Project Performance Period Nov 2014-May-2015
Event Name (if applicable) Kid's Fishing Fun Day
Purpose Teach underprivileged kids how to fish, using proper catch & release techniques, while teaching the importance of natural resource conservation and outdoor recreation ethics and water safety

Fish and Wildlife Code(s) Met (CFG Code Section 13100-13104) 13103 (a) & 10103(m)
Public Benefit The main emphasis of the Kids Fishing Day event is to reach kid's that have never had the opportunity to enjoy the pleasures of outdoor recreation and educate them on the importance of natural resources preservation, proper catch & release fishing techniques and outdoor ethics.

Detail Items to be Purchased (include cost per item, and/or attach quote(s). Additional sheets may be attached.)
145 -150 1-lb black bass for catch and release, after the event the fish are released into the Horseshoe Road Recreation Area Pond for the public to enjoy, restocking the pond.

Vendor to be purchased from Golden State Bait

Will you accept partial funding? ☒ YES ☐ NO

This application may be fax to (209) 525-6773 or mailed to:

Stanislaus County Fish & Wildlife Committee
c/o Stanislaus County Parks and Recreation
Attn: Parks Administration
3800 Cornucopia Way, Suite C
Modesto, CA 95358

I have read and understand the Fund Request Procedures and agree to utilize the funds I am approved for to purchase items listed in this packet for said purposes and in accordance to California Fish and Wildlife Codes and Regulations. I understand I will follow-up with the Committee on the outcome of this fund request by attendance at a Fish and Wildlife Committee meeting within one year.

Signature: WINCHESTER.NORM.ALAN.126171
0257

Digitally signed by WINCHESTER.NORM.ALAN.126171
DN: cn=WINCHESTER.NORM.ALAN.126171, o=Stanislaus County Fish and Wildlife Committee, ou=Stanislaus County Fish and Wildlife Committee, email=WINCHESTER.NORM.ALAN.126171@stanislauscounty.org, c=US

Date: 29-Dec-2014

OFFICE USE ONLY:

APPROVED FOR \$ _____ DATE: _____

STANISLAUS LODGE #170, I.O.O.F.

P.O. Box 834
Knights Ferry, Ca. 95361



Independent Order of Odd Fellows
Stanislaus Lodge # 1.0.0.F
Knights Ferry, CA 95361

24 October 2014

Army Corps of Engineers
Stanislaus River Parks
17968 Covered Bridge Rd
Oakdale, CA 95361
(209) 881-3517

Stanislaus County Fish & Wildlife Committee
3800 Cornucopia Way
Suite C
Modesto, CA. 95358

Subject: Donation for Kids Fishing Fun Day.

Dear Committee Chairman,

The Army Corps of Engineers and The Independent Order of Odd fellows Stanislaus Lodge # 170 as co-sponsors would like to thank the Stanislaus County Fish & Wildlife Committee for allowing us to submit a proposal to the committee in regards to a donation for our **Kids Fishing Fun Day on Saturday May 2nd 2015.**

The main emphasis of the Kids Fishing Fun Day event is to reach kid's that have never had the opportunity to enjoy the pleasures of outdoor recreation and educate them on the importance of natural resources preservation, proper catch & release fishing techniques and outdoor ethics. The kids will be coming from the Stanislaus County **Police Youth Activities League, POC Alfredo Guerra.**

Some of the activities will include: a fly casting demonstration; an interactive animal tracks program, fish imprinting art deco (Gyotaku) and a water safety program put on by Army Corps Rangers and of course lots of fun fishing!

I am inquiring if the Fines Committee would be willing to donate \$2,300.00 for the purchase of 270, 8"- 10" Large Mouth Bass to be purchased from Golden State Bait Inc in Merced formally known as Dutchman Creek.

Stanislaus River Parks has no checking account for the deposit of donations. If our request is funded, **please direct the funds for payment to the vendor.**

If you have any questions, please contact Ranger Norm Winchester @ (209) 881-3517 ex.24. I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Park Ranger
Norm Winchester
Stanislaus River Parks

STANISLAUS LODGE #170, I.O.O.F.

P.O. Box 834
Knights Ferry, Ca. 95361



STANISLAUS COUNTY FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

APPLICATION FOR FISH AND GAME FINE MONIES

FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR

2014/2015

1. NAME & ADDRESS OF APPLICANT.

Independent Order of Odd Fellows
Stanislaus Lodge # 1.0.0.F
Knights Ferry, CA 95361

U.S Army Corps of Engineers
Stanislaus River Parks
17968 Covered Bridge Rd.
Oakdale, CA 95361

2. TITLE OF PROJECT.

Kids Fishing Fun Day.

3. AMOUNT OF FUNDING REQUESTED. \$2,300.00.

\$ 2,000.00 for the purchase of fish planting 270 (8"- 10" Large Mouth Bass) +
\$300 for transportation cost.

4. NAME, TITLE ADDRESS & PHONE # OF PROJECT COORDINATOR.

Park Ranger/Natural Resource Specialist Norm Winchester & Student Park Ranger
Jered Bodenhausen.

17968 Covered Bridge Rd.
Oakdale, CA 95361
(209) 881-3517 ex. 24
(209) 881-3203 fax

5. OBJECTIVE OF PROJECT.

Teach underprivileged kids how to fish, using proper catch & release techniques,
while teaching the importance of natural resource conservation and outdoor
recreation ethics and water safety.

6. COMPLETE PROJECT DESCRIPTION.

The main emphasis of the Kids Fishing Day event is to reach kid's that have
never had the opportunity to enjoy the pleasures of outdoor recreation and educate

STANISLAUS LODGE #170, I.O.O.F.

P.O. Box 834
Knights Ferry, Ca. 95361



them on the importance of natural resources preservation, proper catch & release fishing techniques and outdoor ethics.

The kids will be instructed by professional fisherman on the proper techniques used to catch fish. There will be a demonstration put on by Oakdale Rural Fire Department on fire prevention, if available due to fire season. The Bureau of Reclamation will be conducting an interactive animal tracks program. The Army Corps will be doing an art deco program called Gytaco Fish Imprinting and water safety.

7. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE.
December 2014- May 2015.
8. WHAT OTHER FUNDING SOURCES HAVE BEEN EXPLORED FOR FUNDING OF THIS PROJECT?
Private donations through other Fish farm companies was conducted, many companies have gone out of business.
9. IF NECESSARY, CAN THE PROJECT BE DIVIDED INTO SEGMENTS FOR FUNDING PURPOSES? NO.
10. JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT, INCLUDING DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR ACCOMPLISHING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVIES.
We will bring in 55-60 kids from the Police Youth Activities League that have never recreated on a river or lake and expose them to the fun the outdoors provides. These kids come from low income urban areas that are infested with drugs, guns and violence as part of their everyday life.
11. WHAT ARE THE LONG-RANGE PLANS OF THIS PROJECT?
To make this an annual event for future generations.
12. HOW WILL THE REPORT BE PRESENTED (AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS, CHARTS, MAPS, DISCUSSION, FIELD TRIP)?
A letter describing the results will be mailed after completion of the event.
13. DESCRIBE LAND STATUS, OWNERSHIP, LEGAL DESCRIPTION, VICINITY AND SITE MAPS. Horseshoe Recreation area, East of 14842 Orange Blossom Rd, Oakdale, Ca 95361. Horseshoe Recreation Area 20 Acre pond.
14. THE HISTORY OF CONDITION AND STATUS OF RESOURCE AND EXPECTED BENEFITS.
Fishing has been a sport for many years for families who have access to fishing areas. We are targeting kids, who have never been to a river or fished before.
15. PUBLIC CONTACTS (ORGANIZATIONS, ELECTED OFFICALS, AGENCIES).
Agencies involved include: Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Oakdale Rural Fire & California Department of Fish & Game.

STANISLAUS LODGE #170, I.O.O.F.

P.O. Box 834
Knights Ferry, Ca. 95361



Stanislaus County
Department of Parks & Recreation
24 October 2014

Fish & Wildlife Committee

Scope of Work: This proposal is requesting funding to stock the Horseshoe Recreation Area Pond with large mouth bass.

PROPOSAL
Golden State Bait Inc.

Type of Fish	Quantity	Approximate Cost	Total Cost
Large Mouth Bass	140-145	\$ 8.50 ea (8"-10)	\$2000.00
Delivery	1	\$ 300.00	\$00.00
		Total	\$ 2,300.00

Actual Purchase & Amounts

Type of Fish	Quantity	Approximate Cost	Total Cost
Large Mouth Bass	145	\$ 8.50 ea (8"-10)	\$2000.00
Delivery	1	\$ 300.00	\$00.00
		Total	\$ 2,300.00

The Army Corps would like to thank the Fish & Wildlife Committee for their contribution to this event.

STANISLAUS LODGE #170, I.O.O.F.

P.O. Box 834
Knights Ferry, Ca. 95361



COUNTY: STANISLAUS REGISTERED AQUACULTURALISTS

Facility Information

CLAY PA FISH CO. Out of Business

(209) 480-5147

0842

OAKDALE, CA 95361

10941 EATON RD

Bluegill channel catfish common carp

Largemouth bass

=====

DONALD SCHMIDT LIVE FOODS Only producing catfish

(209) 848-8625

0762

OAKDALE, CA 95361

7549 PATTERSON RD

C G N

Bullfrog channel catfish golden shiner minnow

Largemouth bass mosquito fish smallmouth bass

=====

GINOS FISH FARM/ BIG V CORPORATION Only producing catfish

(209) 668-7868

0823

CROWS LANDING, CA 95313

10815 S CARPENTER RD

=====

KENT KNOX & JOHN LANDERS FISH FARM Only producing catfish

(209) 848-1300

0944

OAKDALE, CA 95361

7591 PATTERSON RD

B C N

Bluegill bullfrog channel catfish

Common carp fathead minnow golden shiner minnow

Largemouth bass mosquito fish red swamp crayfish

=====

MAY ENTERPRISE INC Out of Business

(209) 491-0808

0780

WATERFORD, CA 95386

4831 TIMBELL RD

=====

Golden State Bait Inc. formally know as Dutchman Creek

6554 S. Healy Road

Merced, CA 95340

(209) 384-3474

(209) 385- 3474

=====

STANISLAUS LODGE #170, I.O.O.F.

P.O. Box 834
Knights Ferry, Ca. 95361



*Companies contacted for estimates listed below.

Foothill Fisheries
853-2167

Type of Fish	Quantity	Approximate Cost	Total Cost
Large Mouth Bass	no	\$ a pound (inch fish =	\$
Blue Gill	no	\$ a fish	\$
Delivery	no	\$	\$
	Sturgeon only	Total	\$

*Did not meet requirements

Gino's Fish Farm /Big V Corporation
668-7868

Type of Fish	Quantity	Approximate Cost	Total Cost
Large Mouth Bass	Adult Black Bass no	\$ a pound (inch fish =	\$
Blue Gill	no	\$ a fish	\$
Delivery		\$	\$
		Total	\$

Only carrying Catfish

Kent Knox & John Landers Fish Farm
848-1300

Type of Fish	Quantity	Approximate Cost	Total Cost
Large Mouth Bass	no	\$ a pound (inch fish =	\$
Blue Gill	no	\$ a fish	\$
Red Ear Sunfish	no	3 inch fish = \$ a piece	\$
Delivery		\$	\$
		Total	\$

*Did not meet requirements, ONLY CARRYING CATFISH

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Jack Baylis, Vice President
Los Angeles
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jacques Hostier-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 853-4899
(916) 853-6040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

October 29, 2014

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2014 NOV -3 A 11:03

TO ALL AFFECTED AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a Notice of Receipt of Petition which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on October 31, 2014.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sheri Tiemann".

Sheri Tiemann
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Jack Baylle, Vice President
Los Angeles
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jacque Hoelter-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4890
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

**CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF PETITION**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 2073.3 of the Fish and Game Code, the California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), on October 8, 2014, received a petition from the Center for Biological Diversity to take emergency action to list the Tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

The Tricolored blackbird was historically distributed throughout most of the Central Valley, adjacent foothills, coastal ranges and southern California. Habitat types required by this species include riparian, marsh, and agricultural fields. Tricolored blackbirds are medium-sized, nesting in dense colonies.

Pursuant to Section 2073 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission has forwarded the petition to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for its review and recommendation. The Commission will consider taking emergency action to list the Tricolored blackbird as an endangered species at its December 3, 2014, meeting in Van Nuys.

Interested parties may contact Ms. Helen Birss, Habitat Conservation Planning Branch Chief, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1260, Sacramento, CA 95814, or telephone 916.653.9834, for information on the petition or to submit information to the Department relating to the petitioned species.

October 15, 2014

Fish and Game Commission

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Jack Baylis, Vice President
Los Angeles
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

November 5, 2014

TO ALL INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES:

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Section 662, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to petitions for regulation changes, which will be published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on November 7, 2014.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sherrie Fonbuena".

Sherrie Fonbuena
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2014 NOV - 7 A 10:25

**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 Section 108 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret or make specific sections 108 and 207 of the Fish and Game Code and sections 11340.6 and 11340.7 of the Government Code, proposes to add Section 662, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to petitions for regulation change.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Under current law (Government Code Section 11340.6) any interested person may petition the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) to adopt, amend or repeal a regulation. This section also requires that any petition clearly and concisely state the substance or nature of the requested regulation change, the reason for the request, and reference to the authority of the Commission to take the requested action.

The proposed action adds new Section 662, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR). The proposed regulation outlines the process under which petitions will be evaluated and scheduled for receipt and Commission action and requires the use of the form entitled "PETITION TO THE CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION FOR REGULATORY CHANGE," FGC 1 (New 10/23/14, and being incorporated by reference), for submitting regulation change proposals.

The benefits of the proposed regulation are increased transparency and understanding of the Commission's regulatory process and consistency in the processing of public requests for regulation change.

Commission staff has searched the CCR and has found that the proposed regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the Airtel Plaza Hotel, 7277 Valjean Avenue, Van Nuys, California, on Wednesday, December 3, 2014 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 in the Resources Building, First Floor Auditorium, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California, on Wednesday, February 11, 2015 at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard. Written comments may be submitted on or before 12:00 noon on February 6, 2015 at the address given below, or by fax at (916) 653-5040, or by e-mail to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. All comments must be received no later than February 11, 2015 at the hearing in Sacramento, California. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address.

The regulation 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, Sonke Mastrup, 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

Sonke Mastrup or Sherrie Fonbuena at the preceding address or phone number. Sherrie Fonbuena, [(916) 654-9866 or Sherrie.Fonbuena@fgc.ca.gov] 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. 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/Results of the Economic Impact Analysis

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 Businesses, 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 proposed regulation only affects the process through which the Commission will receive and consider petitions for regulation changes.

- (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 does not anticipate any impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California.

As mentioned above under the Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview, the benefits of the proposed regulations are increased transparency and understanding of the Commission's regulatory process and consistency in the processing of public requests for regulation change.

The Commission does not anticipate any benefits to worker safety or the environment.

(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.

(d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State: None.

(e) 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, Government Code: None.

(h) Effect on Housing Costs: None.

Effect on Small Business

It has been determined that the adoption of this regulation 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, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director

Dated: October 27, 2014



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Director's Office
1416 Ninth Street, 12th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.wildlife.ca.gov

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



2014 NOV -6 A 10:37

October 31, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is preparing a draft environmental document to address potential impacts resulting from the implementation of the state-wide ban on lead ammunition for hunting purposes. CDFW has prepared the attached Initial Study (IS), detailed project description, and a preliminary analysis of the impacts identified in the IS. The comment period resulting from this Notice of Preparation (NOP) is from October 31 through December 1, 2014. Comments may be provided by email to Craig Stowers (craig.stowers@wildlife.ca.gov) or by letter to the following address:

Attn: Craig Stowers
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
1812 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

A public scoping meeting will also be held to solicit comments regarding what the document should address. This meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2014 from 1:00 - 3:00 pm at 1812 9th Street, Sacramento, CA.

Notice of Preparation

Notice of Preparation

To: All State AgenciesFrom: Eric Loft, Branch ChiefCDFW - Wildlife Branch

(Address)

1812 9th St., Sacramento, CA 95811**Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report**

The California Fish and Game Commission will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an environmental impact report for the project identified below. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

The project description, location, and the potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials. A copy of the Initial Study (☒ is ☐ is not) attached.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Mr. Craig Stowers at the address shown above. We will need the name for a contact person in your agency.

Project Title: Prohibition on the Use of Ammunition Containing Lead for the Take of Wildlife with a Firearm

Project Applicant, if any: _____

Date October 28, 2014Signature Title Branch ChiefTelephone 916-445-3555

Reference: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, (CEQA Guidelines) Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375.

Appendix G

Environmental Checklist Form

NOTE: The following is a sample form and may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It may be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form must also be considered. The sample questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance.

1. Project title: Prohibition on the Use of Ammunition Containing Lead for the Take of Wildlife
2. Lead agency name and address:
California Fish and Game Commission
1416 9th Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. Contact person and phone number: Eric Loft, Chief, Wildlife Branch (916) 445-3555
4. Project location: Statewide
5. Project sponsor's name and address:
California Department of Fish and Wildlife
1416 9th Street, Room 1208
Sacramento, CA 95814
6. General plan designation: NA 7. Zoning: NA
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
AB 711 (Chap. 742, Statutes of 2013) requires the Fish and Game Commission to promulgate regulations by July 1, 2015 that phase in the use of nonlead ammunition for the take of wildlife with a firearm in California. The statute requires nonlead ammunition to be used for the take of all wildlife in the state by July 1, 2019. See attached sheet for project description.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
The project occurs on wildlands in California that are open for hunting and the take of wildlife with a firearm.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
NA

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. -- Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
de) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV. RECREATION --

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Pub. Resources Code; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Project Description

Assembly Bill 711 (Chapter 742, Statutes of 2013) was signed by the Governor on October 11, 2013 and became effective January 1, 2014. As enacted, Fish and Game Code section 3004.5 requires full implementation of the statute's ban on the use of nonlead ammunition by July 1, 2019; after this date, nonlead ammunition will be required when taking any wildlife with a firearm statewide. In addition, section 3004.5 requires that by July 1, 2015, the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) must promulgate regulations that phase in the statute's requirements, and that, if any of the statute's requirements can be implemented practicably, in whole or in part, in advance of July 1, 2019, the Commission shall implement those requirements.

Beginning in January 2014, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) initiated an intensive public outreach effort designed to solicit ideas from both hunters and nonhunters on the least disruptive way to phase in the transition from traditional lead to nonlead ammunition consistent with section 3004.5. The Department shared a "starting point" proposal with the public at a total of 16 outreach meetings throughout the state, from Susanville to San Diego. This starting point proposal, as modified by public input received at these meetings, formed the basis for the proposed regulatory language adding a new Section 250.1 to Title 14, California Code of Regulations. The draft regulations constitute the proposed project for the purposes of this environmental document. See Appendix A for the draft regulatory text.

By way of background, ammunition falls into several broad categories including centerfire, rimfire, shotshells, and balls or sabots used in muzzleloading weapons. Centerfire ammunition is available in a variety of sizes (calibers) for both rifles and pistols and is most commonly used for the take of big game animals. Rimfire ammunition is available in smaller sizes, primarily .22 and .17 caliber, and is used most commonly for the take of small game mammals and the control of nongame "varmint" species such as ground squirrels. Shotgun ammunition comes in a variety of gauges and a range of shot or pellet sizes. Shotshells are most commonly used for waterfowl and upland game birds, although larger shot sizes (size 0 or 00 buckshot) and shotgun "slugs" may be used for the take of big game species. Balls and sabots are typically used for the take of big game species using muzzleloading rifles.

The proposed regulations' phasing reflects the relative availability (by both type and volume) of nonlead rifle and shotgun ammunition. Nonlead shotgun ammunition has been required for the take of ducks and geese nationwide since 1991 and nonlead shotshells in waterfowl sizes are widely available. These shells are suitable for the take of larger upland game birds such as pheasants, grouse, band-tailed pigeons and wild

turkeys. They may also be effective for the take of small game mammals, furbearing mammals, and nongame species. Nonlead shotgun shells in smaller shot sizes for dove, quail, and snipe are produced, but are currently not available in the volume necessary to supply the more than 170,000 quail and dove hunters in the state. Nonlead centerfire rifle ammunition is available in the more commonly used big game calibers such as .270, .30-06, and .308. Nonlead ammunition has been required for the take of big game mammals in the condor range since 2008 and the volume of nonlead ammunition has been sufficient to supply the 48,000 deer hunters within the condor range.

Phase 1

Effective July 1, 2015, nonlead ammunition will be required when taking all wildlife on state Wildlife Areas and Ecological Reserves. These Department lands constitute approximately 925,000 acres in California, with high ecological values and some of these areas are popular with hunters. In addition, nonlead ammunition will be required for hunters taking Nelson bighorn sheep in California's desert areas. This requirement will affect a small number of hunters; in 2014 only 14 tags were issued for bighorn sheep statewide. A similar number is anticipated for the 2015 season.

Phase 2

Effective July 1, 2016, nonlead ammunition will be required when taking upland game birds with a shotgun, except for dove, quail, and snipe, and any game birds taken under the authority of a licensed game bird club as provided in sections 600 and 600.4, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. In addition, nonlead ammunition will be required for the take of resident small game mammals, furbearing mammals, nongame mammals, nongame birds, and any wildlife for depredation purposes, with a shotgun statewide. However, in light of the uncertainty regarding the retail availability of nonlead centerfire and rimfire ammunition in smaller calibers, it will still be legal to take small game, furbearing, and nongame mammals, as well as nongame birds and wildlife for depredation purposes with traditional lead rimfire and centerfire ammunition during phase 2.

Phase 3

Pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 3004.5, effective July 1, 2019, only nonlead ammunition may be used when taking any wildlife with a firearm for any purpose in California.

Nonlead Implementation - Initial Study
Impact Significance Analysis

A. Less Than Significant Impact

1. IV(a) - Biological Resources. Beneficial and less than significant impacts may occur to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or otherwise special status as a result of the proposed action. Whereas hunting activity is regulated generally by regulations for specific hunt programs, the proposed action is limited to the phasing in of a ban on lead ammunition that will become effective, regardless, as of July 1, 2019. Thus, the proposed action may benefit listed and special status species such as bald and golden eagles by reducing the potential ingestion of lead from carcasses and gut piles from animals killed with lead ammunition.

2. VIII(h) - Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Less than significant impacts may occur regarding the exposure of people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildfire as a result of the proposed action. A study completed by the US Forest Service in August, 2013 (Research Paper RMRS-RP-104; A Study of Ignition by Rifle Bullets) concludes that steel jacketed and solid copper bullets could reliably cause ignition possibly due to their larger fragment size and the overall "hardness" of the materials when compared to lead. However, most of the ignitions were the result of test firing bullets directly into a steel target, which caused the bullet to fragment and the fragments to then fall into a deep bed of peat (a very fine and dry organic material). These conditions are not often encountered in actual hunting situations; the targets are soft-bodied and tend to dampen fragmenting and heating of bullets as they travel to the target, and the substrates into which those fragments may fall are also not typical of conditions found while hunting.

In addition, it should be noted the study referenced above pertained only to rifle bullets and not nonlead loads fired from shotguns. The smaller size of the projectile (shotgun pellets) and the low muzzle velocities associated with this weapon type may mitigate against the heating identified with nonlead rifle bullets. Moreover, the target zone (mainly slightly to severely above a perpendicular plane) would serve to slow down projectile speeds and allow more time for cooling before hitting any ground based ignition sources.

B. Potentially Significant Impact

XV(b) - Recreation. Although not specifically suggested by the Appendix G Initial Study Checklist, the Department notes that in the event that retail availability of nonlead ammunition fails to meet the demand of California hunters, a potentially significant impact on hunting based recreation in California may occur as a result of the proposed action. Conflicting information regarding market availability and overall cost has been presented by proponents and opponents of the law and has informed the Department's

development of the proposed action. For example, one study, sponsored by the National Shooting Sports Foundation (Southwick Associates 2014), predicts that hunting participation in California may drop by as much as 36% as a result of the proposed regulations. However, a second study sponsored by Audubon California, Defenders of Wildlife, and the Humane Society of the United States (Thomas, 2014) concluded that nonlead ammunition was already commercially available and a two year transition period was adequate to allow manufacturers to adjust for the anticipated increase in demand.

Research by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife indicates that while many different nonlead bullets and cartridges have been certified by the Fish and Game Commission and are advertised for sale by different manufacturers, very few of them are actually available for purchase either in sporting goods stores that typically sell ammunition or from on-line vendors. Furthermore, bullets and cartridges for calibers considered to be "uncommon" are essentially unavailable for purchase by California hunters. Additionally, costs are often substantially higher for nonlead ammunition of all calibers. All indications from ammunition manufacturers suggest they will not be increasing production of nonlead ammunition and most likely will not be able to meet the demand the legislation will create in California.

For these reasons, potentially significant impacts to recreation may occur as a result of: 1) requiring hunters to use nonlead ammunition that may not be available for purchase, which, in turn, may reduce hunting activity in the State; 2) hunters choosing not to participate in their chosen recreational activity due to the substantially higher costs – either through purchasing more expensive nonlead ammunition or purchasing new weapons, barrels or chokes – to comply with the new regulatory requirements.

From: "Swenty, Sarah" <sarah_swenty@fws.gov>
To:
Date: 11/25/2014 11:15 AM
Subject: Reminder: Public Meetings Next Week on Proposal to List West Coast Population of Fisher in Visalia, CA and CSU Stanislaus, Turlock, CA, December 3rd and 4th /ip2

Public Meetings on Proposal to List West Coast Population

of Fisher as Threatened Under Endangered Species Act

Visalia, CA and CSU Stanislaus, Turlock, CA, December 3rd and 4th

Sacramento - The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is seeking information from the scientific community, the public and interested stakeholders on its proposal to protect the West Coast population of fisher as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

A series of meetings and a public hearing will be complete with two informational meetings coming to California:

- **December 3, 2014** -- Visalia Convention Center, 303 E. Acequia, Visalia, California, from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
- **December 4, 2014** -- CSU Stanislaus, Faculty Development Center, Room 118, 1 University Circle, Turlock, California, from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.; free parking in Lot 8 - <https://www.csustan.edu/campus-maps>

A public hearing and five additional information meetings were held in November in a variety of locations in Washington, Oregon and Northern California.

The proposed listing rule published on Oct. 7, 2014 and opened a 90-day comment period to gather scientific information and comments from the public and stakeholders. More information on the proposal is available at: <http://www.fws.gov/cno/es/fisher>.

Public comments will be accepted through Jan. 5, 2015. Specific guidance on types of information the Service is seeking and for submitting public comments can be found in the Federal Register notice at <https://www.federalregister.gov> (search for key word "fisher").

Comments and information can be submitted by one of the following methods:

. Electronically at <http://www.regulations.gov>. In the Search box, enter FWS-R8-ES-2014-0041. You may submit information by clicking on "Comment Now."

. Paper copy, via the U.S. mail or hand delivery, to: Public Comments Processing, Attn: FWS-R8-ES-2014-0041. Division of Policy and Directives Management; U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service, MS: BPHC, 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Va. 22041-3803.

About the size of large house cats, fishers belong to a family of mammals that includes weasels, mink, martens and otters. Fishers live in low- to mid-elevation forests requiring cavities in trees and snags to rear their young and make use of cavities in the trunks of trees, snags and hollow logs and natural platforms for resting and security from predators.

Fishers are found throughout North America, but the West Coast DPS has been reduced in size, and fishers are now found in only two native populations within their historical range, which once covered most of the forested landscapes in California, Oregon and Washington.

In California, there are estimated to be 300 or fewer fishers in the Southern Sierra Nevada Mountains, and a population in the Klamath Mountains of northern California and southern Oregon could number from a few hundred to 4,000. There has also been a reintroduction effort in the Northern Sierra Nevada Mountains, where 40 fishers were released beginning in 2009.

The Endangered Species Act provides a critical safety net for America's native fish, wildlife and plants. The Service is working to actively engage conservation partners and the public in the search for improved and innovative ways to conserve and recover imperiled species.

The mission of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is working with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. We are both a leader and trusted partner in fish and wildlife conservation, known for our scientific excellence, stewardship of lands and natural resources, dedicated professionals, and commitment to public service. For more information on our work and the people who make it happen, visit <http://www.fws.gov/cno>. Connect with our [Facebook page](#), follow our [tweets](#), watch our [YouTube Channel](#), and download photos from our [Flickr page](#).

###

From: "Moler, Robert" <robert_moler@fws.gov>

To:

Date: 12/1/2014 12:05 PM

Subject: USFWS News: Public Hearing for Proposal to Designate Critical Habitat for Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo to be Held in Sacramento, CA December 18, 2014

Dear County Partners,

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will hold a public hearing on the proposed rule to designate critical habitat for the western yellow-billed cuckoo Thursday, December 18, 2014 at the DoubleTree Inn; 2001 Point West Way; Sacramento, CA 95815 from 2 - 4 p.m. with doors opening at 1:30 p.m.

Attached and included below is a news release with more information. Please feel free to forward this announcement to any interested parties. More information about the cuckoo can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/outreach/Public-Advisories/WesternYellow-BilledCuckoo/outreach_PA_Western-Yellow-Billed-Cuckoo.htm

The notice will publish tomorrow in the Federal Register on Tuesday, December 2, 2014. The notice is available for public inspection today at:

http://www.ofr.gov/OFRUpload/OFRData/2014-28330_PI.pdf

Please contact me if you have questions.

Thank you,

Robert Moler

External Affairs - Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior

robert_moler@fws.gov, 916.414.6606

Public Hearing for Proposal to Designate Critical Habitat for Western Yellow-Billed Cuckoo to be Held in Sacramento CA December 18, 2014

Sacramento - Thursday, December 18, 2014, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) will hold a public hearing on the proposal to designate critical habitat for the western distinct population segment of the yellow-billed cuckoo (western yellow-billed cuckoo).

The public hearing will be held at the DoubleTree Inn; 2001 Point West Way; Sacramento, CA 95815 from 2 - 4 p.m. with doors opening at 1:30 p.m. for those wishing to register to speak at the hearing. At the public hearing, the Service will provide opening statements for 20 minutes that will be followed by a 90-minute opportunity for the public to provide verbal comments.

The Service will end the hearing session with a few minutes of closing statements.

On August 15, 2014, the Service proposed to designate critical habitat for the western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*) in 80 separate units in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. At that time, the Service opened an initial 60-day comment period that closed October 14, 2014. The Service reopened the public comment period November 12, 2014, for an additional 60 days that will close January 12, 2015.

Written and verbal testimony on the critical habitat proposal will be accepted at the public hearing. Written comments can also be submitted online at the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. The docket number for the proposed rule is FWS-R8-ES-2013-0011. Comments can also be sent by U.S. Mail or hand delivery: Public Comments Processing, Attn: FWS-ES-R8-2013-0011; Division of Policy and Directives Management; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Headquarters, MS: BPHC; 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041-3803.

The Service is seeking information concerning the habitat needs of the western yellow-billed cuckoo and information on the areas identified as proposed critical habitat for the species. The Service is also seeking information on the incremental economic effects of the proposed critical habitat and information on any potential exclusions from the final designation. To access the proposed critical habitat rule, detailed maps of the proposed critical habitat units, and a specific outline of information requested by the Service, please go to our webpage at: http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/outreach/Public-Advisories/WesternYellow-BilledCuckoo/outreach_PA_Western-Yellow-Billed-Cuckoo.htm.

The Service will review all public comments received during the public comment periods and the public hearing and will consider peer reviews of the proposal from independent experts before making a final decision. The Service listed the western yellow-billed cuckoo as a threatened species on October 3, 2014, and the rule went into effect on November 3, 2014. A final rule to designate critical habitat is expected in 2015.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is committed to providing access to this hearing for all participants. Please direct all requests for sign language interpreting services, close captioning, or other accommodation needs to Robert Moler, (916)414-6606, robert_moler@fws.gov, TTY 800-877-8339 with your request by close of business Wednesday, December 10.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service works with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. For more information, visit www.fws.gov. Connect with our Facebook page at <http://www.facebook.com/usfwspacificsouthwest>, follow our tweets at <http://twitter.com/USFWSPacSWest>, watch our YouTube Channel at <http://www.youtube.com/usfws> and download photos from our Flickr page at http://www.flickr.com/photos/usfws_pacificsw/

-FWS-

CALIFORNIA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION
STATEMENT OF PROPOSED EMERGENCY REGULATORY ACTION

Emergency Action to Amend Section 670.5
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Animals of California Declared to be Endangered or Threatened

I. Statement of Facts Constituting the Need for Emergency Regulatory Action

The population of tricolored blackbirds (*Agelaius tricolor*), which occur mainly in California, is diminishing rapidly and the decline is accelerating due to many factors causing direct mortality and preventing the birds from reproducing successfully.

The Fish and Game Commission (Commission) therefore finds that a biological emergency exists that justifies our immediate action to list the tricolored blackbird as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

This action is based on the following findings of fact:

Rapid Population Decline: Recent statewide tricolored blackbird population surveys have documented a steep decline in abundance. The approximately 145,000 birds counted in 2014 represented a 44 percent decline from 2011 and a 64 percent decline from 2008.

Along the coast, the numbers of tricolored blackbirds are down 91 percent in six years, to less than 700 individuals in a six county region stretching from San Francisco to Santa Barbara. The numbers are down 78 percent in six years in the San Joaquin Valley, where the birds used to breed in greatest numbers.

This year, no breeding colonies were found in Colusa County, likely the first time in the species' evolutionary history that no breeding occurred there. As recently as 2008 there were colonies of 80,000 breeding birds in Colusa County, which illustrates just how quickly the birds have declined.

These population declines were documented despite an increase in survey effort in terms of volunteers participating and sites visited this year.

Diminishing Colony Size: The tricolored blackbird has evolved to breed in large colonies for reproductive success but its colony sizes have declined dramatically in the past 10 years. The ten largest colonies now represent a lower proportion of the overall population as a result of this decline.

The species last produced enough young to replace dying adults in 2006, and has experienced far greater mortality than recruitment each year since then. The past three breeding seasons have been the worst for recruitment ever recorded.

Habitat Destruction: The species has declined largely as a result of land conversions to agricultural crops, primarily nut orchards and vineyards in the Central Valley.

Land conversion has reduced and eliminated wetlands habitat the species needs for breeding and foraging, particularly in the San Joaquin Valley, causing widespread, chronic reproductive failures.

In Southern California, the biggest threats are urbanization and alternative energy development. There are no more than a few thousand birds left in Southern California, where the species was reported to be the most abundant bird a century ago.

This year, approximately 40 percent of the state's population of tricolored blackbirds nested in dairy wheat fields (triticale), where nestlings are at risk because harvest can occur before fledging.

Ineffective Voluntary Programs: While voluntary incentive programs have compensated farmers for delaying harvest, not all farmers with tricolored blackbird colonies on their lands elect to participate, resulting in significant mortality of nestlings.

Other Threats: Concerns exist about potential mortality from shooting of depredating blackbirds on rice fields in early fall and the effects of insecticide use on the species' food sources, although these sources of mortality are not yet well documented.

Identification of Reports or Documents Supporting Regulation Change: A petition was submitted by the Center for Biological Diversity and the Wild Nature Institute to take emergency action to list the Tricolored Blackbird as an endangered species.

Benefits of Listing: CESA listing will provide much needed protections for this declining species and will direct agency focus towards its recovery.

Without protections from harvest-caused mortality the tricolored blackbird could experience declines that further reduce its range in the State, further diminish its abundance, and drop its colony sizes to levels that cannot be successful.

II. 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 determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

- (a) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

(b) **Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:**

None.

(c) **Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:**

None.

(d) **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.

III. Authority and Reference

The Fish and Game Commission proposes this emergency action pursuant to the authority vested by sections 240, 2070, 2075.5 and 2076.5 of the Fish and Game Code and to implement, interpret, or make specific sections 1755, 2055, 2062, 2067, 2070, 2074.6, 2075.5, 2077, 2080, 2081 and 2835, of said Code.

IV. Section 240 Finding

Pursuant to Section 240 of the Fish and Game Code, the Commission made the finding that the adoption of this regulation is necessary for the immediate conservation, preservation, or protection of birds, mammals, reptiles, or fish, including, but not limited to, any nests or eggs thereof.

Informative Digest (Plain English Overview)

Under existing law the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) may designate an animal species as threatened or endangered. The Commission has authority to add or remove a species from the list if the Commission finds, upon the receipt of sufficient scientific information, that the action is warranted. Further, Section 2076.5 provides that the Commission may adopt a regulation which adds a species to the list of endangered or threatened species as an emergency regulation if the Commission finds that there is any emergency posing a significant threat to the continued existence of the species. The proposed regulation would provide that tricolored blackbirds (*Agelaius tricolor*) are listed as endangered. CESA defines an "endangered species" as a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant which is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes. (Fish & G. Code § 2062.)

The population of tricolored blackbirds, which occur mainly in California, is diminishing rapidly and the decline is accelerating due to many factors causing direct mortality and preventing the birds from reproducing successfully.

The Commission therefore finds that a biological emergency exists that justifies our immediate action to list the tricolored blackbird as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act.

This action is based on the following findings of fact:

Rapid Population Decline: Recent statewide tricolored blackbird population surveys have documented a steep decline in abundance. The approximately 145,000 birds counted in 2014 represented a 44 percent decline from 2011 and a 64 percent decline from 2008.

Along the coast, the numbers of tricolored blackbirds are down 91 percent in six years, to less than 700 individuals in a six county region stretching from San Francisco to Santa Barbara. The numbers are down 78 percent in six years in the San Joaquin Valley, where the birds used to breed in greatest numbers.

This year, no breeding colonies were found in Colusa County, likely the first time in the species' evolutionary history that no breeding occurred there. As recently as 2008 there were colonies of 80,000 breeding birds in Colusa County, which illustrates just how quickly the birds have declined.

These population declines were documented despite an increase in survey effort in terms of volunteers participating and sites visited this year.

Diminishing Colony Size: The tricolored blackbird has evolved to breed in large colonies for reproductive success but its colony sizes have declined dramatically in the past 10 years. The ten largest colonies now represent a lower proportion of the overall population as a result of this decline.

The species last produced enough young to replace dying adults in 2006, and has experienced far greater mortality than recruitment each year since then. The past three breeding seasons have been the worst for recruitment ever recorded.

Habitat Destruction: The species has declined largely as a result of land conversions to agricultural crops, primarily nut orchards and vineyards in the Central Valley. Land conversion has reduced and eliminated wetlands habitat the species needs for breeding and foraging, particularly in the San Joaquin Valley, causing widespread, chronic reproductive failures.

In Southern California, the biggest threats are urbanization and alternative energy development. There are no more than a few thousand birds left in Southern California, where the species was reported to be the most abundant bird a century ago.

This year, approximately 40 percent of the State's population of tricolored blackbirds nested in dairy wheat fields (triticale), where nestlings are at risk because harvest can occur before fledging.

Ineffective Voluntary Programs: While voluntary incentive programs have compensated farmers for delaying harvest, not all farmers with tricolored blackbird colonies on their lands elect to participate, resulting in significant mortality of nestlings.

Other Threats: We are also concerned about potential mortality from shooting of depredating blackbirds on rice fields in early fall and the effects of insecticide use on the species' food sources, although these sources of mortality are not yet well documented.

Benefits of Listing: The regulations will benefit the environment in that it will provide much needed protections for this declining species and will direct agency focus towards its recovery.

Without protections from harvest-caused mortality the tricolored blackbird could experience declines that further reduce its range in the state, further diminish its abundance, and drop its colony sizes to levels that cannot be successful.

The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to animals of California declared to be endangered or threatened.

Regulatory Language

Subsection (a)(5) of Section 670.5, Title 14, CCR is amended to read:

§670.5. Animals of California Declared to Be Endangered or Threatened.

The following species and subspecies are hereby declared to be endangered or threatened, as indicated:

... [No changes to subsection (a)(1) through (a)(4)]

(5) Birds:

- (A) California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*)
- (B) Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)
- (C) California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*)
- (D) Light-footed clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes*)
- (E) California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*)
- (F) Western yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus occidentalis*)
- (G) Elf owl (*Micrathene whitneyi*)
- (H) Great gray owl (*Strix nebulosa*)
- (I) Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*)
- (J) Inyo California towhee (*Pipilo crissalis eremophilus*)
- (K) Willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*)
- (L) Arizona Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii arizonae*)
- (M) Gila woodpecker (*Melanerpes uropygialis*)
- (N) Gilded northern flicker (*Colaptes auratus chrysoides*)
- (O) Belding's savannah sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingii*)
- (P) Marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*)
- (Q) Tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*)

(6) Mammals:

- (A) Riparian brush rabbit (*Sylvilagus bachmani riparius*)
- (B) Morro Bay kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys heermanni morroensis*)
- (C) Giant kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys ingens*)
- (D) Tipton kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys nitritoides nitratoides*)
- (E) Fresno kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys nitritoides exilis*)
- (F) Salt-marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*)
- (G) Amargosa vole (*Microtus californicus scirpensis*)
- (H) California bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis californiana*)

... [No changes to subsection (b)]

Note: Authority cited: Sections 240, 2070, 2075.5 and 2076.5 Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 1755, 2055, 2062, 2067, 2070, 2074.6, 2075.5, 2077, 2080, 2081 and 2835, Fish and Game Code.

CATHY WINCHESTER

From: HEIDI HIDALGO
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 7:56 AM
To: MAE SONG; CATHY WINCHESTER
Subject: FW: Correspondence for the Fish and Wildlife Committee
Attachments: 20141215162928353.pdf; 20141215162853193.pdf

For the holder of the next meeting ☺

From: Christine Ferraro [mailto:ferroc@stancounty.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 4:36 PM
To: JAMI AGGERS
Cc: HEIDI HIDALGO; Allison Holmer
Subject: Correspondence for the Fish and Wildlife Committee

Jami: this information arrived today and since there is no BOS meeting until the 6th of January so I am forwarded it to you.

Christine Ferraro Tallman
Clerk of the Board
209 525-4494
1010 10th St. Suite 6700
Modesto, CA 95354

ferroc@stancounty.com

Please take a moment and complete the Customer Satisfaction Survey
by clicking on the following link:

<http://www.stancounty.com/customercenter/index.shtml>

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Jack Baylis, Vice President
Los Angeles
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
DEC 15 A 10:26

December 12, 2014

NOTICE OF PROPOSED EMERGENCY ACTION List the Tricolored Blackbird as an Endangered Species

Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 11346.1(a)(1), the Fish and Game Commission (Commission) is providing notice of proposed emergency action with regards to the above-entitled emergency regulation.

SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS

Government Code section 11346.1(a)(2) requires that, at least five working days prior to submission of the proposed emergency action to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the adopting agency provide a Notice of the Proposed Emergency Action to every person who has filed a request for notice of regulatory action with the agency. After submission of the proposed emergency to OAL, OAL shall allow interested persons five calendar days to submit comments on the proposed emergency regulations as set forth in Government Code Section 11349.6.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments or contentions, in writing, submitted via U.S. mail, e-mail or fax, relevant to the proposed emergency regulatory action. Written comments submitted via U.S. mail, e-mail or fax must be received at OAL within five days after the Commission submits the emergency regulations to OAL for review.

Please reference submitted comments as regarding "Tricolored Blackbird" addressed to:

Mailing Address: Reference Attorney
Office of Administrative Law
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814

California State
Fish and Game Commission
Attn: Sheri Tiemann
1416 Ninth Street, Rm. 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814

E-mail Address: staff@oal.ca.gov
Fax No.: 916-323-6826

fgc@fgc.ca.gov
916-653-5040

For the status of the Commission's submittal to OAL for review, and the end of the five-day written submittal period, please consult OAL's website at <http://www.oal.ca.gov> under the heading "Emergency Regulations."

CATHY WINCHESTER

From: HEIDI HIDALGO
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 7:56 AM
To: MAE SONG; CATHY WINCHESTER
Subject: FW: Correspondence for the Fish and Wildlife Committee
Attachments: 20141215162928353.pdf; 20141215162853193.pdf

For the holder of the next meeting ☺

From: Christine Ferraro [mailto:ferroc@stancounty.com]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2014 4:36 PM
To: JAMI AGGERS
Cc: HEIDI HIDALGO; Allison Holmer
Subject: Correspondence for the Fish and Wildlife Committee

Jami: this information arrived today and since there is no BOS meeting until the 6th of January so I am forwarded it to you.

Christine Ferraro Tallman
Clerk of the Board
209 525-4494
1010 10th St. Suite 6700
Modesto, CA 95354
ferroc@stancounty.com

Please take a moment and complete the Customer Satisfaction Survey
by clicking on the following link:

<http://www.stancounty.com/customercenter/index.shtml>

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Richard Rogers, Vice President
Santa Barbara
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Jack Baylis, Member
Los Angeles
Jacque Hostler-Carnesin, Member
McKinleyville

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

January 2, 2015

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to Amending Sections 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 702, 708.5, 708.11 and 713 Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to Mammal Hunting Regulations for the 2015-2016 season, which are published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on January 2, 2015.

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

Additional information and all associated documents may be found on the Fish and Game Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov.

Mr. Craig Stowers, Department of Fish and Wildlife, phone (916) 445-3553, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,


Jon D. Snellstrom
Associate Governmental Program Analyst

Attachment

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2015 JAN - 5 A 10:42

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, 202, 203, 215, 219, 220, 331, 332, 460, 713, 1050, 1055, 1055.1, 1572, 3452, 3453, 4302, 4304, 4331, 4334, 4336, 4340, 4657, 4753, 4902 and 10502; reference sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 207, 210, 215, 219, 220, 331, 332, 458, 459, 460, 713, 1050, 1055, 1055.1, 1570, 1571, 1572, 1573, 1575, 2005, 3452, 3453, 3950, 3951, 4302, 4304, 4330, 4331, 4332, 4333, 4334, 4336, 4340, 4341, 4652, 4653, 4654, 4655, 4657, 4750, 4751, 4752, 4753, 4754, 4755, 4902, 10500 and 10502, Fish and Game Code; proposes to Amend sections 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 702, 708.5, 708.11 and 713; and Add Section 364.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), relating to Mammal Hunting Regulations for the 2015-2016 season.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Subsection 360(a)
Deer A, B, C and D Zone Hunts

Existing regulations provide for the number of license tags available for the A, B, C, and D Zones. This regulatory proposal changes the number of tags for all existing zones to a series of ranges presented in the table below. These ranges are necessary because the final number of tags cannot be determined until spring herd data are collected in March/April. Because severe winter conditions can have an adverse effect on herd recruitment and over-winter adult survival, final tag quotas may fall below the proposed range into the "Low Kill" alternative identified in the most recent Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

Deer: § 360(a) A, B, C and D Zone Hunts			
Tag Allocations			
§	Zone	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(1)	A	65,000	30,000-65,000
(2)	B	35,000	35,000-65,000
(3)	C	8,150	5,000-15,000
(4)	D3-5	33,000	30,000-40,000
(5)	D-6	6,000	6,000-16,000
(6)	D-7	9,000	4,000-10,000
(7)	D-8	8,000	5,000-10,000
(8)	D-9	2,000	1,000-2,500
(9)	D-10	700	400-800
(10)	D-11	5,500	2,500-6,000
(11)	D-12	950	100-1,500
(12)	D-13	4,000	2,000-5,000
(13)	D-14	3,000	2,000-3,500
(14)	D-15	1,500	500-2,000
(15)	D-16	3,000	1,000-3,500
(16)	D-17	500	100-800

Deer: § 360(a) A, B, C and D Zone Hunts Tag Allocations			
§	Zone	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(17)	D-19	1,500	500-2,000

**Subsection 360(b)
Deer X-Zone Hunts**

Existing regulations provide for the number of deer hunting tags for the X zones. The proposal changes the number of tags for all existing zones to a series of ranges presented in the table below. These ranges are necessary at this time because the final number of tags cannot be determined until spring herd data are collected in March/April. Because severe winter conditions can have an adverse effect on herd recruitment and over-winter adult survival, final tag quotas may fall below the proposed range into the "Low Kill" alternative identified in the most recent Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

Deer: § 360(b) X-Zone Hunts Tag Allocations			
§	Zone	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(1)	X-1	770	1,000-6,000
(2)	X-2	150	50-500
(3)	X-3a	275	100-1,200
(4)	X-3b	795	200-3,000
(5)	X-4	385	100-1,200
(6)	X-5a	65	25-200
(7)	X-5b	50	50-500
(8)	X-6a	320	100-1,200
(9)	X-6b	305	100-1,200
(10)	X-7a	225	50-500
(11)	X-7b	135	25-200
(12)	X-8	210	100-750
(13)	X-9a	650	100-1,200
(14)	X-9b	325	100-600
(15)	X-9c	325	100-600
(16)	X-10	400	100-600
(17)	X-12	680	100-1,200

**Subsection 360(c)
Additional Deer Hunts**

Existing regulations provide for the number of deer hunting tags in the Additional Hunts. The proposal provides a range of tag numbers for each hunt from which a final number will be determined, based on the post-winter status of each deer herd. These ranges are necessary at this time because the final number of tags cannot be determined until spring herd data are collected in March/April. If severe winter conditions adversely affect herd recruitment and over-winter adult survival, the final recommended quotas may fall below the current proposed range into the "Low Kill" alternative identified in the most recent Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

Existing regulations for Additional Hunts G-8 (Fort Hunter Liggett Antlerless Deer Hunt) and J-10 (Fort Hunter Liggett Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt) provide for hunting to begin on October 4 and continue for two (2) consecutive days and reopen on October 11 and continue for three (3) consecutive days in order to accommodate for Base operations and other hunt opportunities. The proposal would modify the season to account for the annual calendar shift by changing the season opening dates to October 3 and October 10 for 2 and 3 consecutive days respectively, in order to accommodate for Base operations. In addition, Fort Hunter Liggett has requested the mandatory hunter orientation meeting required for Hunt J-10 be deleted from the Special Conditions due to insufficient staffing levels.

Minor editorial changes are necessary to provide consistency in subsection numbering, spelling, grammar, and clarification.

The proposal changes the number of tags for all existing hunts to a series of ranges as indicated in the table below.

Deer: § 360(c) Additional Hunts Tag Allocations			
§	Hunt Number (and Title)	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(1)	G-1 (Late Season Buck Hunt for Zone C-4)	2,710	500-5,000
(2)	G-3 (Goodale Buck Hunt)	35	5-50
(3)	G-6 (Kern River Deer Herd Buck Hunt)	50	25-100
(4)	G-7 (Beale Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	20 Military*	20 Military*
(5)	G-8 (Fort Hunter Liggett Antlerless Deer Hunt)	20 Tags Total* (10 Military & 10 Public)	20 Tags Total* (10 Military and 10 Public)
(6)	G-9 (Camp Roberts Antlerless Deer Hunt)	0	30 Tags Total* (Military and Public splits TBD)
(7)	G-10 (Camp Pendleton Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	400 Military*	400 Military*
(8)	G-11 (Vandenberg Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	250 Military*, DOD and as Authorized by the Installation Commander**	250 Military*, DOD and as Authorized by the Installation Commander**
(9)	G-12 (Gray Lodge Shotgun Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	30	10-50
(10)	G-13 (San Diego Antlerless Deer Hunt)	300	50-300
(11)	G-19 (Sutter-Yuba Wildlife Areas Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	25	10-50

Deer: § 360(c) Additional Hunts			
Tag Allocations			
§	Hunt Number (and Title)	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(12)	G-21 (Ventana Wilderness Buck Hunt)	25	25-100
(13)	G-37 (Anderson Flat Buck Hunt)	25	25-50
(14)	G-38 (X-10 Late Season Buck Hunt)	300	50-300
(15)	G-39 (Round Valley Late Season Buck Hunt)	5	5-150
(16)	M-3 (Doyle Muzzleloading Rifle Buck Hunt)	20	10-75
(17)	M-4 (Horse Lake Muzzleloading Rifle Buck Hunt)	10	5-50
(18)	M-5 (East Lassen Muzzleloading Rifle Buck Hunt)	5	5-50
(19)	M-6 (San Diego Muzzleloading Rifle Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	80	25-100
(20)	M-7 (Ventura Muzzleloading Rifle Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	150	50-150
(21)	M-8 (Bass Hill Muzzleloading Rifle Buck Hunt)	20	5-50
(22)	M-9 (Devil's Garden Muzzleloading Rifle Buck Hunt)	15	5-100
(23)	M-11 (Northwestern California Muzzleloading Rifle Buck Hunt)	20	20-200
(24)	MA-1 (San Luis Obispo Muzzleloading Rifle/Archery Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	150	20-150
(25)	MA-3 (Santa Barbara Muzzleloading Rifle/Archery Buck Hunt)	150	20-150
(26)	J-1 Lake Sonoma Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	25	10-25
(27)	J-3 (Tehama Wildlife Area Apprentice Buck Hunt)	15	15-30
(28)	J-4 Shasta-Trinity Apprentice Buck Hunt)	15	15-50
(29)	J-7 (Carson River Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	15	10-50
(30)	J-8 (Daugherty Hill Wildlife Area Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	15	10-20
(31)	J-9 (Little Dry Creek Apprentice Shotgun Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	5	5-10
(32)	J-10 (Fort Hunter Liggett Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	85 Tags Total* (20 Military & 65 Public)	75 Tags Total* (15 Military & 60 Public)
(33)	J-11 (San Bernardino Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	40	10-50
(34)	J-12 (Round Valley Apprentice Buck Hunt)	10	10-20
(35)	J-13 (Los Angeles Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	40	25-100
(36)	J-14 (Riverside Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	30	15-75
(37)	J-15 (Anderson Flat Apprentice Buck Hunt)	10	5-30
(38)	J-16 (Bucks Mountain-Nevada City Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	75	10-75
(39)	J-17 (Blue Canyon Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	25	5-25

Deer: § 360(c) Additional Hunts Tag Allocations			
§	Hunt Number (and Title)	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(40)	J-18 (Pacific-Grizzly Flat Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	75	10-75
(41)	J-19 (Zone X-7a Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	25	10-40
(42)	J-20 (Zone X-7b Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	20	5-20
(43)	J-21 (East Tehama Apprentice Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	50	20-80

**Specific numbers of tags are provided for military hunts through a system which restricts hunter access to desired levels and ensures biologically conservative hunting programs.*

***DOD = Department of Defense and eligible personnel as authorized by the Installation Commander.*

Section 361 Archery Deer

Existing regulations provide for the number of deer hunting tags for existing area-specific archery hunts. The proposal changes the number of tags for existing hunts to a series of ranges presented in the table below. These ranges are necessary at this time because the final number of tags cannot be determined until spring herd data are collected in March/April. Because severe winter conditions can have an adverse effect on herd recruitment and over-winter adult survival, final tag quotas may fall below the proposed range into the "Low Kill" alternative identified in the most recent Environmental Document Regarding Deer Hunting.

Archery Deer Hunting: § 361(b) Tag Allocations			
§	Hunt Number (and Title)	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(1)	A-1 (C Zones Archery Only Hunt)	1,945	150-3,000
(2)	A-3 (Zone X-1 Archery Hunt)	130	50-1,000
(3)	A-4 (Zone X-2 Archery Hunt)	10	5-100
(4)	A-5 (Zone X-3a Archery Hunt)	30	10-300
(5)	A-6 (Zone X-3b Archery Hunt)	70	25-400
(6)	A-7 (Zone X-4 Archery Hunt)	110	25-400
(7)	A-8 (Zone X-5a Archery Hunt)	10	15-100
(8)	A-9 (Zone X-5b Archery Hunt)	5	5-100
(9)	A-11 (Zone X-6a Archery Hunt)	50	10-200
(10)	A-12 (Zone X-6b Archery Hunt)	90	10-200
(11)	A-13 (Zone X-7a Archery Hunt)	45	10-200
(12)	A-14 (Zone X-7b Archery Hunt)	25	5-100
(13)	A-15 (Zone X-8 Archery Hunt)	40	5-100

Archery Deer Hunting: § 361(b)			
Tag Allocations			
§	Hunt Number (and Title)	Current 2014	Proposed 2015 [Range]
(14)	A-16 (Zone X-9a Archery Hunt)	140	50-500
(15)	A-17 (Zone X-9b Archery Hunt)	300	50-500
(16)	A-18 (Zone X-9c Archery Hunt)	350	50-500
(17)	A-19 (Zone X-10 Archery Hunt)	100	25-200
(18)	A-20 (Zone X-12 Archery Hunt)	100	50-500
(19)	A-21 (Anderson Flat Archery Buck Hunt)	25	25-100
(20)	A-22 (San Diego Archery Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	1,000	200-1,500
(21)	A-24 (Monterey Archery Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	100	25-200
(22)	A-25 (Lake Sonoma Archery Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	35	20-75
(23)	A-26 (Bass Hill Archery Buck Hunt)	30	10-100
(24)	A-27 (Devil's Garden Archery Buck Hunt)	5	5-75
(25)	A-30 (Covelo Archery Buck Hunt)	40	20-100
(26)	A-31 (Los Angeles Archery Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	1,000	200-1,500
(27)	A-32 (Ventura/Los Angeles Archery Late Season Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	250	50-300
(28)	A-33 (Fort Hunter Liggett Late Season Archery Either-Sex Deer Hunt)	50 Tags Total* (25 Military & 25 Public)	50 Tags Total* (25 Military & 25 Public)

* Specific numbers of tags are provided for military hunts through a system which restricts hunter access to desired levels and ensures biologically conservative hunting programs.

Subsection 362 **Nelson Bighorn Sheep**

The existing regulation in subsection 362(d), Title 14, CCR, provides for limited hunting of 14 Nelson bighorn rams in specified areas of the State. The proposed change is intended to adjust the number of tags based on Department's annual population estimates in the management units. The number of tags allocated for each of the nine hunt zones is based on the results of the Department's estimate of the bighorn sheep population in each zone. Tag allocations are proposed to ensure the take of no more than 15 percent of the mature rams estimated in each zone. Final tag quota determinations will be completed by April of 2015 pending completion of population surveys and associated analyses.

The following proposed number of tags was determined using the procedure described in Fish and Game Code Section 4902:

§ 362(d) HUNT ZONE	Current 2014 Tag Allocation	Proposed 2015 Tag Allocation [Range]
Zone 1 - Marble/Clipper Mountains	4	0-4
Zone 2 - Kelso Peak/Old Dad Mountains	0	0-4
Zone 3 - Clark/Kingston Mountain Ranges	1	0-2

Zone 4 - Orocopia Mountains	2	0-2
Zone 5 - San Geronio Wilderness	2	0-3
Zone 6 - Sheep Hole Mountains	0	0-2
Zone 7 - White Mountains	1	0-5
Zone 8 - South Bristol Mountains	1	0-3
Zone 9 - Cady Mountains	2	0-4
Open Zone Fund-raising Tag	1	0-1
Marble/Clipper/South Bristol Mountains Fund-raising Tag	0	0-1
Kelso Peak/Old Dad Mountains Fund-raising Tag	0	0-1
TOTAL	14	0-32

Subsection 363 Pronghorn Antelope

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 2015. The final tag quotas will provide for adequate hunting opportunities while allowing for a biologically appropriate harvest of bucks and does in specific populations.

The proposed 2015 tag allocation ranges for the hunt zones are as set forth below.

2015 Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocations (Ranges)						
Hunt Area	Archery-Only Season		General Season			
			Period 1		Period 2	
	Buck	Doe	Buck	Doe	Buck	Doe
Zone 1 – Mount Dome	0-10	0-3	0-60	0-20	0	0
Zone 2 – Clear Lake	0-10	0-3	0-80	0-25	0	0
Zone 3 – Likely Tables	0-20	0-7	0-150	0-50	0-130	0-50
Zone 4 – Lassen	0-20	0-7	0-150	0-50	0-150	0-50
Zone 5 – Big Valley	0-15	0-5	0-150	0-50	0	0
Zone 6 – Surprise Valley	0-10	0	0-25	0-7	0	0
Big Valley Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-15 Either-Sex		0	
Lassen Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-15 Either-Sex		0	
Surprise Valley Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-4 Either-Sex		0	
Likely Tables Apprentice Hunt	N/A		0-5 Either-Sex		0	
Fund-Raising Hunt	N/A		0-10 Buck			

Section 364 Elk

Existing regulations specify elk license tag quotas for each hunt. In order to achieve elk herd management goals and objectives and to maintain hunting quality, it is periodically necessary to adjust quotas in response to dynamic environmental and biological conditions. The proposed amendments to Section 364 will establish final tag quotas within each hunt adjusting for annual fluctuations in population number; adjust season dates/tag distribution for hunts on Fort Hunter Liggett and in the Northwestern Roosevelt Hunt area; as well as make minor editorial changes.

Preliminary tag quota ranges [shown in brackets] are indicated pending final 2015 tag allocations in accordance with elk management goals and objectives based on the results of survey data collected in January - March 2015. The proposed elk tag quota ranges for 2015 are as follows:

2015 Proposed Elk Tag Allocation [shown in ranges]					
§	Section 364 Elk	Bull	Antlerless	Either-Sex	Spike
a	General Roosevelt Elk Hunts				
1	Siskiyou	0-30	0-30		
2	Big Lagoon	0-10	0-10		
3	Northwestern California	0-10	0-35	0-45	
4	Klamath	0-20	0-20		
5	Del Norte	0-15	0-20		
6	Marble Mountains	0-70	0-30		
b	General Rocky Mountain Elk Hunts				
1	Northeastern California	0-30	0-10		
c	General Roosevelt/Tule Elk Hunts				
1	Mendocino	0-4	0-4		
d	General Tule Elk Hunts				
1	Cache Creek	0-4	0-4		
2	La Panza Period 1	0-12	0-10		
	La Panza Period 2	0-12	0-12		
3	Bishop Period 3	0-10	0-30		
	Bishop Period 4	0-10	0-30		
	Bishop Period 5	0-10	0-30		
4	Independence Period 2	0-10	0-30		
	Independence Period 3	0-10	0-30		
	Independence Period 4	0-10	0-30		
	Independence Period 5	0-10	0-30		
5	Lone Pine Period 2	0-10	0-30		
	Lone Pine Period 3	0-10	0-30		
	Lone Pine Period 4	0-10	0-30		
	Lone Pine Period 5	0-10	0-30		
6	Tinemaha Period 2	0-10	0-30		
	Tinemaha Period 3	0-10	0-30		
	Tinemaha Period 4	0-10	0-30		
	Tinemaha Period 5	0-10	0-30		
7	West Tinemaha Period 1	0-10	0-30		
	West Tinemaha Period 2	0-10	0-30		
	West Tinemaha Period 3	0-10	0-30		
	West Tinemaha Period 4	0-10	0-30		
	West Tinemaha Period 5	0-10	0-30		
8	Tinemaha Mountain Period 1	0-8			
	Tinemaha Mountain Period 2	0-8			
	Tinemaha Mountain Period 3	0-8			
	Tinemaha Mountain Period 4	0-8			
	Tinemaha Mountain Period 5	0-8			
9	Whitney Period 2	0-4	0-10		
	Whitney Period 3	0-4	0-10		
	Whitney Period 4	0-4	0-10		
	Whitney Period 5	0-4	0-10		
10	Grizzly Island Period 1	0-3	0-12		0-6
	Grizzly Island Period 2	0-3	0-12		0-6
	Grizzly Island Period 3	0-3	0-12		0-6
	Grizzly Island Period 4	0-2	0-12		0-6
	Grizzly Island Period 5	0-2	0-12		0-6
11	Fort Hunter Liggett Period 1		0-16		
	Fort Hunter Liggett Period 2		0-14		
	Fort Hunter Liggett Period 3	0-14			
12	East Park Reservoir	0-4	0-8		
13	San Luis Reservoir	0-10	0-10	0-10	
14	Bear Valley	0-4	0-2		

2015 Proposed Elk Tag Allocation [shown in ranges]					
§	Section 364 Elk	Bull	Antlerless	Either-Sex	Spike
15	Lake Pillsbury	0-4	0-4		
16	Santa Clara	0-4			
17	Alameda	0-4			
e	Apprentice Hunts				
1	Marble Mountains			0-4	
2	Northeastern CA			0-4	
3	Cache Creek	0-2			
4	La Panza Period 1	0-2	0-2		
5	Bishop Period 2	0-10	0-30		
6	Grizzly Island Period 1		0-4		0-4
	Grizzly Island Period 2				0-4
7	Fort Hunter Liggett	0-2	0-8		
f	Archery Only Hunts				
1	Northeastern California Archery Only			0-20	
2	Owens Valley Multiple Zone Archery Only	0-10	0-10		
3	Lone Pine Archery Only Period 1	0-10	0-30		
4	Tinemaha Archery Only Period 1	0-10	0-30		
5	Whitney Archery Only Period 1	0-10	0-30		
6	Fort Hunter Liggett Archery Only		0-10	0-6	
g	Muzzleloader Only Hunts				
1	Bishop Muzzleloader Only Period 1	0-10	0-30		
2	Independence Muzzleloader Only Period 1	0-10	0-10		
3	Fort Hunter Liggett Muzzleloader Only	0-6			
h	Muzzleloader/Archery Only Hunts				
1	Marble Mountains Muzzleloader/Archery Only			0-10	
i	Fund Raising Tags				
1	Multi-zone	1			
2	Grizzly Island	1			
3	Owens Valley	1			
j	Military Only Elk Tags				
1	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Early Season	0-2	0-2		
	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Period 1		0-16		
	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Period 2		0-14		
	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Period 3	0-14			
2	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Apprentice	0-2	0-8		
3	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Archery Only		0-10	0-6	
4	Fort Hunter Liggett Military Muzzleloader Only	0-6			

**Add Section 364.1
SHARE Elk Hunts**

The Shared Habitat Alliance for Recreational Enhancement (SHARE) program was established in the Fish and Game Code (§§1570-1574) to encourage private landowners to voluntarily make their land available to the public for wildlife-dependent recreational activities. Due to the prevalence of private land in many of the elk zones, managing population numbers with regulated hunting is becoming more challenging. Under the SHARE program, participating landowners receive compensation and liability protection in exchange for allowing access to or through their land for public recreational use and enjoyment of wildlife. SHARE is funded with application fees for access permits. These regulations will establish SHARE elk hunts with separate seasons and tag quotas under the provisions of the 2010 Final Environmental Document Regarding Elk Hunting. Tag issuance will be through the SHARE program utilizing the programs existing tag distribution procedures.

364.1(c)	2015 SHARE Elk Tag Allocation [Proposed Ranges]
----------	--

\$	Hunt Name and Type	Bull	Antlerless	Either-sex	Spike
(1)	Siskiyou	[0-30]	[0-30]		
(2)	Big Lagoon	[0-10]	[0-10]		
(3)	Northwestern California	[0-10]	[0-35]	[0-45]	
(4)	Klamath	[0-20]	[0-20]		
(5)	Del Norte	[0-15]	[0-20]		
(6)	Marble Mountains	[0-70]	[0-30]		
(7)	Northeastern California	[0-30]	[0-10]		
(8)	Mendocino	[0-4]	[0-4]		
(9)	Cache Creek	[0-4]	[0-4]		
(10)	La Panza	[0-24]	[0-24]		
(11)	Bishop	[0-50]	[0-150]		
(12)	Independence	[0-50]	[0-150]		
(13)	Lone Pine	[0-50]	[0-150]		
(14)	Tinemaha	[0-50]	[0-150]		
(15)	West Tinemaha	[0-50]	[0-150]		
(16)	Tinemaha Mountain	[0-40]	-		
(17)	Whitney	[0-26]	[0-50]		
(18)	Grizzly Island	[0-13]	[0-66]		[0-38]
(19)	Fort Hunter Liggett	[0-22]	[0-48]	[0-6]	
(20)	East Park Reservoir	[0-4]	[0-8]		
(21)	San Luis Reservoir	[0-10]	[0-10]	[0-10]	
(22)	Bear Valley	[0-4]	[0-2]		
(23)	Lake Pillsbury	[0-4]	[0-4]		
(24)	Santa Clara	[0-4]	-		
(25)	Alameda	[0-4]	-		

Section 702

Fees

The proposed amendment establishes in subsection 702(c)(1)(W) a new \$20.00 Deer Harvest Non-reporting Fee, to be collected at the time the subsequent year's deer tag or deer tag drawing application is purchased, for all deer hunters who fail to report their hunting results by the established deadline as required in amended Section 708.5.

Cost Estimate for Non-Reporting of Deer Harvest per Year										
Estimated Average 168 hour per month			Benefit Rate = 46.79%			28,000		Average # tags sold		
Task	Hourly Rate	# of Hours	Salaries Cost	Benefits 46.79%	Total Salaries + Benefits	STD OE&E	Unit Cost	Units*	Postage	Total
Meat Locker Booklets							\$5.00	250	\$0	\$1,250
Meat Locker Data Entry (1 Scientific Aid for 2 months)	\$13	336	\$4,368	\$2,044	\$6,412	\$4,667			\$0	\$11,078
Meat Locker Data Validation (1 Environmental Scientist for 1 month)	\$26	168	\$4,368	\$2,044	\$6,412	\$2,333			\$0	\$8,746

Cost Estimate for Non-Reporting of Deer Harvest per Year										
Estimated Average 168 hour per month			Benefit Rate = 46.79%			28,000		Average # tags sold		
Task	Hourly Rate	# of Hours	Salaries Cost	Benefits 46.79%	Total Salaries + Benefits	STD OE&E	Unit Cost	Units*	Postage	Total
Report Preparation (1 Environmental Scientist for 1 month)	\$26	168	\$4,368	\$2,044	\$6,412	\$2,333			\$0	\$8,745
Data Entry for mailed in report cards (3 Sci. Aides, 2 months each)	\$13	1008	\$13,104	\$6,131	\$19,235	\$14,000			\$0	\$33,235
LRB costs to implement and manage non-return fee (1 AGPA for 2 months; postage for non-report mailing notifications)	\$30	336	\$10,080	\$4,716	\$14,796	\$4,667	\$0.42	183,997	\$81,945	\$96,742
		2016								\$159,796
						5% Est of Non-reporting Tag Holders:			9200	\$17.37
						Based on the Proposed Rate of \$20.00 for the non-reporting fee, it covers the projected costs and a small buffer for misc. and unanticipated costs.				\$20.00
										\$184,000

Section 708.5 Deer Tagging and Reporting Requirements

According to the current regulations in Section 708.5, deer tag holders are required to fill out harvest report cards and return them to the Department within 30 days of harvesting a deer. Hunters unsuccessful in taking a deer are not required to report.

Report cards are an important tool to collect deer harvest information and provide an enforcement mechanism for limiting deer harvest to within acceptable levels established by population surveys and analyses. However, harvest report cards for deer currently have very poor return rates, historically less than 25% overall (although they are variable depending upon zone). Such low return rates may potentially lead to proposed management actions without adequate data to justify them. In addition, existing regulations do not incorporate new procedures for electronic reporting via the Department's website and utilizing the Department's Automated License Data System (ALDS) in the collection of this important harvest data.

The low rate of return for report cards results in increased effort by the Department for managing the hunting programs through additional data collection and analysis to fill data gaps, outreach to remind hunters to return report cards, and other enforcement activities. The cost of this additional effort will be offset by the proposed Deer Harvest Non-reporting Fee.

Proposed Regulations

The proposed amendments will require deer tag holders to report the harvest result, whether successful or unsuccessful, either through ALDS or by mail, or be subject to a fee applied at the time of later purchases of licenses or tags. The objectives of the proposed regulations are to:

- ensure continued hunting opportunities for hunters in California by providing the Department with more accurate and comprehensive data on deer hunter success and harvest levels by zone;
- establish a process and specify a date by which all harvest reports, including those where no deer was taken, must be made; and
- recover the increased cost of management of deer due to the non-reporting of harvest data regardless of success.

These objectives are proposed to be achieved through the following amendments:

- Amend Section 708.5 to require all deer tag holders to report within 30 days of harvest or by January 31, whichever date is first, either through ALDS or by mail to the address specified on the harvest report card.
- Amend Section 708.5 to require all deer tag holders that are unsuccessful, whether they hunted or not, to report their 'no harvest' results by January 31, either through ALDS or by mail to the address specified on the harvest report card.
- Amend Section 708.5 to establish a Deer Harvest Non-reporting Fee (set at \$20.00 in Section 702(c)(1)(W)) to be collected at the time the subsequent year's deer tag or deer tag drawing application is purchased, for all deer hunters who failed to report their hunting results by the established deadline.

Section 708.11

Elk License Tags, Applications, Distribution and Reporting Procedures

Existing regulations specify license tags shall be attached to the antler of an antlered elk, or to the ear of an antlerless elk immediately after killing. However, it can be difficult to transport the elk carcass from the harvest location when the head, with ear, is required to be attached along with the useable parts of the kill. Many hunters bone out the meat or quarter the animal to reduce the amount of weight that must be transported from the harvest location. Allowing a new option for the tag to be attached to the leg, or remain with the largest portion of meat provides flexibility during transport while still implementing tagging requirements.

The current regulations do not specify evidence of sex for antlerless elk, only that the tag be attached to the ear (and therefore the head). Modifying the regulation to allow a new option to maintain evidence of sex attached to the kill will result in a reliable means to identify sex of the animal.

Additionally, the regulations for elk do not currently specify the length of time an elk tag must be retained. Antelope, Bear, and Deer all specify the tag must be retained for 15 days after the close of the season. In order to clarify regulations and maintain consistency among species, the proposed regulation implements a tag retention requirement of 15 days after the close of the season.

Hunting is no longer permitted on Santa Rosa Island. The property is now a National Monument administered by the National Park Service.

Proposed Regulations

- Amend subsection 708.11(c) to optionally allow elk tags to be attached to the leg, or largest portion of meat; and, provide evidence of the sex of the animal when the head of an antlerless elk is not retained.
- Amend subsection 708.11(c) to require that elk tags be kept for 15 days after the close of the season.

- Delete subsection 708.11(d) removing the reference to Santa Rosa Island.

Section 713

Tag Replacement for Carcass Condemnation

Existing regulations identify a process by which a hunter can have a diseased, injured, or chemically immobilized big-game carcass condemned. Following the condemnation by a department employee, the hunter currently has the following options under subsection 713(c):

- (1) Purchase and use a duplicate tag subject to the fees established in Section 702 for the remainder of the current season under which the animal was taken;
- (2) Upon payment of duplicate tag fee, receive the same tag for the next approved hunting season;
- (3) Participate in the next big-game drawing for that species with one additional point added to the number of preference points the hunter had when they obtained the original tag, or;
- (4) Receive a refund for the tag and have their preference point total for that species restored to the amount they had when the tag was awarded.

Under the department's Automated License Data System (ALDS), big-game tags are issued annually using "quota splits", with a portion of the available tags issued based on the applicant's point total and the remainder issued on a random basis. Unfortunately, the ALDS system is unable to reserve a tag for the next year as provided in option (2); and option (4) does not create an advantage in the drawing system that would assure receiving a tag in the following hunting season. Eliminating options #2 and #4 will streamline the programming process for ALDS and the remaining options (1) and (3) will assure a simple process to provide a hunter who has had a big-game carcass condemned in one year a tag in the same zone/hunt in the following year.

Proposed Regulations

Delete from subsection 713(c) subparagraphs (2) and (4).

Benefits of the regulations

The big game herd management plans specify objective levels for the proportion of Deer (sections 360 and 361), Nelson Big Horn Sheep (Section 362), Pronghorn Antelope (Section 363), and Elk (Section 364). These ratios are maintained and managed in part by annually modifying the number of tags. The final values for the license tag numbers will be based upon findings from the annual harvest and herd composition counts. The addition of private lands in the SHARE program, to be implemented in new Section 364.1 within the Elk hunt areas, benefits both the landowner and the state through better herd management and cooperation.

Non-monetary benefits to the public

The Commission does not anticipate non-monetary benefits to the protection of public health and safety, worker safety, the prevention of discrimination, the promotion of fairness or social equity and the increase in openness and transparency in business and government.

Consistency with State or Federal Regulations

The Fish and Game Commission, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202 and 203, has the sole authority to regulate deer hunting in California. Commission staff has searched the California Code of Regulations and has found the proposed changes pertaining to deer tag allocations are consistent with Sections 361, 701, 702, 708.5 and 708.6 of Title 14. Therefore the Commission has determined that the proposed amendments are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the Resources Building Auditorium, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, February 12, 2015, at 8:00 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 at the Flamingo Conference Resort & Spa 2777 Fourth Street, Santa Rosa, California, on Thursday, April 9, 2015, at 8:00 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 April 2, 2014 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 April 2, 2015. All comments must be received no later than April 9, 2015 at the hearing in Santa Rosa. 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, Sonke Mastrup, 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 Sonke Mastrup or Jon Snellstrom at the preceding address or phone number. **Craig Stowers, Wildlife Branch, phone (916) 445-3553, 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/Results of the Economic Impact Analysis

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 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 proposed action adjusts tag quotas for existing deer 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; 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 and to the state's environment. Hunting provides opportunities for multi-generational family activities and promotes respect for California's environment by the future stewards of the State's resources. These proposals also contribute to the sustainable management of natural resources and benefits to the State's environment because the proposed regulations will assist the Department in the sustainable management of California's big game populations.

Sections 360, 361, 362, 363 and 364: The proposed action will not have significant impacts on jobs or business within California. The proposed action adjusts tag quotas for existing hunts based on herd performance criteria and merely establish mandatory reporting requirements for all deer hunters and an administrative fee for non-reporting. Given the number of tags historically available, the minimal adjustments in tag numbers that are anticipated for the 2015-2016 hunting season, and the area over which they are distributed

- (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 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

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, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: December 23, 2014

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director

Commissioners
Michael Sutton, President
Monterey
Jack Baylis, Vice President
Los Angeles
Jim Kellogg, Member
Discovery Bay
Richard Rogers, Member
Santa Barbara
Jacque Hostler-Carmesin, Member
McKinleyville

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

Fish and Game Commission



Sonke Mastrup, Executive Director
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1320
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653-4899
(916) 653-5040 Fax
www.fgc.ca.gov

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2015 JAN - 5 A 10:42

January 2, 2015

This is to provide you with a copy of the notice of proposed regulatory action relative to amending Section 7.50, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, relating to the proposed changes in Central Valley Salmon Sport Fishing regulations, which are published in the California Regulatory Notice Register on January 2, 2015.

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

Additional information and all associated documents may be found on the Fish and Game Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov.

Karen Mitchell, Senior Environmental Scientist, Fisheries Branch, phone (916) 445-0826, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations.

Sincerely,



Jon D. Snellstrom

Associate Governmental Program 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, 202, 205, 215, 220, 240, 315 and 316.5; reference sections 200, 202, 205, 206, 215 and 316.5, Fish and Game Code; proposes to Amend subsections (b)(5), (b)(68), and (b)(156.5) of Section 7.50, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), relating to Central Valley Salmon Sport Fishing.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

The current sport fishing regulations allow for salmon fishing in the American, Feather and Sacramento rivers. The Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) is proposing new Chinook salmon bag and possession limits in the American, Feather, and Sacramento rivers.

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) is responsible for adopting recommendations for the management of recreational and commercial ocean salmon fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (three to 200 miles offshore) off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California. When approved by the Secretary of Commerce, these recommendations are implemented as ocean salmon fishing regulations by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

The PFMC will develop the annual Pacific coast ocean salmon fisheries regulatory options for public review at their March 2015 meeting and develop the final PFMC regulatory recommendations for adoption by the NMFS at their April 2015 meeting. Based on the action taken by the NMFS, the Department will propose specific bag and possession limits for the American, Feather, and Sacramento rivers which will:

- (1) align the inland salmon sport fishing possession limit with the ocean salmon sport fishing possession limit;
- (2) allow for additional harvest of salmon if low instream flow conditions persist due to the existing drought to reduce impacts to spawning habitat; and
- (3) increase or decrease the current salmon bag and possession limits based on the PFMC salmon abundance estimates and recommendations for ocean harvest for the coming season.

Proposed Regulations

At this time, a range [shown in brackets] of bag and possession limits are proposed to continue salmon fishing in the American, Feather and Sacramento rivers. The proposed range of bag and possession limits for Central Valley fall-run Chinook salmon stocks are as follows:

In the American River subsections 7.50(b)(5):

- (A) and (D) a season of July 16 through December 31 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.
- (B) a season of July 16 through August 15 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.
- (C) a season of July 16 through October 31 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.
- (E) a season of July 16 through December 16 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.

Feather River, subsections 7.50(b)(68)

- (D) a season of July 16 through October 15 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.
- (E) a season of July 16 through December 16 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.

Sacramento River below Keswick Dam, subsection 7.50(b)(156.5)

- (C) a season of August 6 through December 16 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.
- (E) a season of July 16 through December 16 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.
- (F) a season of July 16 through December 16 with a bag limit of [0-4] Chinook salmon and a possession limit of [0-8] Chinook salmon.

Benefits of the regulations

As set forth in Fish and Game Code section 1700 it is "the policy of the state to encourage the conservation, maintenance, and utilization of the living resources of the ocean and other waters under the jurisdiction and influence of the state for the benefit of all the citizens of the state and to promote the development of local fisheries and distant-water fisheries based in California in harmony with international law respecting fishing and the conservation of the living resources of the oceans and other waters under the jurisdiction and influence of the state. This policy shall include [as applicable to inland fisheries] all of the following objectives:

- (a) The maintenance of sufficient populations of all species of aquatic organisms to insure their continued existence.

- (b) The maintenance of a sufficient resource to support a reasonable sport use, where a species is the object of sport fishing, taking into consideration the necessity of regulating individual sport fishery bag limits to the quantity that is sufficient to provide a satisfying sport.
- (c) The management, on a basis of adequate scientific information promptly promulgated for public scrutiny, of the fisheries under the state's jurisdiction, and the participation in the management of other fisheries in which California fishermen are engaged, with the objective of maximizing the sustained harvest."

Adoption of scientifically-based Central Valley salmon seasons, size limits, and bag and possession limits provides for the maintenance of sufficient populations of salmon to ensure their continued existence. The benefits of the proposed regulations are concurrence with Federal law, sustainable management of the Central Valley salmon resources, and promotion of businesses that rely on Central Valley salmon sport fishing.

Non-monetary benefits to the public

The Commission does not anticipate non-monetary benefits to the protection of public health and safety, worker safety, the prevention of discrimination, the promotion of fairness or social equity and the increase in openness and transparency in business and government.

Consistency with State or Federal Regulations

Section 20, Article IV, of the State Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Fish and Game Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to regulate recreational fishing in waters of the state (Fish & Game Code, §§ 200, 202, 205). The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The Commission has searched the California Code of Regulations and finds no other state agency regulations pertaining to recreational fishing seasons, bag and possession limits. Further, the Commission has determined that the proposed regulations are neither incompatible nor inconsistent with existing federal regulations.

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the Resources Building Auditorium, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, California, on Thursday, February 12, 2015, at 8:00 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 at the Flamingo Conference Resort & Spa

2777 Fourth Street, Santa Rosa, California, on Wednesday, April 8, 2015, at 8:00 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 April 2, 2014 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 April 2, 2015. All comments must be received no later than April 9, 2015 at the hearing in Santa Rosa. 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, Sonke Mastrup, 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 Sonke Mastrup or Jon Snellstrom at the preceding address or phone number. **Karen Mitchell, Fisheries Branch, phone 916-445-0826, 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.

VI. 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 Businesses, 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 proposed changes are necessary for the continued preservation of the resource and therefore the prevention of adverse economic impacts.

- (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 does not anticipate any impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new business, the elimination of existing businesses or the expansion of businesses in California. The minor variations in the bag and possession limits as may be established in the regulations are, by themselves, unlikely to impact business.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents. Providing opportunities for a salmon sport fishery encourages consumption of a nutritious food. The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment by the sustainable management of California's salmon resources.

The Commission does not anticipate any non-monetary benefits to worker safety.

- (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.

- (d) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

- (e) 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, 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, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law.

FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

Dated: December 9, 2014

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director