Suction Dredge Permitting Program Supplemental EIR-CEQUA

Mill Creek, Plumas County CA

Thomas A. Wess
May 5, 2011

Mark Stopher
California Department of Fish and Game
601 Locust Street
Redding, CA 96001

Re: Suction Dredge Permitting Program Supplemental EIR-CEQA

Dear Mr. Stopher,

I am submitting this letter because of the Class A restriction listed in the Draft Proposed Suction Dredge Regulations (February 28, 2011) for Mill Creek in Plumas County (Page 47). Class A is described as "No dredging permitted at any time" due to the presence of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Yellow Legged Frog (SNMYLF) (Rana Sierrae).

I am a co-owner of two mining claims (placer) on the lower reaches of Mill Creek above the East Branch of the North Fork Feather River near Rich Bar. The other co-owners are my brothers. These two claims have been in the family for 98 years. My grandfather moved to Rich Bar in 1907 working on the construction of the railroad and obtained partnership to the claims in 1913. My father was taken to live on the claim at the age of three months in 1924. My grandfather built a two story four bedroom home on the claim in 1925 and it remained a family residence until its forced removal in the 1970's due to government regulations of the US Forest Service.

I have been going to and staying on the claim since my birth in 1951 and continue to do so today along with my wife, children and now my grandchildren. I have fished in, hiked near, swam in, bathed in, drank from, dredged in, and jumped rocks over Mill Creek my entire life and I have never seen one frog nor tadpole of any type. I have seen deer, bear, bobcats, mice, snakes, fish, bees, birds and lots of mosquitoes, but never any frogs. I listened to the call of the SNMYLF online and can positively say I have never heard the croak of that specific type of frog. The sound is most distinct and it would have certainly peaked my curiosity as to the source of the sound.

I have enclosed a letter from Bob Callahan who is the only other individual which we have allowed to work our claim. He has been in the area since childhood (1950's) and has no memories of seeing any frogs in or around Mill Creek.

Because of the restrictions on Mill Creek, I have extensively researched the SNMYLF and found a great amount of information on the subject. One of the first things I discovered in common among all articles and studies regarding the habitat was that the SNMYLF is a mid to high altitude frog commonly seen above 6,000 feet and is most typically found as high as 11,000 to 12,000 feet in high open alpine lakes. (See attached pictures of sample lakes.) Any streams shown are of the high meadow variety. Furthermore I found no evidence of habitats in faster moving waters, steeper slopes, or rocky, tree lined streams.
Further research revealed the primary reason for lack of the SNMYLF to be in Mill Creek. The natural enemy, which feeds on the eggs and young tadpoles, is the native trout which are present in Mill Creek. Depending on water temperatures, the time to reach maturity can be up to four years, allowing ample time for the trout to consume the eggs and small tadpoles. A reasonable conclusion can be made that the SNMYLF does not exist at lower sections of the stream because there are native trout in the stream. The SNMYLF historically has inhabited the higher lakes because the native trout from the lower streams were unable to reach the headwaters and higher lakes due to natural barriers of steep rocky terrain and waterfalls. Thus, the frogs were able to thrive without the threat of the aggressive trout.

One of the primary reasons consistently listed in the studies for the decline of the SNMYLF is due to the introduction of non-native trout in the higher lakes for recreational fishing. This is not the case in Mill Creek because the trout are already there. Other primary factors are disease, pesticides and some mention of global warming.

Our claim is located on the lower section of Mill Creek and is bounded by Bucks Lake Wilderness. (See the attached map filed with BLM showing the boundaries of our claims and the wilderness area.) In measuring the primary streams of Mill Creek, Fales Creek and Clear Creek there is approximately 53,600 feet of stream. Only the lower section, about 6,600 feet or 12% of the streams, lies outside of the wilderness area, has been open to dredging. The remaining 88% is closed to any use of internal combustion engines thus preventing the use of a dredge. The upper headwaters of Mill Creek are already protected by the Bucks Lake Wilderness and federal regulations.

Another major issue discovered is regarding the locations of where frogs have been reported. I was able to find the locations of and related documentation regarding the finds on AmphibiaWeb using the Berkeley Mapper Point Mapping Service. The locations of the four finds of Rana Muscosa are at Silver Lake, Rock Lake, Gold Lake and along a tributary coming down from Rock Lake (Exhibit A1 through A6). There have been no reported finds of the SNMYLF at on or around Mill Creek in Plumas County.

The next important information is the boundary line between watersheds. While reviewing topographical maps of the area, I noticed a ridge running between Silver Lake (including the lakes where the frogs were reported) and the Mill Creek headwaters (Exhibit B1 & B2). I was then able to locate a US Fish and Wildlife Service mapping program which identifies the same ridge as the official dividing line between Mill Creek and Spanish Creek (Exhibit C). This is also confirmed with the USGS Viewer (Exhibit D1 & D2).

The location of the known SNMYLF is not in the same watershed as Mill Creek and all streams or lakes where there are known SNMYLF flow southeasterly away from Mill Creek and its headwaters.
The use of watersheds as boundary lines is supported using the Aquatic Biodiversity Management Plan prepared for the California Department of Fish and Game. In the plan it states “most units are defined by watershed boundaries…….. Management plans for these areas should be site specific…..” (Exhibit E page 1). This is also supported using the California Department of Fish and Game CNDDB QuickViewer. According to the California Department of Fish and Game website “The CNDDB Quick Viewer tool provides the user with a list of all CNDDB elements (species or natural communities) that have been documented by the CNDDB to occur on the selected USGS 7.5' topographic quad. This list may include both recent and historical records.” The map is divided into counties and quadrangles. The program will list if the SNMYLF is present within that quad or not. The lower reaches of Mill Creek and our claims are in the Caribou Quad, and the list for that section shows no SNMYLF. The Bucks Lake Quad does show the presence of the SNMYLF. (Exhibits F1 through F4). While this may be correct the information on this quad does not differentiate between watersheds and the Bucks Lake Quad contains parts of both watersheds which drain in different directions. An error would be made to assume the presence of the SNMYLF throughout an entire quad. The only legitimate determining factor would be based upon watersheds, as the aforementioned CA Department of Fish and Game (Exhibit E) suggests.

Recommendation: With the absence of the affected species, I respectfully request the removal of Mill Creek in Plumas County from the “Class A” status as currently listed in the Draft Proposed Suction Dredge Regulations (page 17, Line 28).

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Wess
April 11, 2011

Good day, Tom.

I trust this brief missive will find you and yours, well.

In reference to your inquiry to me regarding frogs at the claims:

I'm not sure which year I worked your lower claim, nor the elevation I worked at.

However, I can say that since 1959, since I began coming to Mill Creek, Clear Creek, and French Creek, up until my last passage there (2003?) I do not recall seeing any frogs or toads during my hiking, exploring, and dredging.

Certainly, this is not to say there are no frogs or toads in that region, but only to say I cannot recall seeing any, or hearing any stories about frogs or toads.

Like many children that grew up when I did, I took interest in turtles, frogs, toads, and other critters that provided amusement. I believe that had I seen any frogs or toads around the Mill Creek area, I probably would have taken the time to amuse myself with them, and therefore may have some memory of them.

I simply have no memories of seeing any.

Please pass on our best to Susie and the family.

Best regards,

Bob and Maryann Callahan
Rana sierrae - Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog

Formerly Rana muscosa - Mountain Yellow-legged Frog
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country: USA</th>
<th>State: California</th>
<th>County: Plumas County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Plumas National Forest, Silver Lake, T24N R7E Sec1 (SE 1/4 of SE 1/4), 39°57' 32.2&quot; N, 121° 8' 9.2&quot; W</td>
<td>Collector(s): J.A. Wilkinson and J.V. Vindum</td>
<td>Date Collected: 22 Aug 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altitude: 39° 57' 32.2&quot; N</td>
<td>Coord. Source: Garmin 12 GPS</td>
<td>Collector's (Field) Number: JVV-6370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude: 121° 8' 9.2&quot; W</td>
<td>Georef. By: J.V. Vindum</td>
<td>Georef. Remarks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat. Long/errror tated Locality: California: Plumas Co.: Plumas National Forest, Silver Lake, T24N R7E Sec1 (SE 1/4 of SE 1/4), 39°57' 32.2&quot; N, 121°08' 09.2&quot; W, 5820 ft</td>
<td>Fe Stage: Juv</td>
<td>Preservative: Alc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lev: 5820 ft</td>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td>Identified: J.V. Vindum, 3 Sep 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Publications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS 209404</th>
<th><em>Rana muscosa</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country: USA</td>
<td>State: California</td>
<td>County: Plumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality: Plumas National Forest, Rock Lake, T24N R7E Sec13 (NE 1/4 of NE 1/4), 39 56 29.22 N, 121 08 29.29 W</td>
<td>Collector(s): J.A. Wilkinson and J.V. Vindum</td>
<td>Island(s): Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Collected: 23 Aug 1999</td>
<td>Collector's (Field) Number: JVV-6388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude: 121° 8' 29.29&quot; W</td>
<td>Georef. By: J.V. Vindum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Lat/Long Error</td>
<td>Georef. Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated Locality: California: Plumas Co.: Plumas National Forest, Rock Lake, T24N R7E Sec13 (NE 1/4 of NE 1/4), 39 56 29.22 N, 121 08 29.29 W, 6240 ft</td>
<td>Life Stage: Juv</td>
<td>Preservative: Alc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td>Identified: J.V. Vindum, 3 Sep 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elev: 6240 ft</td>
<td>Habitat:</td>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close and Return
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS 227668</th>
<th><em>Rana muscosa</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>County: Plumas Island(s): Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locality:</strong></td>
<td>Plumas National Forest, Bucks Lake Wilderness, effluent of Rock Lake, T24N R7E S13 (SW 1/4 of NE 1/4), 39° 56' 25.7&quot; N, 121° 08' 25.5&quot; W</td>
<td>Collector(s): D.G. Mulcahy and G.O.U. Wogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Collected:</strong></td>
<td>30 Aug 2003</td>
<td>Collector's (Field) Number: DGM- Field Notes: 1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coord. Source:</strong></td>
<td>Garmin 12 GPS</td>
<td>Georef. By: D.G. Mulcahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georef. Remarks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Lat/Long Error:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stated Locality:</strong></td>
<td>California: Plumas Co.: Plumas National Forest, Bucks Lake Wilderness, along drying tributary coming down from Rock Lake, T24N R7E S13 (SW 1/4 of NE 1/4), 39° 56' 25.7&quot; N, 121° 08' 25.5&quot; W, 6230 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Stage:</strong></td>
<td>Larva</td>
<td>Preservative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Form Identified: D.G. Mulcahy, 5 Sep 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elev.:</strong></td>
<td>6230 ft</td>
<td>Habitat: 1645 hrs. In puddle, ca 1 m wide, 20 cm deep, along drying tributary coming down from Rock Lake. Water temp. 18 C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

[Close and Return]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS 227259</th>
<th>Rana muscosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>State:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumas National Forest, Bucks Lake Wilderness Area, outlet of Gold Lake, T24N R8E S18 (SW 1/4 of NW 1/4), 39 56 33.93 N, 121 08 06.44 W</td>
<td>Collector(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39° 56' 33.93&quot; N</td>
<td>Date Collected:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121° 8' 6.44&quot; W</td>
<td>Collector's (Field) Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California: Plumas Co.: Plumas National Forest, Bucks Lake Wilderness Area, Gold Lake, near outlet of Gold Lake to Jacks Meadow, T24N R8E S18 (SW 1/4 of NW 1/4), 39 56 33.93 N, 121 08 06.44 W, 5920 ft</td>
<td>Stated Locality:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Preservative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5920 ft</td>
<td>Habitat:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close and Return
Ridge line separating drainage areas.

All known locations in which Sierra Nevada Yellow Legged Frogs (Rana sierrae) were found drain toward Meadow Valley away from the Mill Creek Fall Creek Drainage Area.
US Fish and Wildlife Service shows the division line between Watersheds.

Silver Lake, Gold Lake, Rock Lake, Mud Lake and Jacks Meadows, where the Sierra Nevada Yellow Legged Frog (Rana Sierrae, *Formerly* Rana muscosa - Mountain Yellow-legged Frog) were located, all drain into the Spanish Creek Watershed, AWAY from Mill Creek and the East Branch North Fork Feather River Watershed.
State of California
The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR
THE BIG PINE CREEK WILDERNESS BASIN OF THE SIERRA NEVADA
INYO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, 1999 - 2005

BY

Curtis Milliron, Associate Fishery Biologist
Eastern Sierra and Inland Deserts Region
Bishop, California

The Mission of the Department of Fish and Game is to manage California’s
diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources, and the habitats upon which
they depend, for their ecological values and for their
use and enjoyment by the public.
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1. Species stocked and recent management of the Big Pine Basin lakes .............................. 6
INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

The movement of trout into wilderness waters of the eastern Sierra began in earnest around the turn of the 20th century. Historical stocking registers account for the quantity in milk cans of brown (often referred to as Loch Leven), brook, rainbow and golden trout stocked into wilderness basins. Cans were transported by packstock to nearly every accessible named lake in the Sierra. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) now utilizes a twin engine turboprop airplane equipped with bomber doors and a GPS (global positioning system) tracking system to stock approximately 246 of the 600 named lakes above 9000 ft elevation in the eastern Sierra fisheries management unit. However, fisheries management activities, including fishery monitoring and evaluation, have not kept pace with fish movement technology. Most of the allotments for trout stocked into these lakes were determined over 30 years ago by experienced biologists using their best judgment and factors such as angler use, lake size, desirable species (from a recreational fisheries perspective), and some site specific fish growth or condition data. Adjustments to trout stocking allotments were made for individual lakes only during years when CDFG staff could spend time away from the demands of other important front-country fishery issues. Until recently, impacts on native biotic communities went largely unnoticed by CDFG biologists, because most lakes had not been revisited for decades.

Reported Sierra amphibian declines (Bradford, 1989) prompted a larger effort toward amphibian population surveys by the CDFG and U.S. Forest Service. With additional documented population losses of the mountain yellow-legged frog (MYLF), Rana muscosa, the CDFG began increasing wilderness resource assessment activities and initiated a fisheries and ecosystem management planning program for the eastern Sierra.

One of the major causes of MYLF population losses has been the introduction of trout into originally fishless habitats (Cory 1963; Bradford et al. 1993; Bradford et al. 1994; Jennings 1996; Knapp 1996). Site specific fisheries management plans are needed for all high Sierra waters to assure that trout fisheries are managed in a manner compatible with other native aquatic and riparian resources. Area fisheries management plans will need to comply with individual future species recovery plans or conservation strategies which may impart additional fisheries management constraints. CDFG plans should attempt to optimize recreational benefits while maintaining natural biodiversity using a basin-by-basin approach. The MYLF is a California State and Federal Species of Special Concern, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is currently assessing the need to list this species as Threatened or Endangered. As of this writing, a MYLF conservation strategy is near completion.

Twenty-one management units, mostly in the eastern Sierra, have been identified for management by CDFG’s Bishop office (Figure 1). Most units are defined by watershed boundaries; however, several adjacent smaller basins may be combined to form a management planning unit. Management plans for these areas should be site specific, based on current assessments of fish and amphibian populations, angler use, and the status of key native biota and habitats. Input from CDFG stakeholders will be included.
This first plan focuses on the North and South Forks of the Big Pine Creek Basin. The following objectives are being used to develop the current plan:

Objective 1: Manage wilderness lakes in a manner which maintains or restores native biodiversity and habitat quality, will support viable populations of native species, and provides for recreational opportunities considering historical use patterns. In some areas, most or all of the lakes may be managed as natural reserves, with little or no angling available. Likewise, in areas of high recreational demand, most or all of the lakes may be managed for recreational angling.

Objective 2: Refinements to trout stocking allotments should be based on recent, site-specific data.

Objective 3: For each lake, the species, frequency, and number of trout stocked should be guided by the following provisions:

A) Since MYLF abundance in lakes has declined and is negatively correlated with trout presence, lakes with extant populations of MYLF, or other species of concern, should generally not be stocked. Where a MYLF population exists within close proximity to an established wilderness fishery, an assessment of fishing use and the feasibility of trout removal should be made to determine if the water could be converted to a fishless condition in order to benefit MYLF. Wilderness fisheries management should incorporate objectives of the MYLF Conservation Strategy.

B) Golden trout should be given priority over other trout species and stocked into waters following existing Fish and Game Commission policy (Appendix II). Other species of trout may be stocked to meet other fishery management objectives and for experimental stocking programs; however, the stocking of brook trout should generally be avoided because they are lake spawners and have a greater potential for establishing overabundant, self-sustaining, stunted populations. Brook trout should not be stocked where their range may be extended.

C) Wilderness lakes should be managed to optimize angling opportunity within a given basin. For example, some lakes might be managed for trophy-sized fish, some for fast-action on smaller sized fish, and others for species diversity.

D) Trout should not be stocked into waters with existing self-sustaining trout populations unless needed to meet goals for improving angling diversity, trophy or fast-action fishing, or research. Experimental planting of trout to control undesirable fish populations is not restricted under this provision.

E) In addition to the application of chemicals in lakes, new and innovative non-chemical means to control undesirable fish populations should be encouraged, including the use of stocked, sterile, predatory trout, strains or species of fish not previously stocked, or physical means of removal.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Big Pine Creek Basin is within the John Muir Wilderness of the Inyo National Forest on the east slope of the Sierra Nevada. The North Fork Big Pine Creek drainage contains eleven named lakes (Big Pine Lake #8 is the only CDFG designated name) and numerous unnamed ponds. The South Fork Big Pine Creek drainage contains six named lakes and numerous unnamed ponds. Although Willow Lake is included in this lake listing, it is actually a streammarsh complex rather than a true lake. Lake maps with associated fishery data are in Appendix I. The Palisade Glacier complex is a prominent feature of the basin.

Area of the basins are approximately 31.7 square miles and 39.0 square miles west above Little Pine Creek and west above the town of Big Pine, CA, respectively. The 50-year average mean water content of the snowpack on April 1 for all snow courses is 18.3 inches, and the average (100% normal) precipitation at the Glacier Lodge rain gage is 16.89 inches (Steve Keef, Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power). See Appendix II for data on Big Pine Creek total and mean flows from 1932 to 1997.

METHODS

Public scoping to address issues which should be considered in the fisheries management plans for both the Big Pine and Convict Wilderness basins was held on November 26, 1996. Fifteen interested individuals representing local agencies and organizations attended (Appendix II). Major issues included the desire to continue trout stocking activities and to manage for a balance between recreational fisheries and other aquatic species. Representatives from the Eastern Sierra Packers Association suggested that pack train use for trout stocking should be re-instituted where feasible in lieu of aerial stocking.

Fish and amphibian surveys were conducted in the North and South forks of the Big Pine Drainage following the protocol designed by Fellers and Freel in 1995 and modified by Knapp (University of California, Sierra Nevada Aquatic Research Laboratory, pers. com.). To collect fish, each lake was netted with two lightweight Swedish experimental gill nets measuring 1.8m x 36m and having six panels with a mesh size ranging from 10mm to 38mm. Otoliths were extracted from most of the trout caught in gill nets for age determination. Each lake was visually surveyed for the presence and abundance of amphibians. One day of field work was generally required to complete field study objectives for each lake surveyed by a two person crew. Additional surveys were conducted to cover all amphibian habitats, including ponds and streams, and to determine the presence of existing or potential key fish barriers. Fish barriers were identified in the North Fork drainage using the following criteria: presence of a rock barrier with a vertical drop of more than five feet; or a shorter drop, if fish were absent.
upstream; or a continuous reach of stream with high gradient and no holding/resting water for trout. Using ArcView GIS software, data were archived and analyzed, and plan alternatives were generated.

Angler use at each water in the basin was estimated through volunteer angler surveys. Two "iron rangers", or metal survey stations, were put at the wilderness access trailheads, encouraging anglers to provide data for this management plan. The survey form (Appendix II) queried anglers on date, location, fish species caught, number of trout kept and released, trout lengths and condition, fishing effort, and satisfaction. The most useful data appeared to be location(s) fished, since much of the remaining data were of poor quality. To help anglers identify waters, a simple GIS map of the basin was printed on the back of each survey form.

To minimize optical distortion, lake images were scanned from the central third of aerial photographs (approximately 1:15,840 scale; 1993-94) obtained from the Inyo National Forest. Scanned images were georeferenced using Geographic Transformer AVX™ as an ArcView GIS software extension. For comparison of lakes with each other, images were scaled at 1:2,400 (Appendix I).

FISHERIES RESOURCES

Brown (BN), rainbow (RT), brook (BK), golden (GT), and cutthroat trout (CT) have been stocked in the Big Pine Basin (Table 1). CDFG calendar year end stocking records date back to the 1960's, though trout were likely first stocked into some Big Pine lakes near the turn of the 20th century. Further information on fish presence and past stocking allotments are contained in the stream and lake files of the CDFG’s Bishop office.

Wilderness fisheries have been managed for wild trout and "put and grow" hatchery fingerling trout. Many strains of rainbow trout, brown trout, and brook trout have been stocked into backcountry lakes and tributaries, and many of these trout have successfully spawned, producing "wild trout" progeny. The term "wild trout" should not be confused with "native trout", which refers to trout that existed in watersheds prior to European settlement and have a defined natural range without human intervention. All waters in Inyo and Mono counties south of the Walker River drainage, including waters in the Big Pine Basin, have no native trout.

A reduction of stocked trout in 1999 is supported by data collected for this management plan. Stocked trout were observed in many cases to compete with an already overabundant wild brook trout population resulting in slow growth of all trout. In the case of the Thumb lakes, golden trout were simply too numerous in habitats with too little food to yield desirable trout growth.

Hatchery allotments are "goals", and production shortfalls and surpluses may occur in some years. Actual numbers stocked can be affected by the availability of strains, CDFG hatchery budgets, drought, disease, and the severity of winter conditions.
Table 1. Fish species stocked and recent management of the Big Pine Basin lakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of lake</th>
<th>Fish species stocked historically</th>
<th>1996 fish stocking</th>
<th>1999 fish stocking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>BN, RT, BK</td>
<td>6,000 RT</td>
<td>6,000 RT annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>BK, RT</td>
<td>9,000 RT</td>
<td>2,000 RT annually or experimental*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>BK, RT</td>
<td>5,000 RT</td>
<td>3,000 RT annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>BK, RT, BN, CT</td>
<td>5,000 RT</td>
<td>1,000 RT annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>BK, RT, BN</td>
<td>8,000 RT</td>
<td>2,000 RT annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>BK, RT, BN</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>BK, GT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>BK, RT, CT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>250 GT annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>BK, RT, BN</td>
<td>4,000 RT</td>
<td>Not stocked or experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Mack</td>
<td>BK, RT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainard</td>
<td>BK, RT, GT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumb, lower</td>
<td>BK, RT, GT</td>
<td>1,000 GT</td>
<td>500 GT every even year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumb, upper</td>
<td>BK, RT, GT</td>
<td>1,000 GT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinore</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
<td>Not stocked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Experimental management is discussed in the FUTURE FISHERIES RESEARCH section of this plan.

Brook trout are no longer stocked in the Big Pine Creek Basin, since they generally overpopulate, become stunted, and maintain this condition almost indefinitely. Although brook trout are a prized sport fish, they are commonly a nuisance species in backcountry lakes, and their presence frequently precludes other more desirable resource management options.

Angling regulations for all waters in the Big Pine Creek Basin follow the Sierra District general regulations that allow anglers to harvest 5 trout per day with 10 trout in possession. Additionally, up to 10 brook trout per day less than 10 inches total length may be taken and possessed over and above the other daily bag and possession limits specified. The brook trout “bonus bag limit” was adopted to encourage the harvest of brook trout from overpopulated waters such as those found in the Big Pine Creek Basin.

Fifteen Big Pine lakes currently offer anglers the opportunity to catch four trout species. Fish species distributions are derived from stocking records and gill net data (Figure 2). Rainbow trout are stocked and may be maintained through natural reproduction in Black
Lake and Big Pine lakes First through Fifth. However, no rainbow trout were sampled from Second Lake, and only one rainbow trout was caught in Fifth lake, despite 9,000 and 8,000 rainbow trout stocked in each lake, respectively, in previous years. Rainbow trout coexist with brown trout in Big Pine Creek below First Lake. With little or no spawning habitat available, rainbow trout in Sixth and Summit lakes are expected to become extirpated without further stocking. Wild brown trout are present in First Lake and downstream in Big Pine Creek to the Owens Valley. Golden trout are maintained in lower Thumb lake through stocking. Golden trout in upper Thumb lake appear to be maintained by stocking and may become extirpated if stocking were halted. Brook trout are present in all waters, except the Thumb lakes, Summit Lake, Finger Lake, and Eighth Lake.

Most trout caught with gill nets were aged using otoliths. Fork lengths at each annulus were graphed for each species present in each lake (Figure 3). Trout ages ranged from one year to an estimated 15 years old, with the average age being five years old. In many cases, trout growth slowed after age four, because of a lack of food for larger trout. The exception was brown trout in First Lake, where two large individuals (2,110 g and 1,740 g) were captured that had partially shifted from invertebrates to fish as a primary food source. Trout condition may degrade with age as observed for Sixth Lake brook trout and Black Lake rainbow trout (Figures 4 and 5, respectively).

A total of 152 anglers responded to the volunteer angler use survey (Figure 6). Generally, angler use was not well correlated with angler success, fish size, or angler satisfaction; use was greatest at waters near lower elevation hiking trails; and use was much greater in the North Fork lakes than in the South Fork lakes. The light use of the South Fork lakes is probably due to fewer fishing opportunities and more difficult access to the lakes.

AMPHIBIAN RESOURCES

The CDFG is concerned about MYLF declines in the Sierra range and southern California. Because of competition and predation by trout on MYLF and the similar habitat requirements of these species, introductions of non-native trout in high mountain lakes have been shown to be a major cause of MYLF declines. This fisheries management plan includes MYLF population assessments, and CDFG’s future management direction will include these findings to provide more protection and improvement for Big Pine Basin MYLF populations.

Four MYLF populations were present within the NF Big Pine Creek drainage in 1998 (Figure 2). Two populations, one in Eighth Lake and the other in Sam Mack Meadow (Figures 7 and 8, respectively), are in good condition and appear to be at carrying capacity for the habitats available. Both populations have approximately 700-1,000 individuals (adults and tadpoles combined). The remaining two populations, one in a
Figure 4. Condition factor at length for Black Lake Rainbow Trout. August, 1996.

Figure 5. Condition factor at length for Sixth Lake Brook Trout. August, 1996.
Figure 6. Angler use in the Big Pine Basin from volunteer angler surveys collected, 1995-98.
pond near Seventh Lake (Figure 7) and the other in a meadow south of Summit Lake
(Figure 9), were considered in poor condition, with each having an estimated population
of less than 70 individuals (adults and tadpoles combined), in 1998. The pond
population near Seventh Lake was extirpated in 1999.

Eighth Lake was stocked prior to 1989 with golden trout, but the allotment was canceled
that year due to a severe winter, which caused a complete winter kill of trout. Lake
surveys have determined that, in the absence of trout, MYLF have proliferated within
the lake and surrounding waters. This response is one of the few known examples of
natural MYLF population recovery after trout extirpation.

MYLF are currently common in the outlet of Eighth Lake downstream to a small fish
barrier. Below the barrier, trout are common and no MYLF were found. A few adult
MYLF were observed around the margins of Sixth Lake, but no fishless breeding area is
available in the lake. A small population of MYLF inhabited several shallow ponds
(<1m deep) adjacent to Seventh Lake in 1998. However, no MYLF were observed in
Seventh Lake, located just 2 meters away, but teeming with brook trout. This
population became extirpated in 1999 when brook trout invaded the pond habitat.

Trout populations within this upper complex of three lakes (Sixth through Eighth) are
isolated from lower elevation populations through a series of fish barriers. To benefit
MYLF, these populations could be eradicated, with no chance of unaided trout
recolonization.

The small MYLF population below Summit Lake and near Fourth Lake exists in very
small isolated pools within an ephemeral stream channel. MYLF recruitment was very
low during the three years of recent observation. MYLF are long-lived, and this
characteristic has allowed them to survive in the marginal habitats available since the
introduction of trout into Fourth Lake. Their status is tenuous and will remain so, unless
additional trout-free habitat becomes available, or they may become extirpated.

MYLF in Sam Mack Meadow are isolated from trout and other MYLF populations, and
no habitat is available for population expansion. This population needs to be monitored
to assure that no trout are introduced into the ponds or adjoining waters.

Tree frogs, *Hyla regilla*, were more common than MYLF in the Big Pine Creek Basin
(Figures 10 and 11). No other amphibian species were observed during our aquatic
habitat surveys.
FUTURE FISHERIES RESEARCH

Fisheries managers possess several “tools” which they use to manage sport fish populations. Restricting angler harvest of fish through angling regulations are an effective means of protecting fish populations that are vulnerable to overfishing, such as roadside trophy trout fisheries. However, in high mountain lakes, liberal angling regulations to increase harvests rates of over abundant stunted fish populations often do not achieve desired objectives. For example, it is doubtful many anglers take advantage of the brook trout bonus bag regulation (allows 10 brook trout < 10” in length, in addition to the Sierra District 5 trout limit). Because of their remoteness, even an unlimited possession limit may not produce an appreciable increase in trout harvests in many high mountain lakes. Another tool managers use is fish stocking, which is an effective means of maintaining trout populations that are not self-sustaining, increasing species diversity to a fishery, and improving trout growth by altering population density. However, the biggest problem with fish stocking is that it is difficult to remove an unwanted fishery after an introduction has occurred. Fish removal has traditionally been accomplished by using the piscicide, rotenone, which is derived from the roots of several tropical and subtropical plants. While rotenone is also toxic to certain non-target species (gill-breathing invertebrates and tadpoles), these species generally recover rapidly after a chemical treatment. An alternative to rotenone on some smaller waters is trout eradication using gill nets. Some success has been achieved using gill nets to eradicate several small populations of golden and rainbow trout and one very small population (N=97) of brook trout (Knapp, 1998). However, control of most brook trout populations through this method would be difficult because of the large number of fish present, high reproductive potential of this species, and large size and depth of many lakes. More tests of this method of eradication, and other possible fish population control methods, need to be conducted.

In the Big Pine Creek Basin, brook trout are overpopulating 9 of the 15 lakes that contain trout, resulting in poor growth and marginal sport fisheries. The development of other practical means to control brook trout, either through reducing population abundance or by complete population eradication, is necessary. Two experimental approaches for brook trout population control are proposed. The first is to eliminate the stocking of fingerling rainbow trout into Second and Black lakes and replace them with fewer, but much larger, trout that are able to immediately prey upon the abundant supply of smaller brook trout. The objective is to increase brook trout growth by reducing intraspecific competition for the limited food supplies in these lakes. This approach holds promise since these stocked trout would not need to compete with brook trout to attain a large size, but would require a larger food item (brook trout fry and fingerlings) for continued growth and survival. Any trout species of a large size could meet the management objective; however, large brown, cutthroat or tiger trout (sterile hybrid between brown trout and brook trout) are highly piscivorous and may be longer lived and/or more difficult to harvest than large rainbow trout.
A second method, proposed for Sixth and Seventh lakes, uses gill nets and other harvest
gear (traps, seines, angling, etc.) to directly remove brook trout. The objective would be
to remove all trout from these two lakes during a two-year intensive gill-netting operation.
These two lakes would then be left barren of trout to benefit native species, especially
MYLF. Brook trout spawning areas (Figure 7) would also be disrupted or made
unusable. The full proposal is presented in Appendix II.

These methods, if successful, could be used in many other Sierra lakes to meet site-
specific fishery objectives, improve angling recreation, and implement responsible native
species management objectives.

PROPOSED MANAGEMENT DIRECTION

Several management directions were developed for this plan to explore the range of
fisheries management possibilities. The analysis included actions to 1) increase MYLF
(and other native fauna) populations, with the decrease in angling opportunities offset
through improved fisheries management elsewhere in the basin, 2) maximize
recreational fisheries with increased potential to harm native fauna, 3) increase MYLF
(and other native fauna) populations to the extent feasible with a large decrease in
angling opportunities, and 4) no action which depicts current fisheries management
based on recent assessments. CDFG’s management direction, action “1” above, is
presented in this section, while evaluations of the other three actions are presented in
Appendix II.

This plan is directed mostly toward management of the North Fork of the Big Pine Creek
Basin. The South Fork lakes offer less opportunity for fisheries enhancements or
amphibian reintroductions. If experimental fisheries management techniques prove
successful and cost effective, then Brainard and upper Thumb lakes in the South Fork
Basin would be candidates for future management actions.

CDFG’s management direction proposes experimental fisheries management in Second
and Black lakes initially, with more lakes to follow if results are favorable (Figure 12). A
trophy fishery would be established in Summit Lake utilizing golden trout. Trout will be
removed from the upper North Fork Basin (Sixth and Seventh lakes) where MYLF
should quickly re-colonize former lake habitats. On the South Fork, trout will no longer
be stocked at upper Thumb Lake, which will be monitored to determine if the present
golden trout population is self-sustaining. MYLF may be reintroduced with an intra-basin
transfer into Upper Thumb. Stocking allotments in other basin waters are based on the
findings from fisheries resource assessments to date. This management direction is
outlined further in the schedule of activities.
EXPECTED BENEFITS

This management plan was developed with a set of objectives based on the CDFG’s responsibility to manage all of California’s diverse fauna, CDFG policies and management authorities, and our desire to fairly balance the demands upon our venerable resources. It is clear that to develop and implement comparable management plans for all back country waters will be a demanding task requiring cooperation and even encouragement from our stakeholders. However, every future visitor of the Big Pine Basin will not be entirely satisfied with the outcome of our management. Some will contend that all non-native trout should be eliminated, a task not likely to ever be accomplished. Others have difficulty accepting the inherent values of things non-consumptive, like the mountain yellow-legged frog. The intent of this plan is to provide for improved recreational opportunities while maintaining biodiversity. It is our collective responsibility to pass on to future Americans the natural components that we inherited - clean water, beautiful landscapes, wild lands, and the fisheries and native fauna of the Big Pine Creek Basin and elsewhere.

Throughout the Big Pine Creek Basin, fisheries management is being refined based on new information and our current biological understanding of high elevation trout and frog populations. In most cases, trout stocking allotments were reduced to decrease competition for the limited food supplies available in these waters. As a result, trout average size should increase moderately in these lakes. Since brook trout are so very abundant in the basin, there will be no shortage of angling opportunities or fast action waters.

We propose to initiate several experimental trout stockings in Black Lake and Second Lake, and possibly several other lakes containing stunted brook trout, depending on realized benefits. Stocking large piscivorous (fish eating) trout will reduce the enormous numbers of young brook trout, resulting in substantial growth increases of both predatory and remaining brook trout. The current Black Lake fishery is mainly comprised of very slender undernourished trout, averaging only seven inches and 1.3 ounces and almost unsuitable for human consumption. Our goal is to raise the average size by at least an inch and double the current average weight. Black Lake should remain a fast action water, and also provide anglers with healthy, attractive trout.

Summit Lake is the only lake in the North Fork of Big Pine that does not provide spawning habitat suitable for trout, including brook trout. A unique opportunity exists here to manage this water as a trophy fishery. Since no trout reproduction occurs, the CDFG can control which species of trout is stocked and at what density it is maintained (i.e. # of trout/surface acre). A low density trout population, as is present in Summit Lake, yields higher individual fish growth than a high density population. Maintaining this condition will provide angling opportunities for larger (12 to 16 inch) trout, but with lower catch rates (# fish/hr.). Stocking golden trout is favored by the local packer and meets the Fish and Game Commission policy for golden trout management; however, any trout species could be managed to produce a trophy fishery in Summit Lake. The
development of this trophy fishery and improved recreational fisheries management in other waters will offset lost angling opportunities in the two waters that will be converted to a fishless state for the benefit of native fauna.

Removing trout populations from the two upper North Fork waters, Sixth and Seventh lakes, will greatly increase the abundance and stability of the MYLF population that currently inhabits Eighth Lake. These two lakes supported approximately 10% of fishing recreation in the Big Pine Creek Basin in 1999. The loss of angling opportunity at these two lakes should be offset through implementation of fisheries management programs mentioned above. Trout populations in this upper subbasin are isolated from downstream waters by natural fish barriers. Trout above the barriers will be removed by netting and trapping adults and juvenile fish, and by blocking access to spawning habitats. This project is a multi-year effort, and if successful, techniques for conversion of other brook trout waters in the Sierra to either a fishless condition, or in preparation for improved trout management, could be developed.

Finally, golden trout in upper Thumb Lake will no longer be stocked. Use of this fishery is very low, average trout size is poor, and the habitat may not support natural reproduction. A good golden trout fishery still exists in nearby lower Thumb Lake. If golden trout do not maintain a population in upper Thumb Lake, an intra-basin MYLF relocation will be attempted to reestablish them in the South Fork drainage.
## SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

**Present Plan to Stakeholders:**

Meet with Inyo Forest personnel and Eastern Sierra Packers Association and present management plan for discussion and comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initiate Experimental Management:**

Determine species and strain of trout to stock into Black Lake for experimental management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secure approval from the Chief of the Department’s Fisheries Programs Branch and from the Inyo Forest Supervisor if using a new species or hybrid of trout, as per MOU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collect additional baseline data for future analysis of population response to treatment at Black and Second lakes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordinate with the local packer to stock approved trout when available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stock GT into Summit Lake to Initiate Trophy Trout Program:**

Secure approval from the Chief of the Department’s Fisheries Programs Branch and from the Inyo Forest Supervisor, as per MOU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determine stocking rates and frequency and add to hatchery allotment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remove Trout from the Upper North Fork Basin:**

Collect information on BK population density, size distribution, general movement patterns, and the timing and location of spawning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 1999 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remove adult trout in Sixth and Seventh lakes by gill nets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 1999 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remove trout in stream between Sixth and Seventh lakes by electrofishing and trapping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 1999 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disrupt spawning by covering BK spawning habitat, dispersing gravels, directed netting, destroying embryos, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1999 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remove subadult trout in Sixth and Seventh lakes by gill nets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitor success of the project and remove remaining trout.

Monitor re-colonization of MYLF to upper basin habitats

Monitor Upper Thumb Lake’s Trout Population and Potential for MYLF Re-introduction.

Survey upper Thumb Lake trout spawning habitat and young-of-the-year.

Set gill nets at upper Thumb Lake to determine if GT are self-sustaining.

Reintroduce MYLF with an intra-basin transfer to Upper Thumb Lake.

Maintain Current Fisheries Management in Other Big Pine Basin Waters.

Implement trout stocking allotments.
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APPENDIX I

MAPS AND SURVEY DATA SUMMARIES FOR BIG PINE CREEK BASIN LAKES

The following section provides maps and associated fishery survey data pertinent to aquatic resource management by the CDFG. Each water body being considered in this plan is displayed as a GIS layout with an overlay of current fisheries data (length frequency histogram from gill netting). Each layout has been scaled to 1:2,400 which allows for a quick impression of the relative size of the lake in comparison to all other waters in the basin. Additionally, the scanned aerial photographs are of sufficient detail to characterize surrounding land forms and vegetative types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake Name</th>
<th>Elevation (Feet)</th>
<th>Surface Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>9,958</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>10,056</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>10,247</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>10,720</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>10,787</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>11,088</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>11,160</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10,647</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Mack</td>
<td>11,793</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinore</td>
<td>10,988</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>9,561</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainard</td>
<td>10,234</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumb, lower</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumb, upper</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>10,785</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ecord</th>
<th>QUADNAME</th>
<th>ELMCODE</th>
<th>SCINAME</th>
<th>COMNAME</th>
<th>FEDSTATUS</th>
<th>CALSTATUS</th>
<th>DFGSTATUS</th>
<th>CNPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>ABNKC01010</td>
<td>Pandion haliaetus</td>
<td>osprey</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>ABNKC01010</td>
<td>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</td>
<td>bald eagle</td>
<td>Delisted</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>AMACC01020</td>
<td>Myotis yumanensis</td>
<td>Yuma myotis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>CTT51120CA</td>
<td>Darlingonia Seep</td>
<td>Darlingonia Seep</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDAST8H182</td>
<td>Packera eurycephala var. lewisrosei</td>
<td>Lewis Rose's ragwort</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDBET02030</td>
<td>Betula glandulosa</td>
<td>dwarf resin birch</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDBRA06090</td>
<td>Boehmera constancei</td>
<td>Constance's rock-cress</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDCRA0A030</td>
<td>Sedum albomarginatum</td>
<td>Feather River stonecrop</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDFAB0F9J0</td>
<td>Astragalus webberi</td>
<td>Webber's milk-vetch</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDFAB2B1A0</td>
<td>Lupinus dalesiae</td>
<td>Quincy lupine</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDLAM180L0</td>
<td>Monardella stebbinsii</td>
<td>Stebbins' monardella</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDLAM180W0</td>
<td>Monardella folletii</td>
<td>Follett's monardella</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDONA050Q2</td>
<td>Clarkia mildrediae ssp. mildrediae</td>
<td>Mildred's clarkia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDORO04020</td>
<td>Lewisia cantelowii</td>
<td>Cantelow's lewisia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDRHA0C010</td>
<td>Rhamnus alnifolia</td>
<td>alder buckthorn</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PDRHA0H061</td>
<td>Frangula purshiana ssp. ultramafica</td>
<td>Caribou coffeeberry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>PMCY03CE0</td>
<td>Carex sheldonii</td>
<td>Sheldon's sedge</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>QUADNAME</td>
<td>ELMCODE</td>
<td>SCINAME</td>
<td>COMNAME</td>
<td>FEDSTATUS</td>
<td>CALSTATUS</td>
<td>DFGSTATUS</td>
<td>CNPSLIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>AABH01340</td>
<td><em>Rana sierrae</em></td>
<td>Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate Endangered</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>ABNKC10010</td>
<td><em>Haliseetus leucocephalus</em></td>
<td>Baird eagle</td>
<td>Delisted</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>CTT51120CA</td>
<td>Darlingtonia Seep</td>
<td>Darlingtonia Seep</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>NBMUS41020</td>
<td>Meesia triquetra</td>
<td>three-ranked hump moss</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDASTE020</td>
<td>Oroystemma elatum</td>
<td>tall alpine-aster</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDRA06090</td>
<td>Boechera constancei</td>
<td>Constance's rock-cress</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDVARX00M0</td>
<td><em>Stellaria longifolia</em></td>
<td>long-leaved starwort</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDVAR1020</td>
<td><em>Eremogone cliftonii</em></td>
<td>Clifton's eremogone</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDFA02601A</td>
<td><em>Lupinus daleiaceae</em></td>
<td>Quincy lupine</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDLAM1800W0</td>
<td><em>Monardella foliittii</em></td>
<td>Follett's monardella</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDONA050Q2</td>
<td>Clarkia mildrediae ssp. mildrediae</td>
<td>Mildred's clarkia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDSAXW010</td>
<td>Hemieva ranunculifolia</td>
<td>buttercup-leaf suksdorfdia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PDSHR14Y0</td>
<td>Pansyemone personatus</td>
<td>closed-throated beardtongue</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PMCYP037K0</td>
<td>Carex limosa</td>
<td>mud sedge</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bucks Lake</td>
<td>PMORC00M0</td>
<td>Corallorhiza trifida</td>
<td>northern coralroot</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record</td>
<td>QUADNAME</td>
<td>ELMCODE</td>
<td>SCINAME</td>
<td>COMNAME</td>
<td>FEDSTATUS</td>
<td>CALSTATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>AAABH01050</td>
<td>Rana boylii</td>
<td>foothill yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>AAABH01340</td>
<td>Rana sierrae</td>
<td>Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate Endanger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>ABNKC01010</td>
<td>Pandion haliaetus</td>
<td>osprey</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>ABNKC12060</td>
<td>Accipiter gentilis</td>
<td>northern goshawk</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>AMAJF03010</td>
<td>Gyrfalcon</td>
<td>Gyrfalcon</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>CTT51120CA</td>
<td>Darlingtonia Seep</td>
<td>Darlingtonia Seep</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>NBMUS13010</td>
<td>Brachia bolanderi</td>
<td>Bolander's bruchia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDASTEA020</td>
<td>Oreoctomama elatum</td>
<td>tall alpine-aster</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDDBRA06090</td>
<td>Boechera constancei</td>
<td>Constance's rock-cress</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDAB01010</td>
<td>Brasenia schreberi</td>
<td>watershield</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDAB221A0</td>
<td>Lupinus dalesiae</td>
<td>Quincy lupine</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDLAM180W0</td>
<td>Monardella folletti</td>
<td>Follett's monardella</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDRHA0061</td>
<td>Frangula purshiana ssp. ultramafica</td>
<td>Canbou coffeeberry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDROS0XQ0</td>
<td>Ivesia webberi</td>
<td>Webber's ivesia</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PDSCR1L4Y0</td>
<td>Penstemon personatus</td>
<td>closed-throated beardtongue</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Meadow Valley</td>
<td>PMCYP03C90</td>
<td>Carex scoparia</td>
<td>pointed broom sedge</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sierra Nevada Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog 
(*Rana sierrae* and *Rana muscosa*)

**Threats**

Once the most abundant frog in the Sierra Nevada, the mountain yellow-legged frog is now critically endangered in the Range of Light. Populations of mountain yellow-legged frogs have declined dramatically and they are now found in fewer than 7 percent of their historic localities. This decline is due to a number of factors, including the stocking of fish in high elevation lakes, many of which did not contain fish historically. As a result of these fish stocking efforts, which continue today, more than 90% of Sierra Nevada lakes which were naturally fish-less now contain introduced trout. There is abundant scientific evidence that predation by non-native trout on mountain yellow-legged frog tadpoles, as well as adults, is a major factor in the decline of this amphibian. Other factors leading to declines in population include toxins from pesticides and herbicides, livestock impacts, chytrid fungal infection, and off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation.

**Habitat**

The habitat of the mountain yellow-legged frog consists of glaciated lakes, ponds, tans, springs, and streams in the upper elevations (above 6,000 feet generally) of the Sierra Nevada. The adaptations that allow them to live at these high elevations and cold temperatures have made them highly vulnerable to introduced fish species. The species is usually associated with montane riparian habitats in lodgepole pine, yellow pine, sugar pine, white fir, whitebark pine, and wet meadow vegetation types, and range from southern Plumas County to southern Tulare County.

**Conservation**
Nearly all the remaining populations of mountain yellow-legged frog occur on public lands, and studies have demonstrated that in the absence of disease, it is possible to bring these species back to recovery. Recent surveys, however, have shown an increase in the deadly disease, chytridiomycosis. The Sierra Nevada Framework Plan provides strategies to reduce all the factors causing a decline in mountain yellow-legged frog populations including prohibition of pesticides from frog habitat, removing livestock near lakes and pond areas, prohibiting development of new recreation trails that would affect known frog sites, and the identification of Critical Aquatic Refuges to protect sensitive species. It also calls for the removal of exotic fish from frog habitat. The 2004 revisions to the Framework have weakened the protections for the mountain yellow-legged frog by failing to maintain grazing restrictions for amphibian species in key habitats. A return to a robust monitoring and restoration program as promoted and required by the original Sierra Nevada Framework is vital to protect the species from disappearing from the Sierra Nevada altogether.

Status

Until recently, the mountain yellow-legged frog in the northern and central Sierra Nevada, and those in the mountains of southern California, were thought to be the same species. Today the Sierra Nevada mountain yellow-legged frog—specifically, those frogs north of Mather Pass—is recognized as a unique species, Rana sierrae. The species are thought to have diverged more than 2 million years ago. Both species are critically endangered with extinction. Surveys have shown that 93% of the R. sierrae and 95% of R. muscosa historical populations are now extinct.

In 2003 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) determined that the Sierra Nevada population of the mountain yellow-legged frog should be protected under the Endangered Species Act, but that listing the species under the Act is "warranted but precluded" by the agency's backlog of priorities and budget constraints. Subsequent legal action on behalf of the species resulted in a 2007 USFWS 12-month petition finding (see below, in Supporting Documents) that the mountain yellow-legged frog is still precluded from listing under the Endangered Species Act, basically due to the agency's lack of funds and priority allocation. Such administrative delaying is pushing the species closer to extinction throughout the Sierra Nevada.

On September 15, 2010, the California Fish and Game Commission accepted a petition from the Center for Biological Diversity to list all populations of the mountain yellow-legged frog (Rana muscosa and Rana sierrae) as "endangered" under the California Endangered Species Act. As a result, on October 1 both species were listed as "candidate" species and will be managed as "endangered" until the final decision on whether to list the species is made.

For more information about the mountain yellow-legged frog, visit the mountain yellow-legged frog website of Dr. Roland Knapp, at http://www.mylfrog.info.
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**Supporting Resources**
2007 Finding by USFWS of Warranted but Precluded listing under ESA (69KB PDF)

2006 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruling requiring USFWS to substantiate Warranted but Precluded listing (57KB PDF)

2003 Finding by USFWS of Warranted but Precluded listing (126KB PDF)

2003 Complaint to USFWS challenging delay of listing by Earthjustice on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity and Pacific River Council (139KB PDF)

2000 Petition to USFWS to list as Endangered by the Center for Biological Diversity and Pacific Rivers Council (230KB PDF)

California Department of Fish and Game Natural History Information (URL) --This California state website contains rather limited and old information but is a good basic background composite for the species. Choose from a drop-down list to select the animal you are interested in.
Dramatic decline of native Sierra Nevada frog linked to introduced trout

An adult female mountain yellow-legged frog outfitted with a radio belt for tracking in the Sixty Lake Basin of Kings Canyon National Park. Below: Part of the basin, where UC Berkeley researchers removed trout from several lakes to re-establish native frog populations. (Photos by Vance Vredenburg/UC Berkeley)

Data gathered over seven years by a University of California, Berkeley, researcher have played a key role in convincing the National Park Service and the California Department of Fish and Game to remove trout from some high-altitude lakes in California's Sierra Nevada to save the disappearing mountain yellow-legged frog.

UC Berkeley post-doctoral fellow Vance T. Vredenburg showed that introduced trout have devastated native frog populations over the past 50 years in formerly fish-free high-Sierra lakes, but that removing the fish can allow the frogs to flourish once more.

Vredenburg's study was published this week in the online edition of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

"The mountain yellow-legged frog used to be the most common inhabitant of the high Sierra, but frog populations have declined dramatically enough to put it on the endangered species list," said Vredenburg, who works at the campus's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology. "I'm not saying that other things didn't cause a decline as well, but this report shows that most of the problem came from fish."
Though anglers might resist efforts to remove trout from Sierra lakes, Vredenburg's preliminary data and the results of an earlier survey of Sierra frog populations were critical pieces of evidence that led the park service and Fish and Game to consider that approach, at least on a limited basis.

"People want their trout, but they don't realize what they're getting along with their trout - changed ecosystems, diseases and all sorts of things," noted David Wake, a UC Berkeley professor of integrative biology who organized the first international conference on amphibian decline in 1990.

In a 1915 survey of wildlife in the Sierra Nevada, UC Berkeley biologist and museum director Joseph Grinnell complained that mountain yellow-legged frogs (Rana muscosa) were so abundant that his survey team was stepping on them. Today there are probably fewer than 200 populations of the frogs - perhaps 5,000 adults - in their range from north of Lake Tahoe to below Sequoia National Park, Vredenburg said. (A separate endangered population, and perhaps a distinct species, exists in the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains of southern California.)

Non-native trout dumped into the high-Sierra lakes have been suggested as one cause of the decline, but many biologists dismissed this as improbable, since the trout - rainbow, golden and brown - were introduced more than 100 years ago, while the decline has been noted only since the 1980s. Some biologists even claimed that trout don't eat tadpoles, Vredenburg said.

Vredenburg's study, conducted in a remote and rugged area of Kings Canyon National Park, shows both these assumptions to be false. He noted that, while trout were planted in the fishless high-altitude lakes beginning in the late 1800s, mules carrying fingerlings in milk cans could not reach many lakes because of their remoteness and the lack of trails. Thus, the main habitat of the mountain yellow-legged frog - clear, cold, rocky lakes up to 12,000 feet - remained free of fish.

All that changed when the California Department of Fish and Game began planting fish by airplane in the 1950s and '60s, flying low over thousands of lakes in the Sierra and dumping fingerlings everywhere. Today, some 17,000 lakes in the American west are stocked with fish, while 90 percent of the habitat of the mountain yellow-legged frog is now home to introduced trout.

Vredenburg demonstrated in his study that trout are voracious eaters, quickly decimating the tadpoles in a lake. The delay in the decline of adult frogs is most likely due to the fact that they probably live 10 years or more, so the loss of tadpoles would not produce a dramatic drop in adult frogs for a decade or longer.

As part of his study, he and UC Berkeley undergraduate volunteers removed trout from five lakes and documented a rebound in the frog population in all of them. Three years after trout removal, the frog populations in all five lakes were indistinguishable from populations at lakes that had never seen a trout.

"The response was incredibly dramatic and rapid," Vredenburg said. "Every time you plant hundreds of thousands of fish, you're hammering a nail in the frogs' coffins. But we can certainly do something about it, we can turn the decline around if the political will is there for people to do it. We know it's possible."

"The results are very convincing," Wake said. "The mountain yellow-legged frog has suffered a 90 percent decline in the Sierra, and here is remedial action that can restore the natural populations. There are other problems these populations face, but this immediate problem is solvable."

"Vance's study is fabulous and of tremendous importance," agreed David Graber, senior science advisor to Kings Canyon and Sequoia national parks. He said that the parks are now engaged in a 10-year "management experiment" to see if removing fish from 11 high-elevation lakes will bring back frog populations. So far, with six of the lakes expected to be declared fish free this summer, it seems to be working.
Nevertheless, he admits that doing this broadly in the high Sierra is neither physically nor politically feasible. Many lakes are too large and deep to allow removal of fish without the use of poisons, and fishermen would protest any loss of trout lakes, no matter what the impact on native amphibian populations.

"This is a stopgap. At this point, we are just simply trying to prevent extinction," Graber said. "These frogs have nearly disappeared from the high Sierra, so we're (conducting) a panicked rear-guard action."

There also are other possible causes of frog declines, he said, including a fungus now attacking frogs worldwide and pesticides blowing into high-altitude lakes from the Central Valley.

"We don't want to interfere with recreational fishing, but create reserves to help recover the species," added Harold Werner, wildlife ecologist for the two parks. "We want to give the public options."

Fish and Game also is testing fish removal as a way to help declining frog populations, Werner said, and the National Forest Service is interested in the approach.

Vredenburg began his study in 1996 in the Sixty Lake Basin, a bare, rocky landscape between 10,000 and 11,500 feet in elevation that is a two-day hike from the nearest roadhead. He spent several years, from June until the snows came in October, documenting the fish and frog populations at the more than 60 lakes in the basin, and noticed a trend first established by UC Santa Barbara researcher Roland Knapp in an earlier survey of Sierra lakes.

"I documented a pattern that showed there are lakes with frogs only, lakes with fish only and some overlap, but in the lakes with both fish and frogs, there were very few frogs or tadpoles," he said. "The question was, Why?"

Using gill nets, he and his undergraduate assistants removed trout completely from three lakes and greatly reduced the population in two other lakes. In all lakes, both tadpoles and frogs rebounded within three years to levels found in naturally fish-free lakes.

In three other fish-free lakes, he fenced off a small portion and introduced a few trout along with masses of frog eggs. The trout ate every tadpole in all three enclosures.

"It's clear that trout are largely responsible for the decline of this frog, that they explain a vast amount of the decline," Vredenburg said. "It wasn't until the 1950s and '60s, when Fish and Game began dropping fish out of airplanes, that the landscape really changed. The reason there were no native fish in lakes above 6,000 feet is that they couldn't get there, so when you put them in at the top of the watershed, they swim downstream and really alter the ecosystem."

Vredenburg, who has conducted more than 900 censuses of the frog population at lakes throughout the basin, is continuing his studies of the mountain yellow-legged frog to find out how far the frogs roam, where they breed, and with whom. He has already implanted microchips in 1,200 frogs to enable easy identification, like running a bar code across a scanner, and has outfitted many frogs with radio transmitters.

He also has teamed up with other researchers at the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology and at UC Berkeley's departments of integrative biology and plant and microbial biology to determine the effect of a chytrid fungus, Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis, on the mountain yellow-legged frog. The fungus, which is threatening frog populations around the world, attacks the mouthparts of tadpoles as well as adults, and can kill adult frogs. It was discovered in the Sierra Nevada in 2001.

The research is supported by a grant from the Ecology of Infectious Disease Program that is run jointly by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation, and by the U.S. Geological Survey.

Robert Sanders | Source: UC Berkeley
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MOUNTAIN YELLOW-LEGGED FROG (*Rana muscosa*)

HABITAT USE INFORMATION

General

The mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*) occurs primarily at elevations above 1,800 m (5,940 ft) in the Sierra Nevada from Plumas County to southern Tulare County (Zeiner et al. 1988). In the north, a population in Butte County is separated from the main Sierra group by the Feather River Canyon. In southern California, isolated populations exist on Mount Palomar and in the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto mountains. Mountain yellow-legged frogs are found from 1,380 m (4,500 ft) to over 3,690 m (12,000 ft) in the Sierra Nevada and from 370 m (1,200 ft) to 2,310 m (7,500 ft) in southern California (Zeiner et al. 1988). This species is associated with streams, lakes, and ponds in most montane habitats.

Food

Mountain yellow-legged frogs feed primarily on aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, but they tend to prefer terrestrial insects (Stebbins 1951). Adults have been observed eating tadpoles of the Yosemite toad (*Bufo canorus*) (Mullally 1959), and cannibalism in captivity has been reported (Heller 1960). Tadpoles graze on algae and diatoms along rocky bottoms in shallow water of streams, lakes, and ponds.

Water

Mountain yellow-legged frogs are associated with streams, lakes, and ponds in montane habitats and are seldom found more than two or three jumps from water (Mullally and Cunningham 1956, Stebbins 1985). They prefer lakes or streams with slow to moderate water flow (Mullally and Cunningham 1956; Heller 1960). Tadpoles may require up to three over-wintering periods to complete their aquatic development (Cory 1962).

Cover

In the Sierra Nevada, mountain yellow-legged frogs are associated with streams, lakes, and ponds in montane riparian, lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta* var. *murrayana*), subalpine conifer, and wet meadow habitat types. In southern California, populations are restricted to streams in ponderosa pine (*P. ponderosa*), montane hardwood-conifer, and montane riparian habitats (Zeiner et al. 1988). Streams or lakes with sloping banks and a depth of several centimeters at the water's edge are preferred to those with water that is more than 0.6 m (2 ft) deep at the shore (Mullally and Cunningham 1956). The terrestrial component of their environment is composed of rocks, logs, and vegetation occurring on the bank or protruding from the water. Lakes or streams with gently sloping banks that are covered by conglomerates of rocks 15-61 cm (6-24 in) in diameter are preferred over aquatic habitats with banks covered by sand or large boulders (Mullally and Cunningham 1956). In the San Bernardino Mountains, Mullally (1959) found these frogs exclusively in streams where they exhibited a preference for large, clear pools up to 1 m (3 ft).
deep. Mountain yellow-legged frogs usually crouch on rocks or clumps of grass within a few jumps of water. When disturbed, they dive into water, take refuge under rocks, or rest exposed on the bottom. Less commonly, frogs bury themselves in bottom sediments, and during dry conditions they may use rodent burrows (Stebbins 1985).

Reproduction

At high elevations, mountain yellow-legged frogs breed from May to August depending on local conditions. In southern California, reproduction takes place from March to May (Stebbins 1985). Usually 200 to 300 eggs are laid in shallow water and attached to sedges (Carex spp.), gravel or rocks (Stebbins 1985), but occasionally clusters of up to 500 eggs are found. Tadpoles generally over-winter and mature the next spring (Stebbins 1985). However, at high elevations two or three over-wintering periods may be necessary to complete metamorphosis (Cory 1962).

Interspecific Competition

No studies have been done on the range size of the mountain yellow-legged frog. Typical home ranges for this species are probably less than 10 m (33 ft) in the longest dimension. Occasional movements of up to 50 m (164 ft) may be associated with habitat degradation, where these animals may move to avoid desiccation (Zeier et al. 1988). Males probably defend the area around them during the breeding season, and vocalizations given by males during this season may function as territorial defense (Zeier et al. 1988).

Special Considerations

Recent, dramatic population declines have been reported for mountain yellow-legged frogs in montane environments (Phillips 1990, Bradford 1991). Several factors, both natural and anthropogenic, may in part be responsible for these declines. Extreme climatic conditions at high elevations can cause severe natural population fluctuations of this species (Bradford 1991). Overwintering frogs may die when subjected to oxygen depleted waters in shallow lakes or streams (Bradford 1983). Localized population declines may also result from the predation of metamorphosing tadpoles by Bowd's blackbirds (Euphagus cyanocephalus) (Bradford 1991) and of tadpoles and adults by introduced salmonids (Salmo spp. and Salvelinus spp.) (Cory 1963, Zweifel 1968, Bradford 1980). Red Leg disease caused by the pathogen Aeromonas hydrophila may also cause mass extinction events (Bradford 1991). Acidification by atmospheric deposition of high elevation breeding waters may cause substantial effects such as reduced embryo body size and premature hatching of mountain yellow-legged frog eggs (Bradford et al. 1992). The possible long-term effects of acidification on air borne toxins on the health of frog populations is unclear.

HABITAT SUITABILITY INDEX (HS) MODEL

Model Applicability

Geographic area.

The California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) System (Arda 1988, Meyer and Laidenlager 1988, Zeier et al. 1988) contains habitat ratings for each habitat type predicted to be occupied by mountain yellow-legged frogs throughout California.

Season.
This model is designed as a year-round model for the mountain yellow-legged frog.

Cover types.

This model can be used anywhere in California for which an ARCINFO map of CWHR habitat types exists. The CWHR system contains suitability ratings for reproduction, cover and feeding for all habitats predicted to be occupied by mountain yellow-legged frogs. These ratings can be used in conjunction with the ARCINFO map to model wildlife habitat suitability.

Minimum habitat area.

Minimum habitat area is defined as the minimum amount of contiguous habitat that is required before a species will occupy an area. Specific information on minimum area required for mountain yellow-legged frogs was not found in the literature. Our model assumed two home ranges as the minimum area required to support a mountain yellow-legged frog population.

Verification level.

The spatial model presented here has not been field tested. The CWHR suitability values used are based on a combination of published literature and expert opinion. We strongly encourage field testing of both the CWHR database and this spatial model.

Model Description

Overview.

This model uses CWHR habitat type as the initial factor determining suitability of an area for this species. In addition, proximity to permanent water is used to further constrain suitability. Further spatial modeling was not performed on this species. Our habitat maps had patches smaller than two hectares (5 acres). Many mountain yellow-legged frog home ranges will fit in each habitat patch. If geographic data of a higher resolution were available, this model could be modified to include additional spatial analysis. If the cover value is greater than zero and the cell is close enough to water, it is included as suitable habitat.

CWHR habitat type maps must be constructed in ARCINFO GRID format as a basis for the model. The GRID module of ARCINFO was used for these models because of its superior functionality for spatial modeling. Ordinary spatial modeling is possible in the vector portion of the ARCINFO program module, and the modeling done there would have been impossible without the abilities of the GRID module. In addition to more sophisticated modeling, the GRID module's execution speed is very rapid, allowing a complex model to run in less than 30 minutes.

The following sections document the logic and assumptions used to interpret habitat suitability.

Cover component.

A CWHR habitat map must be constructed. The mapped data (coverage) must be in ARC/INFO GRID format. A grid is a GIS coverage composed of a matrix of information. When the grid coverage is created, the size of the grid cell should be determined based on the resolution of the habitat data and the home range size of the species with the smallest home range in the study. You must be able to map the home range of the smallest species with reasonable accuracy. However, if the cell size becomes too small, data processing time can increase considerably. We
recommend a grid cell size of 30 m (98 ft). Each grid cell can be assigned attributes. The initial map must have an attribute identifying the CWHR habitat type of each grid cell. A CWHR suitability value is assigned to each grid cell in the coverage based on its habitat type. Each CWHR habitat is rated as high, medium, low or of no value for each of three life requisites: reproduction; feeding; and cover. The cover value was used to determine the base value of the cell for this analysis (for this species cover and feeding suitabilities are identical). The geometric mean would have resulted in a base map with no suitable habitat since mountain yellow-legged frogs reproduce only in lacustrine and riverine habitats.

Distance to water.

Mountain yellow-legged frogs require free water. All cells further than 30 m from water received a suitability rating of zero.

Species' distribution.

The study area must be manually compared to the range maps in the CWHR Species Notes (Zeiner et al. 1988) to ensure that it is within the species' range. All grid cells outside the species' range have a suitability of zero.

Spatial analysis.

Ideally a spatial model of distribution should operate on coverages containing habitat element information of primary importance to a species. For example, in the case of woodpeckers, the size and density of snags as well as the vegetation type would be of great importance. For many small rodents, the amount and size of dead and down woody material would be important. Unfortunately, the large cost involved in collecting microhabitat (habitat element) information and keeping it current makes it likely that geographic information system (GIS) coverages showing such information will be unavailable for extensive areas into the foreseeable future.

The model described here makes use of readily available information such as CWHR habitat type, elevation, slope, aspect, roads, rivers, streams and lakes. The goal of the model is to eliminate areas that are unlikely to be utilized by the species and lessen the value of marginally suitable areas. It does not attempt to address all the microhabitat issues discussed above, nor does it account for other environmental factors such as toxins, competitors or predators. If and when such information becomes available, this model could be modified to make use of it.

In conclusion, field surveys will likely discover that the species is not as widespread or abundant as the predictions by this model suggest. The model predicts potentially available habitat. There are a variety of reasons why the habitat may not be utilized.

Application of the Model

A copy of the ARC/INFO macro (AML) can be found in Appendix 1.
To create the HSI Coverage, the first step is to eliminate areas too far from water. If the grid cell is more than 30 m from water it receives a suitability value of zero. All other grid cells retain their original values. Since the home range size of the mountain yellow-legged frog (100 m²) is much smaller than the size of our habitat patches at 2.02 ha (20,235 m²), no additional spatial analysis is necessary.

Problems with the Approach

*Habitat map accuracy.*

The resolution of the CWHR habitat map (2.02 ha) is probably too low to give an accurate assessment of how much area is available to this species.

*Habitat elements.*

Habitat elements are very important to most amphibian species. Without additional information about the distribution of essential elements, suitability maps will typically overestimate actual habitat.

*Element map accuracy.*

Since this model is based almost solely on permanent stream location, it is vital that the stream coverages be accurate. The stream coverages we were provided were accurate at 1 to 250,000. This accuracy is unacceptable. We edited these files to include all water courses identified on 1:24,000 USGS quadrangles. This may still be insufficient since some small permanent streams are not included on these maps.

**SOURCES OF OTHER MODELS**

No other habitat models for mountain yellow-legged frog were found.
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Current Research

I am a field ecologist who uses large-scale observational studies, natural experiments, and field experiments to provide insights into how natural and anthropogenic stressors influence the structure and function of aquatic ecosystems. Addressing these often complex questions in a meaningful way requires expertise from a wide range of scientific disciplines, and most of my current research involves collaborative studies with mathematical ecologists, molecular geneticists, taxonomists, and other field biologists. I am keenly interested in applying our research findings to the management and restoration of aquatic ecosystems in the Sierra Nevada.

Effects of Introduced Fish on Lake Ecosystems

The introduction of predatory fish into naturally-fishless lakes typically results in dramatic changes to species composition and to ecosystem processes such as nutrient cycling. In 1995, I began studying the effects of nonnative trout on Sierra Nevada lake ecosystems and on the ability of these systems to recovery following fish removal. This research involved (1) surveys of amphibians, reptiles, invertebrates, and fish at more than 7,000 lakes and ponds, and (2) a whole-lake fish removal experiment designed to quantify faunal recovery in alpine lakes following removal of nonnative trout. The results of much of this research has been published (see Publications), but I continue to monitor the whole-lake fish removal experiment.

The whole-lake fish removal study was initiated in 1996, and involved the removal of nonnative trout from five lakes that were fishless historically. Changes in vertebrate and invertebrate communities in these lakes are being compared to those in three adjacent trout-containing lakes. The majority of taxa expected to have occupied these lakes prior to fish introduction recolonized within five years of fish removal, but continued monitoring indicates ongoing changes in species composition and densities.
We are now using this experiment to study how trout alter linkages between lake and terrestrial ecosystems. For example, large aquatic insects are abundant in fishless alpine lakes but are virtually eliminated by fish introductions. Research by my colleague, Peter Epanchin, shows that alpine-nesting birds forage preferentially at fishless lakes due to the increased abundance of insects relative to their abundance at fish-containing lakes.

Role of an Emerging Disease in Driving Amphibian Declines

The mountain yellow-legged frog was once one of the most abundant vertebrates in the Sierra Nevada, and occupied thousands of lakes and ponds throughout the range. During the past century, this frog has disappeared from more than 90% of its historic habitat, and is now being considered for listing under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. (For more information about the mountain yellow-legged frog, check out www.mylfrog.info.)

Although introduced trout are undeniably a major cause of this decline, our recent research indicates that an emerging disease is also playing a critically important role. Chytridiomycosis is a disease caused by the amphibian chytrid fungus, *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis*. This recently-described pathogen is causing amphibian declines worldwide, and its effects are particularly severe for amphibians living in montane habitats. In the Sierra Nevada, several amphibian species are known to be infected with chytridiomycosis, and the mountain yellow-legged frog is particularly impacted by this disease. Our research has demonstrated that *B. dendrobatidis* probably arrived in the Sierra Nevada relatively recently, has now spread across most of the range, and is responsible for the recent extinction of hundreds of mountain yellow-legged frog populations.

Although most mountain yellow-legged frog populations crash to extinction following the arrival of *B. dendrobatidis*, some populations survive the crash and subsequently persist with the disease. We are currently using field surveys, field and laboratory experiments, molecular genetic techniques, and mathematical modeling to understand these different disease outcomes (extinction versus persistence). Possible mechanisms include differences in frog susceptibility to chytridiomycosis, differences in pathogen virulence, effects of habitat conditions on susceptibility and/or virulence, and density-dependent disease dynamics.

Taxonomy of Lake-dwelling Fauna

Despite decades of interest by both the general public and scientists in the Sierra Nevada, most of the attention has focused on terrestrial ecosystems. The fauna of aquatic habitats, especially lakes, has remained largely undescribed. Given that detecting future faunal changes requires knowing what species currently occur, we are using morphological keys and DNA markers to identify lake-dwelling taxa to the species level. This is a long-term project that requires collaboration with taxonomic experts because a significant number of collected taxa are unknown to science and will need to be described. In addition, required morphological keys are often outdated and incomplete. For a list of taxa that we have identified to date, see the Lake Fauna page.
Anybody Have a Spare Pond?

The ongoing severe declines of mountain yellow-legged frogs in the Sierra Nevada make it all but inevitable that these populations will eventually be listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. Such a listing will trigger the writing of recovery plans for *Rana sierrae* and *Rana muscosa*, plans that will undoubtedly call for the development of captive breeding programs. If successful such programs could provide frogs for reintroductions back into the wild and for experiments that are critical to our understanding of important issues related to frog conservation.

As I've discussed in previous posts captive breeding has an increasingly important role to play in species conservation programs but because maintaining frogs in artificial environments (e.g., indoor aquaria in zoos) is very labor intensive (think of the time required to feed 100 frogs every day, change their water, and clean their enclosures), this gets expensive in a hurry. A cheaper and potentially more productive route would be to hold frogs in natural or semi-natural ponds outdoors. This would greatly reduce the resources needed to maintain these populations because the frogs could feed themselves. **All we need are some ponds that would provide suitable habitat for mountain yellow-legged frogs. Ideal ponds would be located at elevations above 6000', be deep enough to allow frogs to overwinter (>10 feet), and have reasonable access. Ponds would also need to be surrounded with a frog-proof barrier to ensure that frogs don't wander off.**

If we can't locate such ponds we need to consider constructing them. As I write this I'm staring out the window at my back yard, wondering if maybe we could replace that useless lawn with a frog pond. But seriously, we need to engage any interested agency or member of the public and provide the resources necessary to make this happen. Might there be a national forest ranger district out there with a pond near a district office that could be turned into a frog pond? Are there any private landowners who might be willing to have one of their ponds put to such a use?

If any of you readers have any ideas I'd love to hear them.

Back to [The Mountain Yellow-legged Frog Site](#).
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Back to The Mountain Yellow-legged Frog Site.
In the back of our minds, I think most of us have a picture of what frog habitat looks like, perhaps a warm pond filled with lily pads and logs. Given this preconception, it comes as quite a surprise to see mountain yellow-legged frogs basking by the thousands at lakes in the Sierra Nevada that lie well above timberline, some at elevations as high as 12,000' (3,660 m). How do they survive in these cold, stark conditions?

The fact that frogs are ectothermic, as described in my 4/25/08 post, plays an important role in allowing mountain yellow-legged frogs to flourish at high elevations. Given the cold water and air temperatures even in mid-summer, food requirements are relatively modest, allowing frogs to add the necessary fat reserves to get them through the long winter despite low densities of prey.

Despite the general paucity of food in this harsh environment, food is actually plentiful during short periods and mountain yellow-legged frogs take full advantage of this ephemeral abundance. In early summer (a few weeks after ice-out), mayflies and chironomids ("midge") transform from aquatic larvae into terrestrial winged adults and provide a brief dietary bounty for the frogs. The mayfly, Ameletus edmundsi, thrives in cold, high elevation lakes, and its emergence style makes it particularly vulnerable to frogs. Unlike many mayfly species that emerge well offshore, A. edmundsi crawls up onto a shoreline rock and emerges there. In lakes harboring mountain yellow-legged frog populations, I've watched frogs eyeing A. edmundsi larvae from the second they crawl out of the water and then engulfing the winged adult just as it completes metamorphosis. Midge provide a similar feeding
opportunity for frogs. On windy days, chironomid adults aggregate in mating swarms on the lee side of boulders. Within minutes of these aggregations forming, mountain yellow-legged frogs will arrive and spend hours picking off chironomid adults when they land on the rock to rest.

During late summer, most aquatic insect emergences are over and mountain yellow-legged frogs depend more heavily on terrestrial prey. Anything crawling along the lake shore that fits in their mouths is fair game. I've watched grasshoppers get blown into the water, swim back to shore, and be eaten by a frog as soon as they crawl up onto a shoreline rock. Although mountain yellow-legged frogs generally spend their time right at the lake shore, some take advantage of another food source away from water: ants. Frogs will position themselves along ant trails and pick off the hapless ants as they pass by. The metamorphosis of Pacific treefrogs (Pseudacris regilla) from tadpole to froglet in late summer provides another food source. The froglets don't have the well-developed hopping skills of adults and make easy prey for the much larger mountain yellow-legged frog.

Despite the various tricks that mountain yellow-legged frogs employ to fill their bellies, food is scarce in this high elevation environment, especially when there are thousands of frogs at a lake all competing for the same limited food resource. And yet, these high elevation lakes offer the frogs an important advantage over lakes at low elevations: a lack of snake predators. More about that next week....

Back to The Mountain Yellow-legged Frog Site.
For The Frogs, It Is Still Winter

Here in the eastern Sierra Nevada, signs of spring are everywhere. After a winter during which the only common birds were Mountain Chickadees and Dark-eyed Juncos, a host of birds not seen for months are now in every bush and tree. The aspen and cottonwood trees are clothed in catkins, and the trunks of Jeffrey pines smell strongly of vanilla-scented sap. With all of these reminders that summer is on its way, I've been busy preparing for another field season studying mountain yellow-legged frogs up in the High Sierra. On a warm day down here at 7,000' it's easy to forget that for the mountain yellow-legged frogs in the high country it is still winter and will be for another month.

In the fall when the air turns cold and insect prey becomes scarce, mountain yellow-legged frogs retreat into the deep waters of lakes, coming to shore to sun only on the warmest of days. By late October, the lakes are skimmed with ice and by November or December the landscape is clothed in a thick blanket of snow. For the next seven months, the frogs live underwater in a world of near-freezing temperatures and complete darkness, breathing solely through their skin. Like many amphibians, mountain yellow-legged frogs capture prey primarily with their sticky tongues, but this method doesn't work underwater. So, for these seven months the frogs probably don't feed at all, living solely off of the fat reserves they accrued during the previous summer. Most mammals, including humans, die from starvation after a few weeks without feeding, and yet the mountain yellow-legged frog can survive without food for seven or more months! How do they do it?

This survival ability is a direct consequence of amphibians being ectothermic (often called "cold-blooded"), meaning that body temperature is controlled by factors outside of their bodies (e.g., air or water temperature). Body temperature of ectothermic animals controls metabolism, with body temperature and metabolism being positively correlated. During winter, the body temperature of mountain yellow-legged frogs is near the freezing
point and their metabolism is therefore extremely low. As a consequence, their need for food is also greatly reduced. The mountain yellow-legged frog pushes this ability to survive without food to an extreme seen in few other amphibians. During winters with unusually heavy snowfall, lakes can thaw as late as August and then freeze over again in October. Under these conditions, mountain yellow-legged frogs can be without food for ten months and have only August-October to replenish their fat reserves for the next winter.

When spring finally comes to the high-elevation haunts of the mountain yellow-legged frog, lakes thaw and frogs crawl to shore in search of warmth, mates, and food. What has always amazed me when I've been at a lake during this time is that the frogs aren't particularly skinny. They haven't eaten anything for months and yet they are only slightly less plump than they were the previous fall.

I wish I could go months without eating. That ability would certainly make my backpack a lot lighter during the summer when I'm doing my frog research in the Sierra Nevada backcountry.