

STAFF SUMMARY FOR AUGUST 4-5, 2015

28. UPLAND GAME BIRD**Today's Item**Information Action

Adopt proposed changes to upland game bird regulations.

Summary of Previous/Future Actions

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| • WRC vetting | Jan 14, 2015; Sacramento |
| • Notice hearing | Apr 8-9, 2015; Santa Rosa |
| • Discussion hearing | Jun 10-11, 2015; Mammoth Lakes |
| • Today's adoption hearing | Aug 4-5, 2015; Fortuna |

Background

FGC annually adopts regulations to set limits on upland game bird hunting. In the proposed regulations, DFW provides a range for the number of permits until the conclusion of population survey efforts are completed in the spring; a final recommendation within the range is provided at the Aug FGC meeting. For the 2015-16 season, DFW recommends no change from last year in the number of greater sage-grouse permits allocated to each of four zones (Exhibit 1), which will be reflected in the final statement of reasons:

- | | |
|--|----|
| • East Lassen Zone (two-bird permits) | 0 |
| • Central Lassen Zone (two-bird permits) | 0 |
| • North Mono Zone (one-bird permits) | 30 |
| • South Mono Zone (one-bird permits) | 0 |

In addition, the close of shooting time for spring wild turkey hunting is proposed to be extended by one hour. Shooting time for spring turkey hunters would close at 5:00 p.m. instead of 4:00 p.m.

Significant Public Comments

1. Mono County Board of Supervisors requests a reduction in the number of sage-grouse permits within the North and South Mono management zones to zero for the 2015 and future seasons (Exhibit 3).
2. A request to expand the statewide general hunting season for ringneck pheasants from six to eight weeks to increase hunting opportunity, and to reduce the daily bag limit from three to two roosters to ensure additional take will not negatively impact future populations (Exhibit 4).
3. A request that the take of Eurasian collared doves be prohibited during the spring nesting seasons for mourning and whitewing doves and during the month of Aug to ensure the mourning and whitewing doves are not disturbed by Eurasian dove hunting (Exhibit 5).

The second and third comments are outside the scope of the proposed regulation change, but could be considered in a future upland game rulemaking.

STAFF SUMMARY FOR AUGUST 4-5, 2015

Recommendation

FGC staff: Adopt DFW's recommendations and consider including the ringneck pheasant and Eurasian collard dove recommendations in the next upland game rulemaking.

DFW staff: Recommends only allowing greater sage-grouse hunting in the North Mono Zone with 30 tags, and extend the spring shooting time for wild turkey by one hour.

Exhibits

1. DFW memo with final recommendations
2. ISOR - Upland Game
3. Letter from Mono County Board of Supervisors, received Jun 8, 2015
4. Email from Jim Brown, received Jun 22, 2015
5. Email from Jim Brown, received Jun 22, 2015

Motion/Direction

Moved by _____ and seconded by _____ that the Commission adopts the proposed changes to Subsection 300(a)(1)(D)4 and Section 310.5 related to upland game regulations for the 2015-16 season.

State of California
Department of Fish and Wildlife

Memorandum

Date: July 23, 2015

To: Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director
Fish and Game Commission

From: Charlton H. Bonham
Director



Subject: Agenda Item for the August 5, 2015 Fish and Game Commission Meeting in Fortuna; Department recommendation for amending Section 300, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Re: Upland Game Birds (Sage grouse)

This memo provides the Department's recommendations for proposed changes to Section 300: Upland Game Birds, scheduled for adoption at the Commission's August 5 meeting. In particular, the Department is providing recommended permit allocations for sage grouse after completing our spring 2015 lek counts which contribute to our population assessments for the species. Currently, the Initial Statement of Reasons lists a range of potential permits for each of 4 sage grouse hunt zones and the recommendations herein provide a specific number based on the Department's population assessments. In 2014, North Mono was the only hunt zone that was allocated permits. Each of the other zones had 0 permits because of either short or long-term population declines during drought and following wildfire. Additionally, the species is a candidate for listing by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) range-wide, although they recently concluded that the Bi-State Distinct Population Segment that inhabits Mono County and smaller parts of Inyo County and Nevada, did not warrant listing because of the long-term conservation commitment being put forward by public and private entities.

Lassen Sage-Grouse Hunt Zones

As you recall, sage-grouse permits were reduced to 0 in both Lassen Hunt Zones as an emergency action following the 2012 Rush Fire, which burned a total of 313,000 acres, with 271,000 acres almost entirely in the East Lassen Hunt Zone. Male lek attendance declined substantially in both 2013 and 2014 following the fire as indicated below in Table 1. Lek counts increased slightly this spring, but remain 50 and 54 % below pre-fire population size in the East and Central Lassen Hunt Zones, respectively. Because of this decline, the significant loss of habitat, and ongoing

drought conditions, the Department is recommending no change to the current 0 permits for both Lassen Hunt Zones in 2015.

Table 1. Sage grouse lek counts (Total males counted on all leks by hunt zone), 2012 – 2015.

Hunt Zone	2012	2013	2014	2015	Change (%) 2012 - 2015	2015 Permit Recommendation
North Mono	510	433	524	479	-6%	30
South Mono	418	307	235	195	-53%	0
East Lassen	393	221	149	197	-50%	0
Central Lassen	199	103	48	91	-54%	0

Mono Sage Grouse Hunt Zones

The two Mono Hunt Zones have experienced different population trajectories during the drought period from 2012 – 2015. The North Mono Hunt Zone increased by 275% from 2008 to 2012. Although it experienced a slight decline this year, the population continues to be in the range of record high numbers recorded by the Department (Table 1). The Department has recommended 30 permits in this zone annually since 2011 following the candidacy of sage grouse under ESA.

The South Mono Zone has declined steadily during the drought, from a record high similar to North Mono of 418 males in 2012 to 195 males in 2015 (-53%; Table 1). The South Mono population has historically been dependent on irrigation of Long Valley ranchlands, which will be limited this year by water availability. The North Mono population has more high quality habitat, with natural water availability versus South Mono, which is more managed.

As mentioned above, earlier this year, the USFWS reversed their proposal to list the Bi-State Distinct Population Segment as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act. This decision was based on a conservation plan developed by the Bi-State Technical Advisory Committee, with the Local Working Group, and under the leadership of the Executive Oversight Committee. This plan was the product of a remarkable conservation partnership between California and Nevada, including federal agencies and stakeholders such as Mono County. The commitments by each of these parties to implement the plan, which would reduce the threats to the species,

Sonke Mastrup

July 23, 2015

Page 3

gave the USFWS the assurances needed to determine that listing was not necessary. Even the most conservative population models suggest that the number of permits could be at least twice as high in the North Mono Hunt Zone. Considering the conservation status of the species and its habitat, the Department is recommending no change in the Mono Zones, keeping the number of permits at 30 in North Mono and 0 in South Mono because of the 4 year decline and current drought conditions.

cc: Dan Yparraguirre, Deputy Director
Wildlife and Fisheries Division
Dan.Yparraguirre@wildlife.ca.gov

David Bess, Chief
Law Enforcement Division
David.Bess@wildlife.ca.gov

Wendy Bogdan, General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Wendy.Bogdan@wildlife.ca.gov

Eric Loft, Branch Chief
Wildlife Branch
Eric.Loft@wildlife.ca.gov

Craig Stowers, Environmental Program Manager
Wildlife Branch
Craig.Stowers@wildlife.ca.gov

Scott Gardner, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisor)
Wildlife Branch
Scott.Gardner@wildlife.ca.gov

Craig Martz, Environmental Program Manager
Regulations Unit
Craig.Martz@wildlife.ca.gov

Mike Randall, Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Regulations Unit
Mike.Randall@wildlife.ca.gov

Commission to annually adopt regulations pertaining to the hunting of migratory birds that conform with, or further restrict, the regulations prescribed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) pursuant to their authority under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The Fish and Game Commission selects and establishes in State regulations the specific hunting season dates and daily bag limits within the federal frameworks.

Two proposals are evaluated for regulation changes as follows:

1. Amend subsection 300(a)(1)(D)4. Adjust annual number of sage grouse hunting permits by zone.

Existing regulations provide for the number of sage grouse hunting permits in the East Lassen, Central Lassen, North Mono, and South Mono zones. For the 2015-2016 season, the Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) has proposed a range of permits from which a final number of permits will be determined, based on spring lek counts. Ranges are necessary at this time because the final number of permits cannot be determined until spring lek counts are conducted in April. Current regulations provide permit numbers for sage grouse based on population estimates from 2014 and need to be updated to reflect 2015 estimates.

In March 2010, the USFWS determined that sage grouse were “warranted, but precluded” for protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) both statewide and as a Distinct Population Segment (DPS) in Mono County. A proposed rule was scheduled on the range-wide finding for 2015, but has since been delayed by Congress and now it is not expected to occur in 2015.

In October 2013, the USFWS proposed that the Bi-State DPS should be listed as threatened under the ESA. A final ruling, similar to the range-wide finding discussed above, is not expected in 2015. If this proposal becomes a final rule, the threatened status of the Bi-State DPS would preclude future hunting.

The risks to sage grouse are largely habitat-based. Hunting was not considered a high risk factor in the “warranted, but precluded” finding for sage grouse range-wide by the USFWS, which does not preclude states from continued hunting. In fact, no states have closed hunting as the result of the range-wide ESA decision. The proposed listing rule for greater sage grouse range-wide will be made in fiscal year July 2015 – June 2016.

Concerns about the potential effects of hunting on sage grouse through additive mortality have been expressed in the scientific literature, including studies from California. The Department responded to these concerns by reducing recommended permit numbers substantially as adopted by the Commission in 2007. Since sage grouse were given candidacy under ESA in 2010, the Department has taken an increasingly conservative approach to recommending sage grouse hunting permits and has not recommended any increases in permits despite some of the highest spring breeding populations ever recorded in the Mono zones. The permit system used in California is considered one of the most conservative and best-controlled hunts in sage grouse range.

The Commission took emergency action in 2012 to reduce the number of permits for both the East Lassen and Central Lassen Hunt Zones to zero. This action was taken following the Rush Fire, which encompassed more than 272,000 acres in California, almost entirely within the East Lassen Zone. Because of substantial breeding population declines following the fire, the Department did not recommend any hunting permits in 2013 or 2014. Wildfire is considered one of the highest risks to sage grouse habitats, particularly in northeastern California.

The Department will continue to conduct intensive breeding population surveys in spring 2015, whereby male sage grouse will be counted on all known leks in California, including leks both within hunt zones and in non-hunted areas. These lek counts will be used to estimate population size and a population model will expand the count of males to predict the size of the fall population. The Department will use these data to determine the number of sage grouse hunting permits.

The Department recommendation for 2015 will fall within the following ranges:

	Current (2014) Limit	Proposed (2015) Range
a. East Lassen Zone (two-bird permits)	0	[0-50]
b. Central Lassen Zone (two-bird permits)	0	[0-50]
c. North Mono Zone (one-bird permits)	30	[0-100]
d. South Mono Zone (one-bird permits)	0	[0-100]

The numbers of permits ultimately recommended for each hunt zone will be based on the following criteria:

- Size and trend of the spring breeding population in each hunt zone based on lek counts conducted in March and April.

- The allowable harvest level will not exceed 5% of the predicted fall population.
 - If the allowable harvest in any zone provides for a minimum number of permits to be recommended in any zone of 5 permits or less, no permits will be recommended for that zone.
2. Amend Section 310.5 to add one hour to the end of shooting time for spring turkey hunters.

The shooting time for spring turkey hunting is currently established from one-half hour before sunrise to 4:00 pm. The addition of one hour is being proposed to provide additional hunting opportunity during the spring turkey hunting season. Spring shooting hours for wild turkey are cut off before sunset as a traditional wildlife management technique to allow the birds opportunities to breed and find roosts. Hunters have informally requested this increase to offset time lost when daylight saving was moved from April to March several years ago. The extension to 5:00 PM will still provide adequate protection for the spring breeding population.

- (b) Authority and Reference Sections from Fish and Game Code for Regulation:

Authority: Sections 200, 202, 203, 355, and 3000 of the Fish and Game Code.

Reference: Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 215, 220, 355, 356, and 3000 of the Fish and Game Code.

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

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

- None.

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

- Fish and Game Commission's Wildlife Resource Committee meeting held in West Sacramento, CA on January 14, 2015

IV. Description of Reasonable Alternatives to Regulatory Action:

- (a) Alternatives to Regulation Change:

No Alternatives were identified.

(b) No Change Alternative:

Without a regulation change:

1. Sage grouse permit numbers would not change from 2014 and permits for 2015 would not be calculated based on current year data.
2. Shooting time for spring turkey hunting would not change; additional hunting opportunity would not be realized by adding an additional hour to the end of shooting time.

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

V. Mitigation Measures Required by Regulatory Action:

The proposed regulatory action will have no negative impact on the environment; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

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, because the regulations propose only minor changes to bag limits and shooting hours.

(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 the proposed action would

have on the creation or elimination of jobs or businesses in California or on the expansion of businesses in California because the regulations propose only minor changes to bag limits and shooting hours. The Commission does not anticipate benefits to worker safety because the regulations do not address working conditions.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the health and welfare of California residents. The proposed regulations are intended to provide continued recreational opportunity to the public. Hunting provides opportunities for multi-generational family activities and promotes respect for California's environment by the future stewards of the State's resources.

The Commission anticipates benefits to the environment by the sustainable management of California's upland game resources. The fees that hunters pay for licenses and stamps are used for conservation.

(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: 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.

VII. Economic Impact Assessment

(a) Effects of the regulation on the creation or elimination of jobs within the state

Positive impacts to jobs and/or businesses that provide services to upland game bird hunters will be realized with the adoption of the proposed upland game bird hunting regulations for the 2015-16 season. This is based on the 2011 U.S. Fish and Wildlife National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation for California (issued Feb. 2013). The report estimates that hunters contributed about \$142,412,000 to small businesses

in California during the 2011 small game hunting season. The impacted businesses are generally small businesses employing few individuals and, like all small businesses, are subject to failure for a variety of causes. Additionally, the long-term intent of the proposed regulations is to sustainably manage upland game bird populations, and consequently, the long-term viability of these same small businesses. The 2011 report is posted on the US Dept. of Commerce website at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/fhw11-ca.pdf>.

- (b) Effects of the regulation on the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses within the state

The result of the regulations on the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses within the state will be neutral. Minor variations in the season, bag limits, and shooting hours as may be established in the regulations are, by themselves, unlikely to stimulate the creation of new businesses or cause the elimination of existing businesses. The number of hunting trips and the economic contributions from them are expected to remain more or less the same.

- (c) Effects of the regulation on the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the state

The long-term intent of the proposed regulations is to sustainably manage upland game bird populations, and consequently, the long-term viability of small businesses that serve recreational upland game bird hunters. The minor changes in bag limits and shooting hours in the proposed regulations are, by themselves, unlikely to stimulate the expansion of businesses within California.

- (d) Benefits of the regulation to the health and welfare of California residents

Hunting is an outdoor activity that can provide several benefits for those who partake in it and for the environment as well. The fees that hunters pay for licenses and stamps are used for conservation. In addition, the efforts of hunters can help to reduce wildlife depredation on private lands. Hunters and their families benefit from fresh game to eat, and from the benefits of outdoor recreation. People who hunt have a special connection with the outdoors and an awareness of the relationships between wildlife, habitat, and humans. With that awareness comes an understanding of the role humans play in being caretakers of the environment. Hunting is a tradition that is often passed on from one generation to the next creating a special bond between family members and friends.

- (e) Benefits of the regulation to worker safety

The regulations will not affect worker safety because they will not impact working conditions.

(f) Benefits of the regulation to the state's environment

It is the policy of this state to encourage the conservation, maintenance, and utilization of upland game bird resources for the benefit of all the citizens of the state. The objectives of this policy include, but are not limited to, the maintenance of sufficient populations of upland game birds to ensure their continued existence and the maintenance of a sufficient resource to support recreational opportunity. Adoption of scientifically-based upland game bird seasons, bag and possession limits provides for the maintenance of sufficient populations of resident and migratory upland game birds to ensure those objectives are met.

(g) Concurrence with other Statutory Requirements:

Not applicable

Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview

Current regulations in Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), provide general hunting seasons for taking resident and migratory upland game birds under Section 300. Current regulations in Title 14, CCR, under Section 310.5 establishes shooting times for all upland game birds. The Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) is recommending two regulation changes under these sections as follows:

1. Adjust annual number of sage grouse hunting permits by zone.

Current regulations under subsection 300(a)(1)(D)4. provide a number of permits for the general sage grouse season in each of four zones. At this time the Department has proposed a range of permits specific for all four hunt zones. The final permit numbers will be proposed in June after spring lek counts are completed and annual population data are analyzed. Permit ranges for sage grouse hunting in 2015 are recommended as follows:

- a. East Lassen: [0-50] (two-bird) permits
- b. Central Lassen: [0-50] (two-bird) permits
- c. North Mono: [0-100] (one-bird) permits
- d. South Mono: [0-100] (one-bird) permits

2. Increase shooting time provided for spring turkey hunters under Section 310.5 by one hour; shooting time would end at 5:00 pm instead of at 4:00 pm as provided under current regulation.

Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

Adoption of sustainable upland game seasons, bag and possession limits provides for the maintenance of sufficient populations of upland game to ensure their continued existence.

The Fish and Game Commission, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 200, 202, and 203, has the sole authority to regulate upland game bird hunting in California. Commission staff has searched the California Code of Regulations and has found the proposed changes pertaining to hunting of resident game birds are consistent with Sections 550-553, 630, 703 and 4501 of Title 14. Therefore the Commission has determined that the proposed amendments are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing State regulations. No other State agency has the authority to adopt upland game bird hunting regulations in California.

REGULATORY LANGUAGE

Section 300, Title 14, is amended to read:

§ 300. Upland Game Birds.

. . . [No changes to subsections 300(a)(1)(A-C)]

<i>Species</i>	<i>1. Seasons</i>	<i>2. Daily Bag and Possession Limits</i>
(D) Sage Grouse	The second Saturday in September extending for two consecutive days	See area open zone descriptions in subsection 300(a)(1)(D)3. East and Central Lassen zones: Bag Limit: 2 sage grouse per day, 2 per season Possession Limit: 2 sage grouse per season North Mono and South Mono zones: Bag Limit: 1 sage grouse per day, 1 per season Possession Limit: 1 sage grouse per season

SAGE GROUSE HUNTING ZONE DESCRIPTIONS AND PERMIT PROCESS

3. Area Open Zone Descriptions:

a. East Lassen Zone:

That portion of Lassen County beginning at the intersection of Highway 395 and County Road 502 in the town of Ravendale; north and east on County Road 502 to County Road 526 (Buckhorn Road); east on County Road 526 to the Nevada state line; south along the Nevada state line to its intersection with County Road 320 (Wendel-Flanigan Road); northwest on County Road 320 to its intersection with Highway 395 between Wendel and Litchfield north on Highway 395 to the point of beginning.

b. Central Lassen Zone:

That portion of Lassen County beginning at the intersection of Highway 139 and County Road 513 (Termo-Grasshopper Road); east on County Road 513 to its intersection with County Road 523 (Westside Road); north on County Road 523 to its intersection with County Road 525 (Brockman Road); east on County Road 525 to its intersection with Highway 395; south on Highway 395 to its intersection with Highway

36 in the town of Johnstonville; west on Highway 36 to its intersection with Highway 139 in Susanville; north on Highway 139 to the point of beginning.

c. North Mono Zone:

That portion of Mono County beginning at the intersection of Highway 182 and the California-Nevada state line; south and east along the California-Nevada state line to Highway 167; west along Highway 167 to Highway 395; north along Highway 395 to Highway 182 at Bridgeport; north along Highway 182 to the point of beginning.

d. South Mono Zone:

That portion of Mono County beginning at the intersection of U.S. Highway 6 and U.S. Highway 395; north along U.S. Highway 6 to the intersection of U.S. Highway 120; west along U.S. Highway 120 to the intersection of the Benton Crossing Road; west along Benton Crossing Road to the intersection of Owens River Road; west along Owens River Road to the intersection of U.S. Highway 395; south along U.S. Highway 395 to the point of beginning.

No open season in the balance of the state not included in the above open zones.

4. Number of Permits:

- a. East Lassen Zone: 0 [0-50] permits
- b. Central Lassen Zone: 0 [0-50] permits
- c. North Mono Zone: 30 [0-100] permits
- d. South Mono Zone: 0 [0-100] permits

5. Permit Process:

The free sage grouse hunting permits shall be issued by random drawing. Applicants must have a valid California hunting license and shall submit only one drawing application for either the East Lassen Zone, Central Lassen Zone, North Mono Zone, or the South Mono Zone. Up to four hunters may apply as a party. Applications must be submitted through the Automated License Data System by August 10. Each application will be issued a computer-generated random number and permits shall be issued by random number (from lowest to highest). Party applications shall receive a single random number and parties shall not be split to meet the number of permits available. Successful applicants will be notified by mail prior to the opening date of the season. Permits are nontransferable.

6. Falconry Only Permits:

Applicants desiring to use a sage grouse permit during the falconry-only season must declare upon the application that the permit is for falconry only.

. . . [No changes to subsections 300(a)(1)(E) through 300(b)]

Note: Authority cited: Sections 200, 202, 203 and 355, Fish and Game Code.
Reference: Sections 200, 202, 203, 203.1, 215, 220, 355 and 356, Fish and Game Code.

Section 310.5, Title 14, is amended to read:

§ 310.5 Shooting Hours for Upland Game Birds.

The shooting hours for all upland game birds, except for pheasants and the spring wild turkey season, shall be from one-half hour before sunrise to sunset. The shooting hours for pheasants shall be from 8:00 a.m. to sunset. The shooting hours for the spring wild turkey season shall be from one-half hour before sunrise to 54:00 p.m.

Note: Authority cited: Section 3000, Fish and Game Code. Reference : Section 3000, Fish and Game Code.



Larry Johnston District One Fred Stump District Two Tim Alpers District Three
Tim Fesko District Four Stacy Corless District Five

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF MONO

P.O. BOX 715, BRIDGEPORT, CALIFORNIA 93517
(760) 932-5538 • FAX (760) 932-5531
Bob Musil, Clerk of the Board

June 2, 2015

Sonke Mastrup
Executive Director
California Fish and Wildlife Commission
1416 Ninth Street, Box 944209
Sacramento, CA 94244-2090

**RE: ADJUSTMENT OF ANNUAL NUMBER OF SAGE GROUSE HUNTING PERMITS BY
ZONE**

Dear Mr. Mastrup,

Mono County supports legal and well-regulated hunting and appreciates the opportunity to work with the Commission and the Department of Fish and Wildlife in the stewardship of California's diverse wildlife populations. The County cannot, however, support continued recreational hunting of the Bi-State Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of the Greater Sage Grouse within the North and South Mono management zones, and requests the Commission reduce the number of permits to zero for the 2015 hunting season and future years.

As you are aware, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service proposed listing the Bi-State DPS as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, but issued a decision in April not to list based on conservation commitments by federal, state and local agencies, including Mono County, and participating agricultural operators. We understand that if the bird had been listed, hunting would have been prohibited as it is intentional take. In the wake of the decision not to list, proactively enacting this conservation measure would help ensure our unprecedented conservation effort is successful. Therefore, the County cannot support any intentional take, and believes that even well-regulated take may jeopardize our collaborative efforts.

Respectfully,

Timothy E. Fesko, Chairman
Mono County Board of Supervisors

2015 JUN -8 PM 1:42
CALIFORNIA
FISH AND WILDLIFE
COMMISSION
MS

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]; [FGC](#)
Subject: Re: Proposed Regulation Pertaining to Ringneck Pheasant Season and Bag Limit
Date: Monday, June 22, 2015 3:59:12 PM

Dear Director Bonham -

The following message, as well as another pertaining to Eurasian collared doves was sent to the Fish and Game Commission on June 2. To date I have received no response or even acknowledgement that my email was received. I've double checked and the address I've used is the same one offered on the Commission's website.

I have worked very closely with your agency and the commission over many years, including 29 years managing the nation's largest municipally operated fishing and hunting programs, and have submitted numerous recommendations that have subsequently been approved.

My purpose in writing to your office is to ensure that my message will be forwarded as appropriate.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Jim Brown

ps - The recommendation pertaining to Eurasian collared doves will follow with the same request.

In a message dated 6/2/2015 10:46:20 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

Background: Approximately ten years ago I proposed expansion of the general season for ringneck pheasants from four to eight weeks and a reduction in the daily bag limit from three to two roosters. After discussions with Department staff and the Resources Secretary, it was agreed to expand the season to six weeks, but retain the existing bag limits, with the understanding that my original proposal would be re-considered following analysis of data from the following season.

The purpose of my recommendation was two-fold;

- 1) To expand hunter opportunity for days in the field;
- 2) To compensate for any increased take as a result of the longer season by reducing the bag limit to two roosters.

At the conclusion of the upland season, I was notified that a review of data from state WMA's indicated that despite a 50% increase in available hunter days, there was an "insignificant" take in the number of additional birds harvested during the extended season. Further, I was advised there was no evidence from past studies to indicate that subsequent pheasant reproduction is impacted as long as hunting is limited to roosters only.

Despite my understanding that those results would be used as the basis for consideration of my original proposal in subsequent years, and recommendation by Department staff, I was subsequently told that it would be necessary for me to resubmit my proposal. To be honest I began hunting more out of state and lost interest in continuing to pursue my proposal, which is based almost entirely on the expansion of opportunity and days afield for California hunters, and therefore help to protect the future of hunting in California.

Accordingly, I propose the following:

1) Expansion of the statewide general hunting season for ringneck pheasants from six to eight weeks for the purpose of expanded hunter opportunity;

2) Reduction in the daily bag limit from three to two roosters to help ensure that any additional take during the extended season will not have a significant impact on reproduction and future populations.

Sincerely,

Jim Brown

San Diego, CA

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED] [FGC](#)
Subject: Re: Proposed Emergency Regulation Pertaining to Dove Hunting Season
Date: Monday, June 22, 2015 4:00:24 PM

In a message dated 6/2/2015 10:05:23 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

The purpose of this **proposed emergency regulation** is to better protect the hunting season for mourning and whitewing doves as a game species, by providing regulation of hunting for Eurasian collared doves a non-native species treated as a non-game species with no season or bag limits.

As an avid upland game hunter who has hunted doves for 55 years, primarily in San Diego and Imperial counties, and owner of hunting property in the latter, I have closely observed the dove hunting seasons, particularly since the arrival of Eurasian collared doves, which I have enjoyed hunting year-around.

While I have enjoyed and benefited from the opportunity to hunt Eurasian collared doves without regard to season, it is my observation that the decision not to manage them has had unintended and unforeseen negative consequences relative to the hunting and management of mourning and whitewing doves in particular, and that these negative consequences are limited to two periods.

The first is during the spring where it is quite evident that the hunting of Eurasian collared doves clearly disturbs the nesting of whitewing and mourning doves which may be forced to leave their nests and young at critical times, resulting in nest failure and increased mortality of young birds.

The second period is immediately prior to the September 1 opening of the general dove season and its impact on hunter success involving mourning and whitewing doves. Because it opened on a Monday, the 2014 season represented a "perfect storm" in its impact on the hunting season in Imperial County.

As biologists and hunters know, the opening day of dove season is extremely significant with regard to both overall hunter days in the field and take of both mourning and whitewing doves. Unfortunately, with the opener on a Monday holiday, hunters began arriving in Imperial County on Saturday and took advantage of the opportunity to hunt Eurasian collared doves for two days immediately prior to the opening of the general dove season.

This hunting activity resulted in the premature disturbance and departure of both whitewing and mourning doves from traditional roosting and feeding areas and their flyways, as well as the inadvertent and accidental take of mourning and whitewing doves prior to their season, resulting in a disappointing experience for many hunters on opening day.

It is my observation and belief that the entirely unregulated hunting of Eurasian collared doves has had unintended negative consequences relative to the reproduction of mourning and whitewing doves and other nesting species, as well as hunter success on opening day.

As a result of these negative impacts on both a game species and hunting of them, I am proposing that:

1) The take of Eurasian collard doves shall be prohibited during the most critical period of the spring nesting season for mourning and whitewing doves (dates to be determined by CF&WD biologists);

2) The take of Eurasian collared doves shall be prohibited during the month of August to ensure that mourning and whitewing doves are not disturbed by hunting activity prior to their season, and therefore better protect the interests of California hunters.

Sincerely,

Jim Brown

San Diego, CA