

THIRD REPORT
OF
CITIZEN NONGAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 1979

TO
E. Charles Fullerton, Director
California Department of Fish and Game

Members of the Committee:

Peter Moyle, Chairman
Davis

Rodolfo Ruibal, Vice-Chairman
Riverside

Robert Hassur
San Jose

Lloyd Tevis
Rancho Mirage

Ursula Faasii
Petaluma

Maxine McCloskey
Piedmont

Richard Martyr
Sacramento

INTRODUCTION

The Citizen Nongame Advisory Committee (CNAC) was established in 1975 by the Director of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), as an independent body to provide him with advice on the Department's rapidly expanding role in the management of nongame wildlife. The seven members of the committee were appointed because of their expertise in biology and/or their particular interests in nongame species (Table 1). Since its founding, the committee has met monthly from September through June to discuss issues presented to it by the Director, as well as issues raised by CNAC members. During its first two years, the committee concerned itself largely with broad issues, such as how to expand the CDFG's role in managing nongame species and providing guidelines for all CDFG activities relating to nongame species. Underlying all the committee recommendations is the attitude that the CDFG should adopt an 'ecosystem' approach to management and attempt to look at all management decisions in relation to all the organisms likely to be affected by them, directly or indirectly. These broad recommendations of the committee are expressed in detail in its first and second reports. Since the issuance of the second report in late 1977, the committee has largely shifted its emphasis from general matters to specific issues. It has, however, consistently related its recommendations on specific matters back to the philosophical base established in the early discussion of the committee. Some of the more important of the issues raised in the meetings of the committee, the recommendations of the committee on these issues, and the response of CDFG to the committee's recommendations are the subject of this report.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COMMITTEE

One of the constant concerns of the committee was its effectiveness in improving the CDFG's relationship with nongame wildlife. High levels of frustration with departmental attitudes and programs were often expressed at meetings, but particularly when a committee recommendation was turned down or when attitudes of committee members seemed to be at loggerheads with those of the Department. This frustration was expressed by committee members during a discussion with Director Fullerton on February 5, 1979. Mr. Fullerton expressed his conviction that the committee has been an important force in shaping departmental policies and attitudes, although often its effect is subtle. He pointed out that increasingly decisions being made at all levels within the Department are made only after some thought has been given to how CNAC would react. Indeed, one of the main reasons for the formation of CNAC was to make available to the Department on a regular basis opinions and attitudes that differ from its own, enabling the Department to resolve potential controversies before they get out of hand. Mr. Fullerton pointed out to the committee that the Department is in full agreement with many of its recommendations, but has been unable to do much about them because of the shortage of funds, especially following Proposition 13. However, many of the committee's recommendations have been implemented not only in situations where the committee has initiated the discussion of some issue. Mr. Fullerton also pointed out, and Mr. Martyr verified, that the committee has been used as a model for similar committees in other states, at least in part, because the committee has shown that CDFG did not create a monster when it erected the committee, but that instead fruitful interactions have resulted. Furthermore, it is anticipated that as the CDFG increases its activities in nongame areas the committee will become increasingly important as a sounding board and source of ideas for management.

None of the committee members were wholly satisfied with this discussion, but, on the other hand, none of them decided to resign as well!

CDFG BUDGET FOR NONGAME ACTIVITIES

Among the more frustrating discussions in CNAC meetings were those concerning money for nongame activities. Despite the passage of Proposition 13, the legislature continued to appropriate general fund monies for nongame programs. While the committee was in strong support of these appropriations, it recognized that the cutbacks forced on the Department in their regular programs would affect, directly or indirectly, nongame species as well as game species. Because the Director of CDFG, by the nature of his appointment, has to publicly support the budgetary decisions of the Governor, CNAC could do little here except write protest letters as individuals to the Governor. The form letter received in reply indicated that few minds were changed, although many of the cuts were restored in the Fall of 1979 by the State legislature.

In April, 1978, the committee passed a resolution in support of Assembly Bill 3416, which would have revised considerably the methods by which CDFG programs were funded, providing more emphasis on nongame wildlife:

The long-range objectives of the Department of Fish and Game as recommended by this committee in its First Annual Report (1976) focused on the redirection of the Department's efforts to include all wildlife in California. Objective 2 of that report includes: "The Department should begin immediately to take measures whereby game and nongame species will receive equal departmental attention. This can be accomplished by establishment of a five-year timetable that provides for an orderly and planned reorientation of the Department; annual shifts in the allocation of resources will be a major aspect of this effort..."

Accomplishment of this objective necessitates an increase in attention to nongame wildlife, revision of present funding methods, and an improvement in the techniques of cost accounting of game and nongame components of the budgetary items. With the exception of the two changes noted below, AB 3416 appears to be a good step toward implementation of the committee's recommendations.

The nongame committee recognizes AB 3416 as being evidence of the Legislator's concern for California wildlife and their understanding and empathy for the problems faced by the Department of Fish and Game. The nongame committee endorses the legislation and offers these modifications to further assist the Department in fulfilling its long-range objectives.

Because the Director disagreed with the resolution, it was not forwarded to the authors of the bill. The bill did not pass, in any case.

In the spring of 1978, Alan Oldall of the State Department of Finance asked the committee for its reaction to the definitions of game and nongame activities that he had developed for the purposes of CDFG record keeping of just how their money was spent. The committee found that the definitions were overlapping, inconsistent, and contradictory. The committee felt that the legalistic definitions did not resolve the problems in allocating funds for either game or nongame programs. The definitions were vague on the question of intent. Among the questions raised by the committee were: Within the framework of the definitions, how would animals taken with scientific collecting permits be categorized? How would ecological services be pro-rated between game and nongame?

How would the nongame and game value of Gray Lodge Wildlife Management Area be determined? Would prairie falcons taken under prairie falcon permits be considered game animals? Are mountain lions and bighorn sheep nongame?

The committee suggested that a simpler method of internally categorizing Department expenses would be to list game species and consider all other species to be nongame. It was cautioned that the Department recall the recommendation of the committee's First Annual Report which called for a complete integration of game and nongame programs moving towards a genuine wildlife resources agency.

Although the committee felt that the definitions were likely to increase the problems resulting from the artificial division of departmental activities into game and nongame, the definitions were adopted by the Department of Finance for CDFG to use in their reporting of how their money is spent. The committee consequently sent a letter to Mr. Oldall with the following statement:

"The Citizen Nongame Advisory Committee discussed the definitions of game and nongame on which the Department of Finance will base allocations in the budget for the Department of Fish and Game. The nongame committee wishes to express its dissatisfaction with the decision made by the Department of Finance on the funding criteria. We can only hope that the definitions adopted are not irrevocable. The definitions will have considerable impact on the functions of the Department of Fish and Game. For this reason we have spent considerable time and thought on the matter and regret that your department chose to ignore our recommendations. Your attendance at the September or October meeting of the nongame committee would have given an opportunity for us to discuss these matters more thoroughly and hopefully resolve the differences."

"If the Department of Finance reviews this matter again, the nongame committee would most certainly want an opportunity to discuss the issues fully."

On a more positive note, the committee's recommendations were generally followed when CDFG asked for advice on which projects should be funded with money from the nongame decal program. However, this program has not been particularly successful at raising money so the money was largely spent on 'high visibility' projects.

NONCONSUMPTIVE WILDLIFE ACTIVITIES PROGRAM

On May 16, 1977, CNAC sent the following resolution to Mr. Fullerton:

The Department of Fish and Game traditionally promotes public consumption of wildlife through announcement of its management programs in news releases, publications, and through other public relations efforts.

The committee has already recommended a reorientation of all departmental programs to achieve equal attention for nongame species. This would include establishing public programs of activities and news for the nonconsumer of wildlife. All regions of the Department could provide a wide variety of opportunities and news for viewing wildlife, including game species, and interpretive materials. The regions could issue the same public notices about these opportunities and events that they do for the consumer of wildlife. Region 5 is already embarked

on this kind of effort by offering guided tours to see mule deer, tule elk, and the Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve. Plans for Suisun Marsh include nonconsumptive use.

Care must be taken to avoid trespass problems by planning most or all activities to take place on public land. Any such program must be planned to carefully regulate the activity in order to minimize problems of impacting on the animals themselves, and their habitat. Many different kinds of activities would be available throughout the state, but they should be carefully related to the circumstances at each sport. The activities would range from no program or notice at all, e.g. for endangered and rare species or others that may be vulnerable; to appropriate visitor orientation stations and/or signing, e.g. at salmon runs, monarch butterfly roosts, hibernating ladybug colonies, ground squirrel towns; to guided tours, e.g. seeing elephant seals; through just notification of the opportunity, e.g. seeing grunion and smelt runs.

These activities should stimulate increasing support for the Department's efforts by the nonconsuming public, and would hopefully be reflected in increasing support from the general fund. The Citizen Nongame Advisory Committee urges the Department to devise and implement a nonconsumptive wildlife activities program.

The Department has shown general approval of the concepts expressed in the resolution, but major new efforts have been few.

TRAPPING

After discussing the pros and cons of the trapping of furbearers, the committee came up with the following series of recommendations; the expressions in parentheses are the responses of CDFG.

1. The CDFG conduct a detailed review of the state of the art in trapping techniques and equipment with the intention of banning the steel-jawed trap as soon as a viable alternative exists. This review is to be updated at three-year intervals and the report is to be made public. (CDFG contends no good alternatives to steel-jawed traps exist, as of yet; if they did they would be widely used.)
2. The use of steel-jawed traps for taking fur-bearing mammals for profit shall be governed by the following rules:
 - a. All traps are to be registered before use or upon purchase with the California Department of Fish and Game. (This is being proposed to the Commission for the 1980-81 trapping season)
 - b. All traps are to be permanently labeled at the anchor point with an assigned registration number. (This is already required)
 - c. All trap lines are to be checked within a 24-hour period. (This is already required)
 - d. Anyone who has not previously held a trapping license shall be

required to pass a proficiency test and/or to be apprenticed to an experienced trapper for at least one season. (This is being explored by CDFG)

- e. Any violations of the above will result in the confiscation of all trapping equipment and revocation of the trapping license. (Under existing law the courts can confiscate equipment used in a violation and the license can be revoked.)
3. The capture of nuisance (depredating) animals through the use of steel-jawed traps shall be conducted only by individuals who have been certified by the Department of Fish and Game as trained and competent to do so. Traps are to be registered, labeled and checked in conformance with the regulations in #2 (a,b,c) above. (Code sections 4180 and 4152 require that animals taken for depredation must be taken in compliance with Section 4004(a) and (b) - legislation is required to change)
4. A tax of 5% of the salesprice of each pelt sold will be collected to help defray the cost of administrators of the trapping program in the State and to carry out the review of trapping techniques and equipment. (CDFG likes the concept of additional revenue for furbearer studies.)
5. A report by each trapper must be filed before any further trapping license will be issued. (This is already in practice)

BOBCAT

The committee kept itself well-informed of progress in bobcat research and trapping in California. The members were generally of the opinion that the trapping of bobcats to provide fur for coats was not desirable, especially in light of the general lack of knowledge of bobcat population sizes and biology. The committee therefore recommended (April 1978) that a moratorium be placed on the taking of bobcats until CDFG can demonstrate that harvest would not have a deleterious effect on the populations in the various regions. The Department opposed this resolution on the grounds that the bobcat is a harvestable resource and that so far trapping does not seem to have had any impact on the bobcat populations. Studies of the animal are in progress, however.

ECOLOGICAL RESERVES

The committee is in complete support of the Department's Ecological Reserve System, but problems with the management of the Bolsa Chica Reserve indicated a need for better management plans and better communication between management committees and CDFG. CNAC therefore made the following recommendations (November 13, 1978):

Statement

Ecological reserves are established to provide protection for rare or endangered wildlife, aquatic organisms and specialized terrestrial or aquatic habitat types. They provide a valuable and versatile system for land acquisition and habitat protection by the State. An apparent consequence of the system's versatility is uncertainty on the part of the public and the Department regarding appropriate management of specific areas within the ecological reserve system. The following comments are intended to enhance the effectiveness of the ecological reserve system.

Goal

To improve the protection of rare or endangered wildlife aquatic organisms and specialized terrestrial or aquatic habitat which exists within the State's system of ecological reserves.

Objectives

- (1) Develop a formalized classification for each reserve. Such a system should indicate the purpose for which the reserve was acquired and the categories might include scientific, educational, recreational or protection (for sensitive species and/or habitats).
- (2) Formulate a management plan for each ecological reserve. The Department should:
 - (a) contact experts with knowledge of the area being considered or with expertise on the organisms and/or habitats involved.
 - (b) inform local organizations interested in the reserve system and solicit input to and support for the management plan.
 - (c) in some cases when the land must be purchased quickly, the public and experts should be consulted as early as practicable for input into the management plan. If the purpose of the reserve is not determined prior to acquisition, then a "temporary protective" designation should be assigned.
- (3) Establish Department selected advisory committees of citizens and experts on each ecological reserve at the earliest possible time to provide continuing advice to the Department regarding management direction.
 - (a) The committee should help coordinate citizen input before and during the management plan formulation, prior to Commission adoption of the plan.
 - (b) The committee should be composed of at least three members and chaired by a non-agency person. Meetings should be convened by either the chairman or by order of the regional manager.
 - (c) The committee should meet and be consulted regularly. Minutes of all meetings should be kept.
 - (d) The committee could provide interim approval of uses during the time the management plan is produced.
 - (e) The committee should update and resubmit the management plan to the Department every five years. (Dept. is looking into the feasibility of establishing advisory committees for some of the ecological reserves.)

SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM

The Significant Natural Areas Program is designed to bring together the various groups in California who are trying to protect threatened habitats and to develop an inventory of protected and unprotected areas. The coordinator will be housed at CDFG. CNAC sent the following resolution to Mr. Fullerton (January 1979):

"The Citizen Nongame Advisory Committee strongly supports the Significant

Natural Areas Program that is to be administered by the Department of Fish and Game, and it also recommends that DFG conduct this program in close cooperation with the Department of Parks and Recreation."

One of the committee members (Moyle) attended a meeting to discuss ways in which SNAP could operate most effectively and the committee intends to assist the program in any way it can.

WILDLIFE PLAN

Committee members Maxine McCloskey and Richard Martyr were on the advisory board that assisted in the development of the Department's updated Wildlife Plan. The process began in 1977 and is to be completed in mid-1980. The first plan ever developed in the nation for fish and wildlife was prepared by the Department in 1965. While it met the needs of the 60s, the considerable shift in public attitude towards maintaining environmental quality soon made the plan obsolete. Several significant changes in the new plan to meet the needs of the 80s include:

- (1) A much greater focus on nongame species. In the 1965 plan the majority of individual plans were for game species. In this plan, the majority of the over 300 individual plans are for nongame species, including a discussion of endangered plants.
- (2) Strategic programs for the protection and utilization of fish and wildlife and protection of habitat for the next ten years will be clearly identified and described. This document will guide the formulation of yearly programs.
- (3) Areas of special biological importance were identified, described and mapped for each county to provide a ready reference for land use planners and developers. It is anticipated that mapping important areas such as deer fawning areas, wetlands, bald eagles feeding areas, etc., will serve to alert planners and developers of the need to avoid destruction and disturbance of them.

Overall, it will be much easier to determine how the Department of Fish and Game intends, over the next ten years, to provide for the protection and use of fish and wildlife and their habitat. This should permit greater public participation in determining and supporting fish and wildlife programs.

The first draft of the plan will be reviewed by the committee in February, 1980. Individual species plans are currently being reviewed.

RIPARIAN HABITAT

In October 1977 the committee had a lengthy discussion concerning the importance of saving the remaining riparian forests in California. It recommended to the Director that a survey should be carried out at once, that a moratorium be sought on all logging in riparian forests, that the Department investigate all possible ways of saving the forests, including conservation easements with no rights of public access, and that the Department work closely with the State Forestry Board, the legislature, and other organizations to preserve the habitat. The committee subsequently was quite impressed with the Department's efforts on behalf of the habitat, which included the rapid inventory conducted after the legislature appropriated special funds for a survey and the use of the Wildlife Conservation Board to acquire some pieces of forest.

MONO LAKE

CNAC followed the Mono Lake controversy closely and in November 1978 sent the following statement of support of the CDFG position to Mr. Fullerton, with copies to other concerned individuals:

The level of Mono Lake continues to decline because of water diversions by Los Angeles Power and Water District. While the blasting to maintain a channel between Negit Island and the mainland last spring was fairly successful, and the California gulls continued to experience a successful nesting season in 1978, the lake level has fallen another two feet. The channel has disappeared and Negit Island is connected to the mainland again.

Mono Lake and the islands contain abundant nongame species. It is important to maintain the brine shrimp system which includes the nesting California gulls, migrating Wilson's phalarope, eared-grebes, and other waterfowl. The islands are a possible reintroduction site for peregrine falcons. The islands have been inviolate through history, and it is essential that they remain inviolate. Under present conditions there is the risk of invasion by rodents and other mammals. This cannot be allowed to happen.

The Citizen Nongame Advisory Committee recommends to the Department of Fish and Game that it continue its short-run measures to keep the channel between Negit Island and the mainland by again blasting and/or constructing a barrier.

The committee requests the Department to comment on the draft EIR prepared by the Los Angeles Power and Water District on groundwater pumping in the Owens Basin. Comment should include that impact on the Mono Basin from groundwater pumping in the Owens Basin should be included in the EIR because the two basins share common groundwater. Not only is Los Angeles Water and Power preventing tributaries from entering Mono Lake, but it is also pumping groundwater from Mono Basin. The impact on Mono Lake must be addressed in the EIR.

For long-run measures, the committee recommends that the Department assign high priority to working with other state and federal agencies to devise methods of inducing the Los Angeles district to cease causing further reduction of the water level of Mono Lake, and also to allow enough additional water to enter Mono Lake to cause its level to be determined by biologists that will maintain the Mono Lake ecosystem.

Despite the efforts of CDFG, the lake level continues to decline, and in 1979 California gulls failed to nest on Negit Island.

NONGAME FISH POISONING OPERATIONS

In 1978, CNAC adopted a report by one of its members (Moyle), entitled, "Evaluation of Nongame Fish Poisoning Operations". The report was quite critical of departmental procedures which lead to the poisoning of streams in order to rid them of native nongame species alleged to be competing with or preying on trout. The report and early drafts of it were circulated widely both within the CDFG and outside it. The result was a healthy discussion of the issues by all concerned and a general agreement by CDFG to be more careful in the development, planning and execution of such operations, particularly where native fishes are

involved. The committee has since then continued to keep track of such operations, although few have been proposed recently. However, CNAC did pass a resolution opposing the poisoning of Stampede Reservoir to reduce the populations of native nongame fish in favor of exotic trout species. CNAC opposed the operation (which was not carried out) not only because native fishes were involved, but because it would seriously interfere with a University of California research program on the nongame fishes. The trophy trout fishery already present in the reservoir was felt to demonstrate the compatibility of nongame fish with quality angling.

STRIPED BASS IN GOOSE LAKE

Goose Lake is a large shallow lake on the Oregon border that is too alkaline to support the usual game fishes found in the area. As a consequence it is dominated by native nongame fishes. Although there is little demand for a sport fishery in Goose Lake, the Department decided to introduce striped bass (an exotic species) into the lake, despite the fact that the lake was virtually unstudied. The committee felt that this was a serious problem not only because it would be difficult to predict the impact of the striped bass introduction on the lake and its fauna, but because it seemed to be a clear 'violation' of the principles guiding the introduction of exotic species that the committee had laid out in its first annual report and with which the Department had indicated they were in agreement. The controversy provoked some lengthy correspondence regarding the issue between the Director and the committee, and was finally resolved in a discussion with Mr. Fullerton. Basically the introduction of striped bass into Goose Lake is viewed as a departmental error that is more the exception than the rule. Its impact is reversible because the number of bass introduced was small and they are unlikely to reproduce in the lake. Furthermore, the CDFG agreed to defer any further action on the lake until more was known about it. Some studies of the lake are now being conducted by departmental personnel.

REPTILES AND AMPHIBIANS

CNAC strongly supported the Department's proposed regulations that would have banned the commercial collecting of native reptiles and amphibians. One of its members (Moyle) presented CNAC's position at a meeting of the Fish and Game Commission in which the pros and cons of the regulations were presented. Although it was apparently obvious even to the Commission that the populations of many native reptiles and amphibians are very low and that commercial collecting has been a major cause of the decline, the Commission decided only to ban commercial collecting for the pet trade, but not for scientific purposes. This decision may provide the protection that is needed, provided the definition of scientific purposes is not stretched too far.

TULE ELK

The committee closely followed the Department's adventures with tule elk and some members reviewed the literature on the elk. As a result, the committee recommended that the 2,000 animal goal be retained but that translocation efforts be limited to areas within the animals native range. The CDFG should also seek legislative permission to send excess animals out of State, for nonhunting purposes. The committee also indicated that the evidence that the Cache Creek herd was of hybrid origin was not convincing but urged that a taxonomic study be done on it. In the meantime, the herd should be considered in the tule elk management plans.

The committee also supported the CDFG position opposing elk ranching (to procure antlers) at Pt. Reyes, for humane reasons and because of the possibility that

escapes from the captive herd (of Rocky Mt. elk) might hybridize with the local tule elk. The Fish and Game Commission, however, granted a permit to allow the ranching to take place. Subsequent action by the Legislature will result in termination of this elk ranching effort.

PELICANS AND ANCHOVIES

CNAC members Hassur, Ruibal, and Moyle reviewed the management plan for the California anchovy populations. They concluded that although it has a great many problems, it is one of the most complete management plans in existence. However, it was felt that the impact of an expanded anchovy fishery on seabirds, particularly the brown pelican, was inadequately addressed in the plan. The committee therefore sent Mr. Fullerton the following statement (November 1978):

The Citizen Nongame Advisory Committee has been discussing the brown pelican and its apparent lack of breeding success at Anacapa Island. It appears that there may be a direct connection between the sharp decline in breeding success and a low population of anchovy in that area.

The Nongame Committee has always recommended an ecosystem approach in management objectives and decisions. It has also always recommended that decisions be based on thorough scientific investigation.

While the committee understands that the anchovy report and recommended management scheme are exemplary, we also note that they do not consider adequately the impact of the anchovy fishery on species that are not economically important, especially seabirds.

Our concern now is directed toward the seabirds and their needs. The committee recommends that the Commission adopt an arbitrary three-to-six mile zone around Anacapa Island that would prohibit commercial anchovy fishing. This position would allow a study to be undertaken by the Department for several years. In order to learn more about the interaction between anchovy, seabird, and the fishery, we especially need to learn where and how brown pelicans and other seabirds feed. The study should be carried out under near natural conditions without interference in feeding habits and reproduction.

When the results of the study are available, then intelligent management decisions can be made. In the meantime, the wisest course would be to establish a three-to-six mile zone around Anacapa in which no commercial anchovy fishing could take place.

In reply, Mr. Fullerton indicated that because the National Marine Fisheries Service recommended against closure around the islands, the Fish and Game Commission did not adopt a closure regulation. He also emphasized that the CDFG advocates conservative management policies that favor high anchovy populations, because they are such an important food for other fish as well as seabirds and mammals. CDFG feels that the anchovy is well-protected now with the million ton base level and the five-inch size limit.

CALIFORNIA CONDOR

The committee reviewed much of the literature and discussed the plans for saving the birds with Dr. Ralph Schreiber, Dr. Carl Koford, John C. Borneman, and others on September 11, 1978.

Everybody agreed on the desirability of the assured continuance of this endangered bird, and on the need for an intensive study of the status of the condor population, and its needs for its recovery to greater numbers. Therefore, the committee sent a letter to this effect to Mr. Fullerton. Specific recommendations included were: The committee repeated basically its approval of the Captive Breeding Concept as a last resort to prevent further decline and extinction of the California condor. Because of the time-lag problem inherent in getting projects or studies started, so far as funding is concerned, the committee recommended that the necessary paperwork be started now. However, approval of the Captive Breeding Project should be conditional on the results from a research study, which should be started concurrently with the application process. This study, the committee recommends, should be an intensive one-year field study on the ecology and biology of the condor, with emphasis on the energetics and reproductive ecology of the birds. The committee recommended that if the year of intensive study indicated that the Captive Breeding Program should be used, then details of the procedures to be followed for implementation be directly tied to the results of that study. The committee also recommended that the Condor Recovery Team be enlarged to include more biologists with expertise in the ecology of birds. Further, the committee recommended that the Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service assign a high priority funding to the intensive research so that this effort can get underway as quickly as possible, and also that additionally, funding from commercial enterprises should be pursued.

By and large, CDFG took issue with CNAC's recommendations, as expressed in a letter to the committee by Mr. Fullerton:

- (1) Concept of captive breeding for the California condor: As you are aware, the Department also agrees with this concept. Details on trapping and breeding facilities must be worked out before a permit for such work is authorized by the State. We feel this is a "last ditch" effort on behalf of saving the California condor from extinction and it is imperative that we work closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to initiate a captive propagation as quickly as possible.
- (2) Intensive one-year field study: We feel that adequate studies have been conducted which provide the information indicating the need for a breeding program. Much work must be done before such a program can be initiated and our efforts are now being directed to accomplish this goal. This does not mean that all field work will terminate. On the contrary, field work will be continued by the National Audubon Society, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and some contractual work by this Department.
- (3) If the year of intensive study indicates that a captive breeding program should be used, then details of the procedures for implementation be tied to the study results: Most authorities in bird ecology feel that adequate information is available which dictates the need for a captive breeding program. We are not sure what additional field studies will tell us that can be applied to captive propagation. Procedures for breeding birds in captivity have been worked out by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and others on closely related species.
- (4) Recommendations that the California Condor Recovery Team be enlarged to include biologists with expertise in bird ecology: Changes in, or additions to the Recovery Team membership can be proposed through the

Secretary of the Interior who has the appointing authority. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service, who administer the Recovery Team program, has indicated they strive to keep the Team membership as small as possible. The Team can and has used consultants to obtain assistance in the condor recovery effort.

- (5) Assigning a high priority to funding intensive research: As indicated above, field research is being continued. As the need is indicated from this research and if sufficient funds are not available, we will seek outside funding when sufficient funds are lacking in the Department to resolve questions essential to the management of the wild bird populations and the implementation of a captive propagation program.

Overall, the committee felt the actions to save the condor have come too late, without enough good information on condor biology. Although endorsing the captive breeding program is a worthwhile effort, the committee felt its chances of success were not good and that the likelihood of the condor becoming extinct was high.

THREATENED SPECIES

As the sections of this report on California condor, tule elk, pelicans, and bobcat indicate, CNAC has tried to keep up-to-date on the status of California's threatened or potentially threatened species, making recommendations where needed. The Department has requested the committee's assistance in the evaluation of recommendations to the Commission, it is considering making regarding the adding, changing of status, or removing of animals from the threatened species list. The committee has agreed to help in anyway it can, although it has not yet been requested to do so. The committee rejected, however, the suggestion that it advise the Department on the listing of rare or endangered plants, noting it lacks the expertise to provide such advice and that the California Native Plant Society is well-equipped to provide the advice needed.

Meanwhile, the committee is in the process of evaluating the procedures the Department uses for determining the status of rare or endangered species.

LEGISLATION

At the request of the committee, the Department sent committee members progress reports on legislation relating to the CDFG. Copies of bills of particular interest to the committee were sent to members and the committee's position on such bills was made known to the Director. Positions that are not discussed elsewhere in this report include strong opposition to bills that would have permitted the hunting of bighorn sheep and mountain lions, (both bills failed) the Department was in agreement with the committee's position on these bills. The committee also supported a 1978 State senate bill that specified methods of taking nuisance animals and established a predator research program (the bill failed).

COMMUNICATION

Since its inception, CNAC has expressed concern about the difficulty the general public has in trying to contact the Department, especially in emergency situations or when someone is observed violating the Fish and Game Code. In the First Annual Report, the CNAC recommended that CDFG establish a toll-free number for such purposes; the idea was initially rejected as being too costly. The committee then (September 1977) made the following recommendations:

- (1) Ask the telephone company to add an emergency number for wildlife problems to the list of emergency numbers in the front of every phone book. This would most likely be the number of the regional office of the CDFG, or perhaps the county sheriff in some cases.
- (2) The CDFG should publish prominently in all its publications the information that citizens can report wildlife problems to the sheriff.
- (3) Because the regional offices of the CDFG are not listed in most telephone books, the Department should seek to list the phone number of the nearest regional office with the State of California listings in every telephone book.
- (4) Wherever regional office addresses are printed in Department literature and notices, the telephone number should also be given.

The Department responded to these recommendations by working out an agreement with the telephone companies to have the number of the nearest Fish and Game regional office appear in the front of all telephone books. Then (January 1978), Mr. Fullerton announced that the Department was seeking to establish a system of toll-free numbers for emergencies, and these numbers will be printed in the front of each phone book in the State as the numbers come on the line. The Department will also notify wildlife organizations in the State as the number in their area becomes effective. The Department is working with the phone companies now to try to have just one number throughout the State. In metropolitan areas the State Police will be the recipients of the calls; in some areas the county sheriff's offices will be; and in other areas there will be a recording system, and wardens can use a key to hear the tape.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

Two questions were raised that were not covered in the rules of order adopted by the committee in April 1975: (1) Do committee members vote for themselves as experts or for the constituency for which they were appointed to the committee?, and (2) Do alternates vote?

It was noted that the committee functions informally, reaching recommendations by consensus; therefore, proxy votes were generally unnecessary. It was recommended that on important matters, all committee members should be contacted (with the chairman calling absent members). It was agreed that members should not represent a particular constituency in their voting but rather vote as experts representing the welfare of California's wildlife as a constituency. No voting privileges should be extended to alternates.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The committee thanks Eldridge "Red" Hunt, the CDFG liaison to the committee, for his patient and knowledgeable responses to frequently hostile questions and his diligence in keeping committee members informed on issues of interest to them. The committee also thanks former members Paul Howard and Arden Brame for their participation in committee activities and for the significant roles they played in determining the committee's direction. Jean Martinson deserves thanks for voluntarily putting together an initial outline of this report.

TABLE 1. MEMBERSHIP OF CITIZENS NONGAME ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Name	Affiliation	Area of Interest	Membership				
			1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
Brame, Arden	Eaton Canyon Nature Ctr.	reptiles/amphibians	X	X	X	X	--
Faasii, Ursula		concerned citizen	X	X	X	X	X
Hassur, Robert	San Jose State Univ.	education	X	X	X	X	X
Howard, Paul	National Audubon Soc.	wildlife	X	X	X	--	--
Martyr, Richard	National Audubon Soc.	wildlife	--	--	--	X	X
McCloskey, Maxine ¹	Whale Center	concerned citizen	X	X	X	X	X
Moyle, Peter ²	Univ. of Calif., Davis	fish	X	X	X	X	X
Ruibal, Rodolfo ³	Univ. of Calif., Riverside	ecology, reptiles/amphibians	X	X	X	X	X
Tevis, Lloyd	Rancho Mirage	wildlife	--	--	--	--	X

¹Chairman 1975-1979

²Chairman starting September 1979

³Vice-Chairman 1975-present