

Staff Summary for December 10-11, 2025

11. Pronghorn Antelope Hunting**Today's Item**Information ☐Action ☒

Consider authorizing publication of notice of intent to amend regulations regarding pronghorn antelope hunting.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| • Wildlife Resources Committee (WRC) vetting | May 15, 2025; WRC |
| • WRC discussion and recommendation | September 11, 2025; WRC |
| • Today's notice hearing | December 10-11, 2025 |
| • Discussion hearing | February 11-12, 2026 |
| • Adoption hearing | April 15-16, 2026 |

Background

Current regulations provide descriptions of hunt zone boundaries, season opening and closing dates, methods of take, tag designations (buck, doe, either-sex), tag quotas, bag and possession limits, and special conditions for pronghorn antelope.

The recommended regulation changes for the 2026-27 season modify tag quotas for archery-only season buck, general season period 1 buck, general season period 2 buck, and general season period 1 apprentice either-sex hunts.

Tag quotas are established based on a variety of factors, including pronghorn population density and abundance, age and sex composition, and distribution. Previous surveys have suggested declines in populations of pronghorn antelope; in response, the Commission adopted reduced tag allocations for the 2025 hunt year. However, final recommended tag quotas for 2026-27 will not be determined until surveys are completed and the data analyzed. Surveys and analyses are scheduled for completion by spring 2026. At the adoption hearing, the Department will recommend final tag quotas for each zone based upon findings from the 2025-26 surveys.

Today the Department will give a presentation summarizing the recommended regulation changes (Exhibit 5).

Significant Public Comments (N/A)**Recommendation**

Commission staff: Authorize publication of a notice of intent to amend regulations related to pronghorn antelope hunting as recommended by WRC and the Department.

Committee: Support the recommended regulation changes related to pronghorn antelope hunting.

Department: Authorize publication of a notice of intent to amend regulations as detailed in the Department's presentation (Exhibit 5).

Staff Summary for December 10-11, 2025

Exhibits

1. [Memo transmitting initial statement of reasons, received December 8, 2025](#)
2. [Draft initial statement of reasons](#)
3. [Draft proposed regulatory language](#)
4. [Draft economic and fiscal impact statement](#)
5. [Department presentation](#)

Motion

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission authorizes publication of a notice of its intent to amend Section 363, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, related to pronghorn antelope hunting.

Memorandum

Date: November 25, 2025

Received December 8, 2025
Original signed copy on file

To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Executive Director
Fish and Game Commission

From: Charlton H. Bonham
Director

Subject: **Item for December 10-11, 2025 Fish and Game Commission Meeting: Regulatory Action to Amend Sections 353, 363, 364, 364.1, 555, and 555.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, re: Methods Authorized for Taking Big Game, Pronghorn Antelope Hunting, Elk Hunting, SHARE Elk Hunts, Cooperative Elk Hunting Areas, and Conflict Cooperative Elk Hunting Areas.**

Please find attached the Initial Statement of Reasons to amend sections 353, 363, 364, 364.1, 555, and 555.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, regarding methods authorized for taking big game, pronghorn antelope hunting, elk hunting, SHARE elk hunts, cooperative elk hunting areas, and conflict cooperative elk hunting areas. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) requests consideration of publication of notice after the December 10-11, 2025 Fish and Game Commission meeting.

The proposed amendments would:

- Potentially reduce tag quotas for pronghorn antelope hunts, pending population assessments to be completed in February 2026.
- Expand methods of take for elk to include shotguns firing single slugs for SHARE elk hunts.
- Define a new elk hunt zone for areas currently undefined in a hunt area.
- Increase tag quotas for elk hunts in the Owens Valley Elk Management Unit.
- Increase tag quotas for SHARE elk hunts.
- Clarify tag eligibility across general, fundraising, SHARE, cooperative, and conflict cooperative elk hunts.

If you have any questions on this item, please contact Scott Gardner, Wildlife Branch Chief, at (916) 801-6257. The Department point of contact for this rulemaking is the Statewide Elk and Pronghorn Antelope Coordinator, Brent Wolf, who can be contacted at BigGame@wildlife.ca.gov.

ec: Chad Dibble, Deputy Director
Wildlife and Fisheries Division

Melissa Miller-Henson, Executive Director
California Fish and Game Commission
November 25, 2025
Page 2

Scott Gardner, Chief
Wildlife Branch

Dr. Mario Klip, Environmental Program Manager
Game Conservation and Connectivity Program

Chelle Temple-King, Supervisor
Big Game Unit

Regina Vu, Wildlife Regulations Coordinator
Wildlife Branch

Ona Alminas, Env. Program Manager
Regulations Unit

Mike Randall, Regulatory Analyst
Regulations Unit

David Thesell, Deputy Executive Director
Fish and Game Commission

Ari Cornman, Wildlife Advisor
Fish and Game Commission

David Haug, Analyst
Fish and Game Commission

State of California
Fish and Game Commission
Initial Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action

Amend Sections 363
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Re: Pronghorn Antelope Hunting

I. Date of Initial Statement of Reasons: November 6, 2025

II. Dates and Locations of Scheduled Hearings

(a) Notice Hearing:

Date: December 10, 2025

Location: Sacramento

(b) Discussion Hearing:

Date: February 12, 2026

Location: Sacramento

(c) Adoption Hearing:

Date: April 16, 2026

Location: Sacramento

III. Description of Regulatory Action

(a) Statement of Specific Purpose of Regulatory Change and Factual Basis for Determining that Regulation Change is Reasonably Necessary

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) periodically considers the recommendations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) in amending pronghorn antelope hunting regulations. Considerations include recommendations for adjusting tag quotas (total number of hunting tags to be made available), setting hunt periods, modifying zone boundaries, authorizing methods of take, among others, to help achieve management goals and objectives for pronghorn antelope. To maintain appropriate harvest levels and hunting quality, tags must be adjusted periodically in response to dynamic environmental and biological conditions.

The proposed changes focus on pronghorn antelope tag quotas under subsection 363(m). The last time these regulations were subject to amendment was April 2025. The proposed amendments here represent the culmination of the Department's internal discussion regarding pronghorn antelope population status. The proposed changes are necessary to manage harvest for the population size.

Background

The goal of the Department's pronghorn antelope program is to maintain viable, healthy pronghorn antelope populations, and to provide a variety of recreational activities, including harvest opportunity. A limited number of pronghorn antelope hunting tags are offered annually via the Big Game Drawing, and public demand for pronghorn antelope hunting tags has annually exceeded tag availability for the last ten years. In addition to harvest opportunity, public pronghorn antelope hunting also provides data that enhances the Department's ability to monitor pronghorn antelope populations including spatial, age, genetic, and disease information.

Current Regulations

Section 363 provides descriptions of hunt zone boundaries, season opening and closing dates, methods of take (e.g., general methods, archery only), tag designations (buck, doe), tag quotas, bag and possession limits, and special conditions for pronghorn antelope.

Proposed Regulations

The proposed regulations amend subsection 363(m) to potentially adjust hunting tag numbers across all six hunt zones. Previous surveys have suggested declines in population of pronghorn antelope, and the Commission adopted reduced tag allocations for the 2025 hunt year. The Department is prioritizing additional surveys in February 2026 to continue to assess pronghorn antelope population status and will make a final recommendation following the completion of surveys and data analysis. Administrative regulatory procedures require the notice of proposed changes to the regulations prior to completion of population surveys and data analysis.

Section 363 Pronghorn Antelope

Amend subsection 363(m) to modify tag quotas for archery-only season buck, general season period 1 buck and period 2 buck, and general season period 1 apprentice either-sex hunts. Tag allocations may need to be adjusted to manage harvest following the completion of population surveys. Tag quotas are shown in Table 1 below in a bracketed range. The Department will recommend final tag quotas to the Commission at the adoption hearing.

Table 1. Proposed Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocations (Subsection 363 (m))

<i>Hunt Area</i>	<i>Archery-Only Season Buck</i>	<i>Archery-Only Season Doe</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Buck</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Doe</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Apprentice Either-Sex</i>	<i>General Season Period 2 Buck</i>	<i>General Season Period 2 Doe</i>	<i>Fundraising</i>
Zone 1 -- Mount Dome	0	0	2 [0-2]	0	N/A	0	0	0
Zone 2 -- Clear Lake	4 [0-1]	0	6 [0-6]	0	N/A	0	0	0
Zone 3 -- Likely Tables	0	0	5 [0-5]	0	0	0	0	0
Zone 4 -- Lassen	5 [0-5]	0	35 [0-35]	0	5 [0-5]	35 [0-35]	0	0
Zone 5 -- Big Valley	4 [0-1]	0	5 [0-5]	0	4 [0-1]	0	0	0
Zone 6 -- Surprise Valley	4 [0-1]	0	40 [0-10]	0	4 [0-4]	0	0	0
Zones 1-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

(b) Goals and Benefit of the Regulation

It is the policy of the state to encourage the preservation, conservation, and maintenance of wildlife resources under the jurisdiction and influence of the state. This policy shall include, but is not limited to, the following objectives:

The maintenance of sufficient populations of all species of wildlife and the habitat necessary to provide for the beneficial use and enjoyment of wildlife by all citizens of the state, to perpetuate all species of wildlife for their intrinsic and ecological values, as well as for their direct benefits to all persons, to provide for aesthetic, educational, and non-appropriative uses of the various wildlife species, to maintain diversified recreational uses of wildlife, including sport hunting, as proper uses of certain designated species of wildlife, consistent with the maintenance of healthy, viable wildlife resources, the public safety, and a quality outdoor experience, to alleviate economic losses or public health or safety problems caused by wildlife to the people of the state either individually or collectively in a manner designed to bring the problem within tolerable limits consistent with economic and public health considerations and the objectives.

The proposed regulations will contribute to the sustainable management of pronghorn antelope populations in California. Population objectives are maintained and managed in part by periodically modifying the number of hunting tags distributed. The proposed tag quota changes will help conserve pronghorn antelope populations.

(c) Authority and Reference Sections from Fish and Game Code for Regulation

Authority: Sections 219, 265, 331 and 1050, Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 331, 713 and 1050, Fish and Game Code.

(d) Specific Technology or Equipment Required by Regulatory Change: None.

(e) Identification of Reports or Documents Supporting Regulation Change

Report to follow completion of winter surveys in February 2026.

(f) Public Discussions of Proposed Regulations Prior to Notice Publication

- Wildlife Resources Committee: May 2025
- Wildlife Resources Committee: September 2025

IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action

(a) Alternatives to Regulation Change

No alternatives were identified by or brought to the attention of Commission staff that would have the same desired regulatory effect.

(b) No Change Alternative

Without the proposed changes, the outstanding issues concerning the regulations currently governing pronghorn antelope hunting would remain unaddressed. Retaining the current number of tags for the hunts listed would not be responsive to changes in population status.

V. Mitigation Measures Required by Regulatory Action

The proposed regulatory action will have no negative impact on the environment; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed. The maximum number of tags available in the proposed range is at or below the number of tags analyzed in the 2004 Final Environmental Document Regarding Pronghorn Antelope Hunting.

VI. Impact of Regulatory Action

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 action adjusts tag quotas for existing 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 does not anticipate impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs within the State or any significant impacts on the creation of new businesses, the elimination of existing businesses, or the expansion of businesses in California because the expected economic impacts of the proposed regulations are unlikely to be substantial enough to significantly stimulate demand for goods or services related to pronghorn antelope hunting. The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment including, but not limited to, the maintenance of populations of pronghorn antelope to ensure their continued existence and supporting recreational opportunity, and funding wildlife conservation through the fees that hunters pay for licenses and tags. While there are no anticipated benefits to worker safety, hunting is an outdoor activity that can provide several health and welfare benefits to California residents, including the benefits of fresh game to eat and exercise from outdoor recreation.

- (c) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or 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:

The Commission does not anticipate any new costs or savings to state agencies or costs/savings in federal funding to the state. However, Department revenue is expected to decline if a reduced number of pronghorn antelope tags are made available after the February 2026 survey results.

- (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

VII. Economic Impact Assessment

- (a) Effects of the Regulation on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State

The Commission does not anticipate impacts on the creation or elimination of jobs within the state.

(b) Effects of the Regulation on the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses Within the State

The Commission does not anticipate impacts on the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses within the state because the potential economic impacts of the proposed regulations vary annually as tag quotas change and are unlikely to be substantial enough to stimulate demand for goods or services related to pronghorn antelope hunting in the long run due to annual variability.

(c) Effects of the Regulation on the Expansion of Businesses Currently Doing Business Within the State

The Commission does not anticipate impacts on the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the state because the potential economic impacts of the proposed regulations vary annually as tag quotas change and are unlikely to be substantial enough to stimulate demand for goods or services related to pronghorn antelope hunting in the long run due to annual variability.

(d) Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents

Hunting is an outdoor activity that can provide several health and welfare benefits to California residents. Hunters and their families benefit from fresh game to eat, and from the benefits of outdoor recreation, including exercise. People who hunt have a special connection with the outdoors and an awareness of the relationships between wildlife, habitat, and humans, and hunting can be a family tradition and a bonding activity.

(e) Benefits of the Regulation to Worker Safety

The Commission does not anticipate impacts on worker safety.

(f) Benefits of the Regulation to the State's Environment

The proposed regulations will contribute to the sustainable management of pronghorn antelope populations in California. Population objectives are maintained and managed in part by periodically modifying the number of hunting tags distributed. The proposed tag quota changes will help conserve pronghorn antelope populations.

(g) Other Benefits of the Regulation:

The Commission does not anticipate other benefits from the proposed regulation.

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

Background

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) periodically considers the recommendations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) in amending pronghorn antelope hunting regulations. Considerations include recommendations for adjusting tag quotas, setting hunt periods, modifying zone boundaries, authorizing methods of take, among others, to help achieve management goals and objectives for pronghorn antelope. To maintain appropriate harvest levels and hunting quality, tags must be adjusted periodically in response to dynamic environmental and biological conditions.

Section 363 provides descriptions of pronghorn antelope hunt zone boundaries, season opening and closing dates, methods of take (e.g., general methods, archery only), tag designations (buck, doe), tag quotas (total number of hunting tags to be made available), bag and possession limits, and special conditions for pronghorn antelope.

Proposed Changes

The proposed changes amend subsection 363(m) to potentially adjust hunting tag numbers across all six hunt zones. Previous surveys have suggested declines in population of pronghorn antelope and the Commission adopted reduced tag allocations for the 2025 hunt year. The Department is prioritizing additional surveys in February 2026 to continue to assess pronghorn antelope population status and will make a final recommendation following the completion of surveys and data analysis. Administrative regulatory procedures require the notice of proposed changes to the regulations prior to completion of the surveys and data analysis.

The Department recommends that the Commission consider proposed changes to subsection 363(m) to modify tag quotas for general season period 1 buck and period 2 buck, archery-only season buck, and general season period 1 apprentice either-sex hunts. No changes are proposed to tag quotas for archery only doe or general season doe hunts. Tag allocations may need to be adjusted to manage harvest following the completion of population surveys.

Benefits of the Regulations

The proposed regulations will contribute to the sustainable management of pronghorn antelope populations in California. Population objectives are maintained and managed in part by periodically modifying the number of hunting tags distributed. The proposed tag quota changes will help conserve pronghorn antelope populations.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Section 20, Article IV, of the state Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the 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 adopt regulations governing pronghorn antelope hunting. No other state agency has the authority to adopt regulations governing pronghorn antelope hunting. 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 CCR for any regulations regarding pronghorn antelope hunting; therefore, the Commission has concluded that the proposed pronghorn antelope hunting regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

Proposed Regulatory Language

Section 363, Title 14, CCR, is amended to read:

§ 363. Pronghorn Antelope.

... [No changes to the unnumbered first paragraph of Section 363 and subsections (a) through (l)(7)] ...

(m) Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocations Table.

Hunt Area	Archery-Only Season Buck	Archery-Only Season Doe	General Season Period 1 Buck	General Season Period 1 Doe	General Season Period 1 Apprentice Either-Sex	General Season Period 2 Buck	General Season Period 2 Doe	Fundraising
Zone 1 -- Mount Dome	0	0	2 [0-2]	0	N/A	0	0	0
Zone 2 -- Clear Lake	4 [0-1]	0	6 [0-6]	0	N/A	0	0	0
Zone 3 -- Likely Tables	0	0	5 [0-5]	0	0	0	0	0
Zone 4 -- Lassen	5 [0-5]	0	35 [0-35]	0	5 [0-5]	35 [0-35]	0	0
Zone 5 -- Big Valley	4 [0-1]	0	5 [0-5]	0	4 [0-1]	0	0	0
Zone 6 -- Surprise Valley	4 [0-1]	0	10 [0-10]	0	4 [0-4]	0	0	0
Zones 1-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 219, 265, 331 and 1050, Fish and Game Code.
Reference: Sections 331, 713 and 1050, Fish and Game Code.

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT NAME California Fish and Game Commission	CONTACT PERSON David Thesell	EMAIL ADDRESS fgc@fgc.ca.gov	TELEPHONE NUMBER 916-902-9291
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400 Amend Section 363, Title 14, CCR: Re: Pronghorn Antelope Hunting 2026-27			NOTICE FILE NUMBER Z

A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Impacts business and/or employees | <input type="checkbox"/> e. Imposes reporting requirements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Impacts small businesses | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Impacts jobs or occupations | <input type="checkbox"/> g. Impacts individuals |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Impacts California competitiveness | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> h. None of the above (Explain below): |

Proposed annual updates to Pronghorn hunting regulations have no new private sector costs. See Fiscal Impact Statement below.

If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.

If box in Item 1.h. is checked, complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.

2. The _____ estimates that the economic impact of this regulation (which includes the fiscal impact) is:
(Agency/Department)

- ☐ Below \$10 million
- ☐ Between \$10 and \$25 million
- ☐ Between \$25 and \$50 million
- ☐ Over \$50 million *[If the economic impact is over \$50 million, agencies are required to submit a [Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment](#) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c)]*

3. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: _____

Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits): _____

Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: _____

4. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: _____ eliminated: _____

Explain: _____

5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: ☐ Statewide
☐ Local or regional (List areas): _____

6. Enter the number of jobs created: _____ and eliminated: _____

Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: _____

7. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here? ☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, explain briefly: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)**B. ESTIMATED COSTS** *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? \$ _____
 - a. Initial costs for a small business: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____
 - b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____
 - c. Initial costs for an individual: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____
 - d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: _____
2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: _____
3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements.
Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted. \$ _____
4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? ☐ YES ☐ NO
 If YES, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: \$ _____
 Number of units: _____
5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? ☐ YES ☐ NO
 Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: _____
- Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: \$ _____

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS *Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.*

1. Briefly summarize the benefits of the regulation, which may include among others, the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety and the State's environment: _____
2. Are the benefits the result of: ☐ specific statutory requirements, or ☐ goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?
 Explain: _____
3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? \$ _____
4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California that would result from this regulation: _____

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.*

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

Regulation: Benefit: \$ _____ Cost: \$ _____

Alternative 1: Benefit: \$ _____ Cost: \$ _____

Alternative 2: Benefit: \$ _____ Cost: \$ _____

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: _____
_____4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs? ☐ YES ☐ NOExplain: _____
_____**E. MAJOR REGULATIONS** *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.****California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) boards, offices and departments are required to submit the following (per Health and Safety Code section 57005). Otherwise, skip to E4.***1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises **exceed \$10 million**? ☐ YES ☐ NO***If YES, complete E2. and E3******If NO, skip to E4***

2. Briefly describe each alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1: _____

Alternative 2: _____

(Attach additional pages for other alternatives)

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

Regulation: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 1: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 2: Total Cost \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

4. Will the regulation subject to OAL review have an estimated economic impact to business enterprises and individuals located in or doing business in California exceeding \$50 million in any 12-month period between the date the major regulation is estimated to be filed with the Secretary of State through 12 months after the major regulation is estimated to be fully implemented?

☐ YES ☐ NO*If YES, agencies are required to submit a [Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment \(SRIA\)](#) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c) and to include the SRIA in the Initial Statement of Reasons.*

5. Briefly describe the following:

The increase or decrease of investment in the State: _____
_____The incentive for innovation in products, materials or processes: _____
_____The benefits of the regulations, including, but not limited to, benefits to the health, safety, and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment and quality of life, among any other benefits identified by the agency: _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

Draft Document**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT****A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT** *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*

- ☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
(Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

\$ _____

- ☐ a. Funding provided in _____
Budget Act of _____ or Chapter _____, Statutes of _____

- ☐ b. Funding will be requested in the Governor's Budget Act of _____
Fiscal Year: _____

- ☐ 2. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are NOT reimbursable by the State. (Approximate)
(Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

\$ _____

Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimbursable and provide the appropriate information:

- ☐ a. Implements the Federal mandate contained in _____
- ☐ b. Implements the court mandate set forth by the _____ Court.

Case of: _____ vs. _____

- ☐ c. Implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. _____

Date of Election: _____

- ☐ d. Issued only in response to a specific request from affected local entity(s).

Local entity(s) affected: _____

- ☐ e. Will be fully financed from the fees, revenue, etc. from: _____

Authorized by Section: _____ of the _____ Code;

- ☐ f. Provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each;

- ☐ g. Creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in _____

- ☐ 3. Annual Savings. (approximate)

\$ _____

- ☐ 4. No additional costs or savings. This regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

- ☒ 5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

- ☐ 6. Other. Explain _____

**ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)**

STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)**B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT** *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

It is anticipated that State agencies will:☐ a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.☐ b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for the _____ Fiscal Year☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☐ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program.☒ 4. Other. Explain No change in costs or savings are anticipated. The Department's proposed tag limits will result in up to the same number of tags as the previous season.However, Department revenue is expected to decline if a reduced number of pronghorn antelope tags are made available. See addendum.**C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS** *Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.*☐ 1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

\$ _____

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.☐ 4. Other. Explain _____

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE

DATE

*The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or departments not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.*

AGENCY SECRETARY

DATE

*Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD. 399.*

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER

DATE



STD. 399 Addendum
Amend Section 363
Title 14, California Code of Regulations
Regarding Pronghorn Antelope Hunting

Background

The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission) periodically considers recommendations from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) in amending pronghorn antelope regulations. Considerations include recommendations for adjusting tag quotas, setting hunt periods, modifying zone boundaries, authorizing methods of take, among others, to help achieve management goals and objectives for pronghorn antelope. To maintain appropriate harvest levels and hunting quality, tags must be adjusted periodically in response to dynamic environmental, biological, and social conditions.

Section 363 provides descriptions of hunt zone boundaries, season opening and closing dates, methods of take (e.g., general methods, archery only, apprentice), tag designations (buck, doe), tag quotas (total number of hunting tags to be made available), bag and possession limits, and special conditions for pronghorn antelope.

The proposed changes amend subsection 363(m) to potentially adjust hunting tag numbers across all six hunt zones. Previous surveys have suggested declines in population of pronghorn antelope and the Commission adopted reduced tag allocations for the 2025 hunt year. The Department is prioritizing additional surveys in February 2026 to continue to assess pronghorn antelope population status and will make a final recommendation following the completion of surveys and data analysis. Administrative regulatory procedures require the notice of proposed changes to the regulations prior to completion of the surveys and data analysis.

The Department recommends that the Commission consider proposed changes to subsection 363(m) to modify tag quotas for general season period 1 buck and period 2 buck, archery-only season buck, and general season period 1 apprentice either-sex hunts. No changes are proposed to tag quotas for archery only doe or general season doe hunts. Tag allocations may need to be adjusted to manage harvest following the completion of population surveys.

Table 1. Proposed Pronghorn Antelope Tag Allocations (Subsection 363 (m))

<i>Hunt Area</i>	<i>Archery-Only Season Buck</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Buck</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Apprentice Either-Sex</i>	<i>General Season Period 2 Buck</i>	<i>Fundraising</i>
Zone 1 -- Mount Dome	0	2 <u>[0-2]</u>	N/A	0	0
Zone 2 -- Clear Lake	4 <u>[0-1]</u>	6 <u>[0-6]</u>	N/A	0	0

<i>Hunt Area</i>	<i>Archery-Only Season Buck</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Buck</i>	<i>General Season Period 1 Apprentice Either-Sex</i>	<i>General Season Period 2 Buck</i>	<i>Fundraising</i>
Zone 3 -- Likely Tables	0	5 [0-5]	0	0	0
Zone 4 -- Lassen	5 [0-5]	35 [0-35]	5 [0-5]	35 [0-35]	0
Zone 5 – Big Valley	4 [0-1]	5 [0-5]	4 [0-1]	0	0
Zone 6 -- Surprise Valley	4 [0-1]	40 [0-10]	4 [0-4]	0	0
Zones 1-6	0	0	0	0	2

The proposed ranges do not reduce the overall number of tags available but do allow for a reduced number of tags to be issued if surveys in February 2026 suggest a decrease due to declining populations.

Economic Impact Statement

Section A. Estimated Private Sector Cost Impacts

Question 1. Answer h. None of the above:

No new private sector costs are necessarily incurred with these annual regulatory amendments. 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 because the proposed amendments may result in the same or a small drop in the number of available tags with no change in fees, equipment, or reporting requirements.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Section A. Fiscal Effect on Local Government

Answer 5. No Fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

Section B. Fiscal Effect on State Government

Answer 4. Other.

Explanation: The Department Wildlife Branch, Law Enforcement Branch, and License and Revenue Branch workload is projected to be unchanged from currently existing budgets and resources, as the proposed changes only introduce a range of 0-118 available tags that includes the current tag quota, two of which are fundraising tags. However, Department revenue is expected to decline if a reduced number of pronghorn antelope tags are made available after the February 2026 survey results. Revenue for 2026-2027 would be expected to

fall by \$196.22 per resident tag and \$599.25 per non-resident tag if the Commission authorizes fewer tags through the regulation changes. If up to 10 fewer pronghorn tags are available, at the 2026 price of \$196.22 per resident tag and \$599.25 per non-resident tag, the projected decline in revenue in 2026-27 (assuming the loss of 9 resident tags and 1 non-resident tag sold) would be \$2,365.23.

Section C. Fiscal Effect on Federal Funding of State Programs

Answer 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.



CDFW Stock Photo

PRONGHORN ANTELOPE HUNTING: PROPOSALS FOR REGULATORY CHANGE

Presentation to the California Fish and Game Commission
December 10, 2025

Dr. Mario Klip, Game and Connectivity Programs Manager

Continued Assessment

- Prioritize annual population surveys in northeastern California due to population declines in this area.
 - Scheduled for February 2026
 - Decreasing population estimate may require reduction of tags
 - Potential reductions in Lassen, Likely Tables, Clear Lake, Big Valley, Surprise Valley, and Mt Dome Hunt Zones

Pronghorn Hunts	2025 Tag Allocation	Proposed 2026 Tag Allocation
Mount Dome Period 1 Buck	2	0-2
Clear Lake Archery Buck	1	0-1
Clear Lake Period 1 Buck	6	0-6
Likely Tables Period 1 Buck	5	0-5
Lassen Archery Buck	5	0-5
Lassen Period 1 Buck	35	0-35
Lassen Apprentice Either Sex	5	0-5
Lassen Period 2 Buck	35	0-35
Big Valley Archery Buck	1	0-1
Big Valley Period 1 Buck	5	0-5
Big Valley Apprentice Either Sex	1	0-1
Surprise Valley Archery Buck	1	0-1
Surprise Valley Period 1 Buck	10	0-10
Surprise Valley Apprentice Either Sex	4	0-4
Any Zone Buck – Fundraising	2	2
Total	118	2-118

Pronghorn Population Declines

- General tag reduction since 2020
 - 2021: Reduced by 40 tags
 - 2024: Reduced by 68 tags
 - 2025: Reduced by 21 tags
 - 2026: 116 total general tags
- Population Monitoring
 - Switching from minimum counts to population estimation through distance sampling
 - On-going transition



Questions | Contact

Dr. Mario Klip, Game and Connectivity Programs Manager
Wildlife Branch

BigGame@wildlife.ca.gov

