

Department of Fish and Wildlife
State Wildlife Action Plan
Comment Matrix

6/27/2014

| Item # | Comment | Commenter | Category | Comment Status | Section | Page # |
|--------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| 1 | Need better law enforcement coordination on poachers. | John Livingston | Enforcement | | | |
| a. | Marajuanal eradication needs to be addressed. | John Livingston | Enforcement | | | |
| b. | Deer herds seem to be stressed/eradicated. Do a survey to assess total/local deer herd size. | John Livingston | Species- Terrestrial | | | |
| c. | Clear cutting is degrading animal habitat throughout the state. How is this being addressed as clearcutting is out of control. | John Livingston | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| d. | Need to increase setback of tree cutting from streams and watercourses to improve habitat for animals and plants. | John Livingston | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| e. | If clearcutting is to continue, private timber companies should have to set aside land permanently as wildlife preserves. | John Livingston | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| f. | Utility corridors need to have wildlife crossings. | John Livingston | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| g. | California boarder with Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, and Mexico should not be just a line on a map and DFW border for purposes of study. Interact with scientists in other states. | John Livingston | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 2 | In the program persented at Eureka, November 13th 2013, I did not see any reference to wildlife viewing. I have included several article I pulled off the internet about the community values of wildlife viewing opportunities. The intrinsic values are through families and education institutes introducing children and students to nature, nature viewing, and respect for the environment and its non-human inhabitants. As CDFW transfers from a hunting and fishing emphasis to a whole-wildlife emphasis, the organization needs to promote wildlife viewing opportunities. (Excerpt only) | Chet Ogan | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| a. | We would like to see community input into locating wildlife viewing opportunities on planned, past, and current wildlife projects. | Chet Ogan | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| b. | The enclosed article encapsulates a real fish and wildlife concern in California. (Excerpt only) | Chet Ogan | Enforcement | | | |
| 3 | Separate the consumptive and recreational uses in the companion plans. They are quite separate. | Bob Schneider | SWAP Document | | | |
| a. | Be sure to coordinate with SWWQCB on illegal water diversion. | Bob Schneider | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| b. | Coordinate with each Regional Water Quality Control Board on water quality issues. The Central Valley Board has a marijuana subcommittee focused on water quality pollutant issues with respect to marijuana grows (I am also a Board member on the Central Valley RWQCB). | Bob Schneider | Coordination/Partnership | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| c. | Central Valley perennial grasslands may actually be California Prairies. | Bob Schneider | SWAP Document | | | |
| 4 | Link to BIOS on webpage | Lori Webber | Miscellaneous | | | |
| 5 | Is it possible to explicitly state somewhere in the SWAP that the document is not intended for regulatory purposes- that the document is merely intended as a vision/recommendation documents. | Brenda Coleman | SWAP Document | | | |
| 6 | A "one size fits all" approach to habitat does not appear to be feasible (different uses of properties...different needs by individual owners...different types of operations on individual properties, etc...). There is an enormous amount of data pointing to the importance of cattle ranching in providing appropriate habitat for species. California Tiger Salamander and California Red-Legged Frog actually have a mutually beneficial symbiotic relationship with managed grazing such that grazing improves habitat for those species. Please take note and respond to the ten bullet points attached from the cattlemens association. (Excerpt only) | Michael Johnson | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| 7 | Alternative to "inappropriate grazing" is adverse grazing practices. | Terah Donoran | SWAP Document | | | |
| 8 | I am happy to see American Beaver listed as a sensitive species and am curious to know how it was designated as such. Currently it is on the Non-native and Nuisance list even though it is native to CA. This is because of a few individuals brought in from ID and WA during the transplant program (when in fact they were brought in from ID and OR- not WA). If you consult the Integrated Taxonomic Information System database (www.classification-itis.gov) you will find that there are no recognized subspecies of Castor canadensis. I am wondering if CDFW will consider removing C. canadensis from the non-native and nuisance list to reflect this and to better protect this sensitive species. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| a. | I wonder too if the CDFW will take into consideration the recommendations set forth in the NOAA CCC Coho Recovery Plan to change beaver management practices and regulations to better protect Coho Salmon. These recommendations suggest: Action 3.1.1.7: Utilize non-lethal methods to manage beaver depredation issues(e.g. Flooding, crop damage) within the range of CCC Salmonids, by methods such as flow devices, fencing, and beaver re-location and enhancing habitat complexity. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| b. | Action 3.1.1.8: Where non-lethal methods prove unfeasible to resolve depredation issues, relocate beaver prpulations to remote CCC coho streams where habitat enhancement is needed and resource conflict is low. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| c. | Action 3.2.1.4: Develop and update a Beaver Management Plan for California to benefit salmonids. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| d. | Action 3.2.1.6: Work with CDFW and the Fish and Wildlife Commission to modify Title 14 of the California code of regulations to prohibit recreational hunting/trapping of beavers within all counties within the NCCC Recovery Domain. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| e. | Action 3.2.1.7: Work with CDFW and the Fish and Wildlife Commission to remove beavers from CDFW's list of depredated animals, and/or authorize only non-lethal management and relocation methods within the NCCC Recovery Domain. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| f. | Action 3.2.1.1: Evaluate the potential and specific locations (e.g. State and Federal lands) for the re-location and re-introduction of beaver populations. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| g. | I believe these actions could be beneficial to protecting beaver as a sensitive species as well as listed species such as coho salmon, steelhead, red-legged frogs and the willow flycatcher. All of those species mentioned have benefit from beaver habitat as has been demonstrated in numerous peer-reviewed studies. I would be happy to furnish any of those studies if that would be helpful. I also have a 4 page PDF that summarizes the beaver recommendatinos found in the NOAA CCC Coho Recovery Plan and would be happy to furnish you with that as well. If you have any questions about where beavers are historically native to in California we published two papers in California Fish and Game Journal in 2012 (Lanman & James 2012 and Lanman et. al. 2012) re-evaluating the historic range of beaver in the Sierra Nevada. We just got our subsequent manuscript accepted by the same journal re-evaluating the historic range of beaver in coastal California. | Kate Lundquist | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| 9 | I will submit written comments on American Badger. Attended scoping meeting in Santa Rosa. Glad I didn't drive to San Leandro. Audience plants coho dominated discussion with non-conservation related issues disappointing. I thought process was, however, well managed by you. I hope comments I submit on American Badger will be helpful to you. Citizen Science-Naturalist with 15 years of experience with the American Badger. Probably the only such experience in the State. My time is more valuable to me than sitting through this meeting beyond 7:40. Thank you. (Glad to see American Beaver in sensitive species). | Susan Kirke | Species- Terrestrial | | | |
| 10 | The plan should include payment for ecosystem services on private lands where desired habitats and species are present. | Stephanie Larson | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 11 | My concern regards maintaining stream flow under changing climate regimes. I am a scientist and study beaver re-introduction. I am interested in talking with CDFW about allowing beaver to re-colonize the forest lands they once inhabited. The resulting wetlands would decrease fire vulnerabiity, improve habitat (aquatic, amphibian, avian, and mammal), and buffer seasonal streamflows. - Oh, and they work cheap. I would be very happy to talk with you. | Jeff Baldwin | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 12 | Do like CDFW-Partner with land ownders. | John Ahmann | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| a. | Graze for biodiversity, fire prevention, wild flowers, wildlife habitat. | John Ahmann | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| b. | CDFW manages one million acres with no rangeland manager. | John Ahmann | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| c. | CDFW is signatory of Rangeland Coalition. Encourage protection of rangelands. | John Ahmann | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| d. | Reduce \$1000 permit fee for stock ponds plus \$100 tax each year. | John Ahmann | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| 13 | Fisheries Strategies. Actions--> Clearing house for stream condition data gathered by all land managers. Habitat conditions | Coleen Shade | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| a. | Acquisitions and Conservation Easements should take into account, in the Sierra, the opportunity to conserve working landscapes with the proper management strategies. Removing these working landscapes in the Sierra impact the social & economic fabric of the already stressed communities. | Coleen Shade | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| 14 | Companion Plans- I think "Air" is also a plan, especially related to prescribed burning to restore fire and habitat resiliency to fire. CARB and USFS have smoke plans that might be too restrictive to implement burns in an effective manner (costs and limited time to burn). | David Fournier | SWAP Document | | | |
| a. | The SWAP could be a facilitator for info sharing among agencies focused on similar resource management. Maybe a monitoring data clearinghouse that could be funded and used by fed, state, and local agencies. | David Fournier | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| b. | I'm concerned about some regulation/policy regarding avoidance measure to protect species (of concern) which can actually contribute to the detriment of the species. For example, navaritia, a flower that needs disturbance (bare soil) including fire, but is avoided when what it actually needs is some disturbance (treatment). | David Fournier | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| c. | I'm also interested in the bibliography. | David Fournier | SWAP Document | | | |
| 15 | Please consider reaching out to ARB to collaborate on conservation actions that would also have greenhouse gas benefits. ARB could be a good ally. State Parks is also a likely ally. I expect you have already coordinated with them, but if not yet, it would be valuable outreach. | Curtis Alling | Coordination/Partnership | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 16 | Thank you. Please inform me of peer review and the next hearing with scientists in the geographical area. I am particularly interested in Karen Miner's targets and scopings, grasslands, riparian habitats, etc. | Tony Tucci | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 17 | Concern that planned dredging rather than restoration will destroy wildlife habitat. | Jeanette Vosburg | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 18 | Please see attached- written before your presentation. Suggestions pertain to water body ecosystems. Please consider what is appropriate for Plan. Ideas focus on expanded participation in stakeholder/interagency taskforces, some you may initiate or lead. Of course, I see from your presentations that Reg. Bd. watersheds cut across the "bands" of ecoregions as you divide the habitats among staff, but task forces can be germane to coasts, riparian valleys, etc. (Excerpt only) | Glenn S. Robertson | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 19 | Riparian habitats- targets/goals/actions are excellent. In particular: collating existing data and disseminating it to land managers (data-->action); enforcing existing laws to protect riparian areas; streamlining permits for riparian restoration projects; tax for problem invasive plants. These actionable targets would benefit conservation regions-wide. Also, "improve engagement in decision-making" for Bays, Lagoons, Estuaries- strongly agree with this target/goal. | Betsy Miller | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| 20 | Most common and operative word: IDENTIFICATION Question: How are stress and threat areas IDENTIFIED AND QUANTIFIED? | Harry Walker | SWAP Document | | | |
| 21 | Coordination with agency action plans was identified. Are you working with other entities developing similar plans such as California Partners in Flight? | Lisa Fields | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| a. | For final publication of document, can there be an interactive map component for the online version? Since there are overlapping HUCs and ecoregions, click on your location of interest and links to all relevant chapters of plan appear as hyperlinks? | Lisa Fields | SWAP Document | | | |
| 22 | Ballona Wetlands- Playa Vista: 3 foot drains are sending storm event rain through 3 foot pipes directly to Ballona Creek and immediately to the Santa Monica Bay. These wer quietly installed 10 years ago. Only recently we discovered the reason for historically wet wetlands being very dry even during storm events. The threat of a dredging plan frightens Ballona advocates. | Jeanette Vosburg | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 23 | We want to encourage the use of the California Department of Public Heath's publication of "Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control" be a component of all projects <u>at the beginning</u> of the projects. Doing this will help reduce pesticide loads! | David Brown | Invasive Species | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| a. | We want an opportunity to be active participants on this project. Mosquito and Vector Control Association of California (MUCAC.org). Thanks! | David Brown | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 24 | Suggest DFW make it clear for upcoming scoping meetings that oral testimony will NOT be accepted so participants will come prepared with written comments. | Anonymous | Miscellaneous | | | |
| 25 | Category on the website dedicated to private landowners on how SWAP will affect them. This will clear up communication. A FAQ area might be useful for private landowners. A video might be helpful as well. | Nestor Espinoza | Miscellaneous | | | |
| a. | State what will happen if there is insufficient funds to complete the plan. | Nestor Espinoza | SWAP Document | | | |
| b. | Educate Ranchers on Grazing through website. Maybe a video? Maybe a fact sheet? | Nestor Espinoza | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| c. | Indicate how population size was found for Grasslands and Riparian Zones. | Nestor Espinoza | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| 26 | I'd like the issue of stream-side grazing addressed in this plan. Issues of pollution by cattle and <u>increased water temperature</u> due to grazing and bank degradation are important and need to be dealt with. Thanks. | Fred M. Anderson | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| 27 | Very important to have certified Range Management input for your plans relative to grazing and private lands. | Royce Larsen | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| a. | Can't do research with CDFW funds and keep the trust of private landowners because of the requirement to give specific locations and allowing access by CDFW. | Royce Larsen | Miscellaneous | | | |
| b. | Need to use recent science for all planning documents. | Royce Larsen | SWAP Document | | | |
| c. | Very important to have the plan "Peer Reviewed" outside of CDFW. | Royce Larsen | SWAP Document | | | |
| 28 | We are private property owners and long-time cattle ranchers. We attended the SWAP scoping meeting in San Luis Obispo on October 25,2013,and expressed to you our primary concern that the SWAP plan should include no authorization to manage, attempt to manage, or regulate the private use of private property. We were glad to hear you respond that, "we have no authority to go onto private land or dictate how owners manage their land." The preliminary document's reference to managing at "ecosystem scale" should be clarified so that it applies only to that property where CDF&W has jurisdiction. We respectfully request that you make certain that is clearly expressed in a final document. | Richard &Susie Snedden | SWAP Document | | | |
| a. | If the CDF&W receives the desired SWAP federal funding, we recommend that the money be spent towards: Control of the mountain lion population -lion numbers have compounded- they have moved out of their natural ranges and are causing predation losses and threats to human safety | Richard &Susie Snedden | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| b. | Increasing rancher permits to address the Tule elk/ feral pig encroachment and ensuing damage to ranch infrastructures and forage | Richard &Susie Snedden | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| c. | Expose and work to cease Illegal marijuana grows/drug manufacturing on public lands that endanger the public, pose a wildfire threat and contaminate resources | Richard &Susie Snedden | Enforcement | | | |
| d. | Establish economically viable livestock grazing programs on CDF&W land so that catastrophic events like the Mt. Diablo fire can be avoided. | Richard &Susie Snedden | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| e. | Sell CDF&W lands that are not being managed back into private ownership and prioritize management for the remaining CDF&W land | Richard &Susie Snedden | Miscellaneous | | | |
| f. | We respectfully request that you recognize livestock grazing as an essential habitat tool and not a threat. Livestock grazing is key in mitigating the potential for wildfires that can cause harm to life, air and property. Experts have also recognized that herding animals play a beneficial role in brittle environment stability and productivity. Cattle hooves break up and loosen crusted soils and trample down old plant parts, thereby creating mulch and an ideal seed bed, allowing water to penetrate. Cattle also fertilize the soil through deposits of urine and manure. Cattle grazing encourages plant diversity when cattle graze down the taller aggressive plants, preventing them from shading out and overpowering more vulnerable plants- diversity which benefits the wildlife in the biological chain. The Bitter Creek National Wildlife Refuge in southwest Kern County is a prime example of how the removal of cattle grazing has led to the establishment of a monoculture of plant life. A BLM biologist referred to it, fittingly, as "a weedy mess." It is appropriate to reference in your plan that no-grazing and/or undergrazing can have adverse impacts on wildlife and their essential needs. | Richard &Susie Snedden | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| 29 | <p>The Bay Area Open Space Council appreciates the chance to comment on the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) 2015 Update. The Council collaborates with land trusts, public agencies and conservation organizations to set and execute a conservation vision for the San Francisco Bay Area. For the past 23 years, we have been working regionally to protect the land, connect people to land, and convene efforts to steward parks, trails, and agricultural lands.</p> <p>We applaud the work on the SWAP Update. The State Wildlife Grants Program is important for habitat protection and Wildlife Action Plans are used to prioritize support for species of "greatest conservation need." The 2015 SWAP Update is being prepared in light of several new conservation initiatives; and yet the Update fails to refer to a few important initiatives. The SWAP will leverage resources and be much stronger if the Plan utilizes regional conservation plans and data. We request that the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DWF) recognize, integrate, and reference the following science-based regional conservation data within the SWAP 2015 Update:</p> <p>(1) The Conservation Lands Network (2) Critical Linkages: Bay Area and Beyond (3) Terrestrial Biodiversity and Climate Change Collaborative (TBC3) data</p> | Jenn Fox | SWAP Document | | | |
| a. | <p>In particular, the Bay Area has the established and recognized Conservation Lands Network, a collaborative five-year science-based study that identifies the most essential lands in the Bay Area needed to sustain biological diversity. The Conservation Lands Network and accompanying conservation plans will aid in the development of relevant regional targets, particularly in the North-Coast, Central California Coast, Central California Coast Ranges, and San Francisco Bay Delta Regions. While it is difficult to scale-up finite data developed locally and regionally, the DFW can utilize-and at a minimum, reference-the Conservation Lands Network, and the Bay Area Critical Linkages report, and the TBC3 data to better define regional conservation targets and to strengthen the SWAP Companion Plans.</p> | Jenn Fox | SWAP Document | | | |
| b. | <p>We commend the Department of Fish and Wildlife in its effort to acknowledge climate change uncertainty in the conservation strategies of the SWAP. Relying on national and state scale data, again, limits the relativity of the conservation strategies. The TBC3 data- to be published in December 2013- could directly inform those strategies. We also encourage that the Department of Fish and Wildlife leverage and invite regional and organizational expertise while drafting each of the Companion Plans. The GIS data for these efforts can be downloaded at www.bayarealands.org. Additional research is available through the Bay Area Ecosystems Climate Change Consortium www.baecccc.org.</p> | Jenn Fox | Coordination/Partnership | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>We also encourage the DFW to be more specific in their use and definition of the term "inappropriate grazing." While over-grazing can be a threat to some wildlife habitat, there are many cited studies with evidence that grazing can enhance wildlife habitat (e.g., Marty, J.T. 2005; Pyke, C.R. 2005; Weiss, S.B. 1999.) We suggest the SWAP acknowledge the value of grazing, and the ecological co-benefits that rangelands provide to wildlife, when designating grazing as a threat.</p> | Jenn Fox | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | |
| 30 | <p>SWAP Intentions are admirable as are the objectives. However, if there are no "teeth" in the final product- i.e. no way to enforce the proposed solutions to problems, and if "action" is only "voluntary" then I don't think the project will succeed in proportion to the dollars spent.</p> | Benjamin R. Taylor | Miscellaneous | | |
| a. | <p>Also, I see a lot of overlap of jobs that already exist in the present DFW organization. Unless there is <u>very close</u> coordination and cooperation between the SWAP project people and DFW field personnel.</p> | Benjamin R. Taylor | Coordination/Partnership | | |
| b. | <p>Lastly- who resolves recommendations that may result in criticism of current procedures being followed/conducted by existing field personnel of DFW?</p> | Benjamin R. Taylor | Miscellaneous | | |
| 31 | <p>I feel your job is to do what is best for fish and wildlife that is related to the preservation of the human population. More fish are killed by catch and release then if you would set a limit for human consumption. Your job is not taking taxpayer's money going to meetings that environmentalists are doing anyway. Dirt didn't hurt the fish in the fifties from logging, so why are you restricting it now? There were more fish then. People should be able to cut the burnt trees which breed bugs that kill the forrest and animals. People on roads kill more deer and wildlife than anything else. Slow these people down. Oil and chips on the roads for ice and etc. runs into rivers and creeks and hurts more fish than people. They should be using sand. In your job you should be working with the common man not <u>environmentalists</u>!</p> | Vernon Rylee | Goals and Objectives | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 32 | <p>It should be noted that despite Federal, State and local laws and zoning policies, there are few restrictions on development or degradation of lower elevation riparian areas as well as riparian areas within the active channel. Every year the Russian River loses more of it's riparian areas and this summer we have documented roughly 7 acres of low elevation riparian areas in the floodway zoning designation that have been stripped of vegetation under the auspices of pest control for agriculture, event spaces for private homes and wineries and other uses. Besides the well documented benefit to wildlife and listed fish species, healthy riparian buffers provide a host of benefits to humans such as reducing pollutants in stormwater, reducing property damage from flooding and helping preserve higher groundwater levels in alluvial valleys. Every climate change scenario tells us we can expect more extreme weather such as more prolonged droughts and higher flood peaks. Preserving healthy riparian areas and vegetation helps naturally stabilize banks with tree roots and captures flood debris that could damage vineyards and other property, and is our lowest cost strategy to deal with more violent floods in the future. conclusion we encourage the State Action Plan to prioritize actions that can protect remaining riparian areas and find opportunities to increase riparian area buffers where they are inadequate to support our listed fish species and the thousands of plants and animals species that depend on healthy functional riparian areas for their existence. Protecting riparian areas will also provide benefits to property owners by increasing property protection and to the people of California by reducing water quality problems and conserving our native plants and wildlife. (Excerpt only)</p> | Kate Wilson | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 33 | <p>Ballona Creek is a type of highly polluted urban channelized creek that should <u>not</u> be opened upn into the Ballona Wetlands. It sounds "nice & restore" to natural areas, but it has a lot of toxic runoff and is the biggest polluter of Santa Monica Bay. So Heal the Bay supports Ballona being an "end of the line" clean up basin for all the toxics so that Santa Monica Bay will be cleaner.</p> | Kathy Knight | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| a. | <p>A dog & cat shelter and veterinary clinic is <u>not</u> recreation for a wildlife ecological reserve. It is <u>not</u> the reason that wildlife habitats like the Ballona Ecological Reserve are acquired by the public. The Annenberg Foundation should <u>not</u> be allowed to build a 46,000 sq. ft. facility like this on a rare wildlife habitat. We only have less than 5% of our coastal wetland ecosystems left on the California coast- every square foot is critical to preserve for wildlife and native flora. Thank you for listening.</p> | Kathy Knight | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 34 | <p>The State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) focuses on agriculture as being a negative impact to the riparian habitat in the Central Valley region, but fails to recognize how much habitat the industry provides to the native animals and plants living in the region. Without farming and ranching, there would be far less wildlife habitat in the Central Valley.</p> | Courtney Sorensen | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| a. | <p>The impact of marijuana cultivation and its environmental effects on the wildlife habitat in the Central Valley is not mentioned once in the SWAP update and is an issue that needs to be addressed.</p> | Courtney Sorensen | Enforcement | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| b. | Instead of focusing solely on regulatory solutions, SWAP should make a solid effort on its collaborating and outreach with DFW, private landowners and local organizations in the Central Valley to find appropriate solutions. | Courtney Sorensen | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| c. | SWAP should change it's focus onto ecosystems rather than trying to manage a single species. More often than not, when efforts are made to help a specific species other problems are created for other wildlife habitats that will also need to be fixed later. | Courtney Sorensen | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| 35 | Thanks for the Scoping Meeting in San Luis Obispo which gave us an opportunity to voice our concerns. First and foremost- If you really want the cooperation of landowners you must stop thinking of grazing as a threat. Rather, you need to consider and list all the positive aspects that grazing provides to wildlife management. | Ray Allen | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| a. | Second: Avoid a narrow focus when protecting a species. For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. | Ray Allen | SWAP Document | | | |
| b. | Third: Seek input (review) from Certified Range Managers. | Ray Allen | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| c. | Fourth: Before a specific ecosystem is targeted for habitat, input from local landowners should be sought. | Ray Allen | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| d. | Fifth: CDFW has no business being a landowner | Ray Allen | Miscellaneous | | | |
| e. | Sixth: The 63 (43?) districts that submitted their priorities should go back to their local ranching community for specific input. | Ray Allen | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 36 | REPEAT OF 18 | Glenn S. Robertson | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 37 | I just wanted to tell you that your SWAP Scoping Meeting that you had in Fresno was very informative. You did a good presentation. I have a question about sensitive species: I was wondering who sets the criterion for deciding what species are sensitive to a particular habitat and what those criteria are. | Hal Stainbrook | Miscellaneous | | | |
| 38 | Our organizations understand the SWAP is a requirement of the US Fish and Wildlife Service in order for the state to receive federal wildlife funds which are approximately \$3 million per year that assist in the state's wildlife conservation efforts. However, we would like to have a better understanding regarding the intention of the companion plans to the SWAP. The limited discussions to date portray the plans to be creating a list of desired operation and management practices for a plethora of activities throughout the state. Our organizations have some preliminary concerns as it relates to the need, role and utilization of the proposed companion plans. We hope to learn through continued discussion that our concerns that the companion plans may become quasi regulatory documents are unfounded. It is our understanding the 2005 SWAP was successful in obtaining the federal funding without benefit of the companion plans and would appreciate your edification of the companion plans' intent. In closing, our organizations look forward to participating in the development of the SWAP over the coming months and gaining a better understanding of the intent and need for the companion plans. In the meantime, please feel free to contact us with any questions or comments on this matter. | Nick Konovaloff | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 39 | Please speak faster. Reduce the # of words by 50%. Then your presentation will take a more appropriate amount of time and will be a lot less frustrating to sit through. | Anonymous | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| a. | Do not expect people to sit 6-9 pm without dinner. Alternatives include different hours, provide appropriate refreshments (not Safeway cookies), invite participants to bring their own food, and be sure the venue and announcements allow for food to be eaten before or during the presentations. Get a grant or partner to fund refreshments like hummus, veggie sticks, broccoli flowerheads, olives, nuts, crackers, cheese, fruit, and other healthy choices. Caffeine at the end of a day is not a good choice; hot water for tea is better. | Anonymous | Miscellaneous | | | |
| b. | Public comment should be written on cards for a moderator to sort through and not ask them all. All presentations should be made before the 1st question is asked, so that the presenters/presentations are not given short shift. | Anonymous | Miscellaneous | | | |
| 40 | Interested in working on Companion Plans in regards to agriculture, forest, and rangelands. | John Austel | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 41 | Counties are best suited to play this advocacy role in wildlife policy. We are the level of government most accessible to the rural public where the vast majority of habitat issues arise. We run into our constituents daily at the market, the gas station, restaurants, school functions and church. Unlike state and federal agencies and legislators, we don't have the luxury that distance affords in isolating us from the frustration and ire of the voting public. Thus counties can serve as strong advocates for the public in developing the compromises requisite in 21st century wildlife policy. We are not claiming that Siskiyou County or any county is qualified to manage wildlife. Rather, we are qualified to insure that the human element of the equation does not get lost in wildlife policy implementation. The SWAP should incorporate county input not as an illusory bone tossed to placate political formality, but as a substantive factor in assuring to the greatest degree possible that the goals of SWAP meet the standards of human well-being spoken of in its Open Standards policy. (Excerpt only) | Michael N. Kobseff | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 42 | [Response to "How can the Wildlife Action Plan be revised to assist your organization with carrying out your mission?"]: Dynamic habitat distributed across the landscape; native species only. (Excerpt only) | Steve Brink | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| a. | [Response to "How can you lend your knowledge, expertise, and time to the revision process?"]: Forests | | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 43 | Despite urgent calls to inform national, regional, and state planning efforts, there remains a critical need to develop practical approaches to identify where important lands are for landscape connectivity (i.e., linkages), where land use constrains connectivity, and which linkages are most important to maintain network-wide connectivity extents. We are asking that the Department identify these vital habitat linkages and corridors in the 2015 SWAP and elevate the importance of their preservation, sharing this information with all management agencies, specifically with Region 5 of the US Forest Service. | Kimberly Baker | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| a. | <p>The number and duration of listing for at risk species in California is alarming. Many species have been at risk for decades. From our experience, in the work and involvement in pacific northwestern national forests, public lands and with large corporate land holders we are greatly concerned at the limited amount of knowledge on population numbers, especially when compared to the amount of forest extraction and habitat degradation that has and is currently taking place. Specifically, we are greatly concerned with the lack of population information of the Pacific fisher and Humboldt marten and lack of current Northern Spotted Owl information. Out of hundreds of timber sales on our national forest we know of only one project that instituted surveys for the fisher, despite requirements from forest plans. Because so much habitat has been disturbed, degraded and removed we do not have adequate data to know where populations are or if these populations are viable or continue to decline. We are asking that the Department prioritize regional surveys and collaborate with other agencies to determine the locations and actual population number estimates.</p> | Kimberly Baker | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| b. | <p>As you may be aware, illegal marijuana agriculture is devastating our forests, water and wildlife. One of the largest problems with illegal agriculture is toxic rodenticides. We are asking that the Department make an official and public show of support for banning super toxic rodenticides and other poisons for sale in California. Further, the SWAP revision should acknowledge and include all of the negative effects that unregulated marijuana agriculture is having in our watersheds, including, impacts to water resources, land conversion and affected wildlife species.</p> | Kimberly Baker | Enforcement | | | |
| c. | <p>The ecological costs of livestock grazing are extreme. By destroying vegetation, damaging wildlife habitats, spreading noxious weeds and disrupting natural processes, grazing wreaks havoc on water quality, riparian areas, rivers, deserts, native plants, grasslands and forests - causing significant harm to species and ecosystems. Please acknowledge the detrimental impacts that grazing is having on our natural resources and wildlife species in the revised SWAP. Prioritize influencing; future USFS land management plan revisions (in regards to grazing) legislation and education of Region 5 USFS land managers, especially in order to enforce the Clean Water Act.</p> | Kimberly Baker | Conservation Strategies- Rangelands | | | |
| d. | <p>Please accentuate the vital importance of the preservation of California's forests as a connected landscape in terms of climate change in the SWAP revision.</p> | Kimberly Baker | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| e. | <p>In northwestern California a majority of the land and high quality habitat is within management of the US Department of Agriculture, Region 5 of the US Forest Service (USFS). It is imperative the upcoming National Forest Land Resource Management Plan revisions reflect and incorporate the SWAP. Please help make this possible. It is our view that in order to change the tide of species decline it is essential that all land and water managers get on the same page and work towards a more collaborated effort. (Excerpt only)</p> | Kimberly Baker | Coordination/Partnership | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 44 | <p>Feral pigs occupy all counties in the State of California and cause significant impacts to native habitat annually. They are not native to the state yet they are treated by CDFW as a game species making it very complicated for land managers to treat them as invasive species and target them for eradication. While State Parks has an MOU with CDFW to take pigs which cause damage to State Park lands the Department advocates streamlining the process by which other land owners or open space land managers can apply for and maintain a feral pig depredation permit.</p> | Ken Kietzer | Invasive Species | | | |
| a. | <p>Especially in Southern California human caused wildfires are occurring more frequently than they would under natural conditions and this is causing type conversion from native habitat types to nonnative annual types. Many of these human caused fires originate along roads, including major freeways such as the 91, Santa Ana Freeway. When CDFW is participating in planning efforts evaluating freeway expansion State Parks advocates that some element of fire hardening be carefully evaluated along road sides to help reduce the total number of fire starts occurring along these major arteries.</p> | Ken Kietzer | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| b. | <p>State Parks supports the proposal to promote naturally functioning riparian systems. Flood control projects are all too often in direct conflict with this armoring, channelizing and damming river systems. While providing for public safety, State Parks advocates working closing with flood control agencies to develop and manage naturally functioning riparian systems which support diverse species assemblies and seeking alternaives to projects that would otherwise constrict and reduce the natural function of the state’s riparian systems.</p> | Ken Kietzer | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| 45 | <p>I heard on Capitol Public radio about your 2015 assessment and plan for species, and that F & G wants to resort to ecosystem protection because as species become rare, they become to costly to protect. I want to submit comments to you about it, particularly the issue sof wet & dry deposition, the cocktail effects of endocrine disruptors in the environment and endangerment that may result to species reproduction from these chemicals. I need to know when and where to send the comments, length and format, and I will want to include a large bibliography of peer-reviewed studies. Sadly, it is customary for experts to ignore this threat in their assessments, like the Forest service ignored the impact of EDC's on the dwindling fisher populations in national forests of california. I want to include this message about EDC's in the scoping, how do I do it. This morning i went to your website, and the IE came back with a pop-up that told the website could not be found.</p> | Bud Hoekstra | Miscellaneous | Responded on 10/24 via e-mail at 9:04 am | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 46 | <p>We see the 2005 document repeatedly asserts that residential development is the basis of the State's wildlife ills. The presentations at the October 15 workshop made a similar assertion. We are concerned this assertion may be used to justify policies that also affect operation and maintenance of flood protection and water conservation facilities to the extent that they would result in increasing Los Angeles County residents' exposure to flood and fire hazards. We are also concerned the assertion would be used to attack not only the residents' imported water supply but also their local water supply. We are concerned that CDFW seeks to base dam operation, water diversion, and flood channel policies with what appears to be an inaccurate understanding of: Los Angeles County's natural hydrologic and sediment transport regime; how the County's flood protection and water conservation facilities came about; the nature of dam operations in the County; and the adverse impacts of proposed policies on the health, safety organizations look forward to participating in the development of the SWAP over the coming months and gaining a better understanding of the intent and need for the companion plans. In the meantime, please feel free to contact us with any questions or comments on this matter. can protect remaining rip</p> | Pat Wood | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| a. | <p>Also in regards to the need for consistency in recommendations, we agree with the 2005 document's assertion that <i>tamarisk</i> and <i>arundo donax</i> should be removed because these invasive non-native species consume prodigious amounts of water. However, in its designation of critical habitat for the southwestern willow flycatcher the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service dismisses this impact, and in fact makes statements that appear to express a desire to interfere with removal of tamarisk located within critical habitat for this species. We are concerned that CDFW overstates the role of residential development and understates that of recreational users in regards to adverse impacts to the State's wildlife resources, especially in regards to fires and the introduction and spread of invasive species.</p> | Pat Wood | Invasive Species | | | |
| b. | <p>In recommending non-governmental organizations and "citizen biologists" (as advocated by some of the attendees at the October 15 workshop) to inventory and evaluate sensitive habitat, we believe these volunteers need to ensure they do not themselves damage the resources they want to protect (e.g., the spread of the mud snail infestation in the Santa Monica Mountains). Infrastructure entities and residential developments should not have to shoulder all of the blame for the introduction and spread of invasive species.</p> | Pat Wood | Invasive Species | | | |
| c. | <p>The 2005 document recommends that public land managers protect wildlife habitat linkages on public lands. We believe CDFW needs to make it easier for these managers to get mitigation credits for these efforts. To offset the cost of protection, CDFW should make it easier for owners of public lands to either sell those credits or use them towards any project they undertake, regardless of the project's location in relation to the land being protected.</p> | Pat Wood | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Based on these concerns, we request CDFW's SWAP Team notify us of any workshops discussing water, channel maintenance or flood protection. We believe CDFW's SWAP Team needs to consult water supply and flood protection stakeholders that hold adjudicated water rights and/or perform dam operations. (Excerpt only) | Pat Wood | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 47 | Instead of writing on the comment sheets this is a reminder to include unlawful marijuana cultivation as a human related detrimental activity for riparian areas in almost all water sheds. | John Baker | Enforcement | | | |
| 48 | Full disclosure (honesty) from all parties is of primary importance, even in an era where everybody lies to enhance and protect their position. SWAP recommendations should address that which is realistically (budgetarily) sustainable. As climate change takes center stage (maybe), aligning ourselves with that which is inevitable rather than trying to hold it back is arguably appropriate (the expansion of pinyon and juniper ranges for example, the extirpation of species lower on the food chain than cattlemen, for another). (Excerpt only) | Steve Dickinson | Miscellaneous | | | |
| 49 | While considering the SWAP and re-alignment of CA's wildlife management plan I would like to suggest that the committee serious take into consideration a re-evaluation of the A zone deer hunting region. Especially in the areas north of highway 20 and east of Willits, in the shadows of Sand hedrian mountain. The current line is difficult to enforce, lends itself to poaching and is unfair to the deer population in that area. It may be worth considering. I have previously suggested that fish and game consider the movement of this small north boundary area to the south potentially to the intersection of highway 20 and highway 101 then east. Then from highway 20 Consider using the Potter valley paved road up to Lake Pillsbury as a much clearer boundary and more reflective of the higher altitude and deer in this region. The deer west of Willits and south of highway 101 often go hard horned and deep into the brush much earlier than the deer at these higher elevations. As a result the deer in the higher elevaDepartment prioritize regional surveys and collaborate with other agencies to determine the locations and actual population number estimates. ost | Dustin Destruel | Species- Terrestrial | Responded on 11/21 via e-mail at 3:46 pm | | |
| 50 | Hi, I just wanted to say thanks for inviting us to the meeting last night. Nicole and Joel, from our Strategic Habitat Conservation Team, was also there along with Eric Nelson from the Refuge. Great presentations, organization etc and it was really informative. I will work with Nicole and others to provide comments in the near future from our folks here. Thanks again!!!! | Paula Golightly | Coordination/Partnership | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 51 | <p>I understand that Clear Lake will be considered its own ecoregion and the specialist responsible for Clear Lake is Jeanine Phillips. As far as local government, my department, Water Resources, manages Clear Lake, and will be the main point of contact for Jeanine. With regard to Clear Lake, I was pleased to hear that all tributaries to Clear Lake will be considered as part of the Clear Lake ecoregion. Does this include parts of the tributaries that are currently upstream of Clear Lake hitch barriers? Will the Clear Lake ecoregion be considered as if the hitch is an endangered species or a species of special concern? Will SWAP be communicating with the Chi Council, Lake County's authority on the Clear Lake hitch? Their website is http://lakelive.info/chicouncil/. Who is the specialist responsible for the serpentine habitat? The Lake County authority on serpentine habitat is the UC Davis McLaughlin Reserve, Cathy Koehler or Paul Aigner. Are Land Trusts featured in the SWAP with respect to conservation of habitats? How can CDFW support land and water conservation easements?</p> | Carolyn Ruttan | SWAP Document | Responded via e-mail on 1/13/14 at 5:57 PM | | |
| a. | <p>Will SWAP consider effects to wildlife, from illegal marijuana growing, as threats? I'm thinking of fertilizer use, pesticide use, and trash dumping. Lake County seems to be one of the most desirable counties for marijuana growing and so these threats are significant here. Will the SWAP consider the removal of illegal dams on waterways, constructed for the purpose of marijuana growing, a threat to the downstream ecosystem?</p> | Carolyn Ruttan | Enforcement | Responded via e-mail on 1/13/14 at 5:57 PM | | |
| b. | <p>Lake County has probably more abandoned mercury mine sites, including a superfund site, than any other County. Will mercury mine sites be considered as a threat?</p> | Carolyn Ruttan | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | Responded via e-mail on 1/13/14 at 5:57 PM | | |
| c. | <p>Plants that become invasive species have, in the past, come up against Weed Management Areas, WMAs, local groups of very often passionate volunteers, but also a funding source, that wish to eradicate or control invasive weeds. WMAs have to a large part been disbanded because of lack of funding, so invasive plant species have suddenly reared their ugly head. Where an invasive species was thought to have been eradicated and put on monitoring status, or have been controlled and put on maintenance status, there is no more monitoring or maintenance. Invasive species' populations are reappearing and growing in size. The lesson to be learned from this is, one season's eradication or control can be useless without the follow up for years after. I'm hoping that the lack of funding for WMAs will be considered as a threat to dealing with invasive plant species.</p> <p>When discussing quagga and zebra mussels, is it possible to consider California water bodies in three categories? 1) Infested water bodies requiring control and/or eradication efforts and the necessity to decontaminate boats leaving those water bodies. 2) Uninfested waterbodies, confirmed uninfested by recent veliger tows, requiring prevention efforts. 3) Uninfested water bodies that are not monitored, cannot be confirmed uninfested, requiring monitoring and the necessity to decontaminate boats leaving those water bodies.</p> | Carolyn Ruttan | Invasive Species | Responded via e-mail on 1/13/14 at 5:57 PM | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| d. | How will the enforcement arm of Fish and Wildlife, game wardens, be brought into the SWAP conversation at a local level? I would recommend that all game wardens are given an invitation to comment on their local issues, and to hear from SWAP your goals and objectives. Now SWAP has entered the public comment period, this will be particularly useful for the local communities that see game wardens as their connection to CDFW, and it would be helpful to the enforcement division, to know in very general terms what you hope to accomplish for the State's fish and wildlife. | Carolyn Ruttan | Enforcement | Responded via e-mail on 1/13/14 at 5:57 PM | | |
| 52 | Planning Staff would like to understand how the SWAP will either: (1) interact with or complement the Eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS), (2) supersede the EACCS or (3) not interfere with the EACCS and /or HCPs, whichever of those options is appropriate. (Excerpt only) | Bruce Jensen | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 53 | Thanks to you and your team for hosting a helpful scoping meeting on Tuesday at the San Leandro Library! I was very glad to learn that the 2015 update will incorporate more strategies around collaboration, and a greater focus for ecosystem based habitat conservation. I'm following up regarding my inquiry (and offer) around DFW using local and regional data within respective Conservation Unit strategies. Specifically, the Conservation Lands Network (CLN) and the Bay Area Critical Linkages may prove useful to DFW in this process. Please note, too, that the CLN web tool, called "Explorer" is an easy way for your staff to download and access this data, as well as climate change data for the Bay Area region. Please visit www.bayarealands.org to download all the GIS and datasets. And feel free to contact me if we can aid in any way! I will gladly direct your staff to my colleagues leading these data efforts. | Crystal Simons | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 54 | Based on information on the DFW website and the staff presentation (Oct 16, 2013 – San Diego), the overall goals/objectives of the Plan (create a vision for fish and wildlife conservation, account for accomplishments since 2005, update species-at-risk and species of concern lists, identify threats and stressors affecting the planning units, recommend actions that are implementable, measurable and time-bound, etc.) appear to address the federal SWAP requirements. | William Tippetts | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| a. | The staff presentation stated that the previous (2005) SWAP identified approximately 800 species of concern, but the 2015 update will identify approximately 380 species of concern. The proposed list of species, and the criteria used to develop that list are not provided on the DFW SWAP website. When will that information be made available and is how would species be added or deleted from the list? | William Tippetts | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| b. | <p>The proposed Approach to be used in the SWAP is to develop Conservation Strategies and to identify/implement conservation actions that “eventually” improve the condition of the ecosystem...within and ecoregion, watershed or marine study region. The term “eventually” was described by staff as “within a 10-25 year timeframe.” If the Plan is going to include strategies and actions for implementation over that period, then it should also clearly differentiate which strategies and actions will be instituted in the immediate (presently or within 1-2 years from approval of the Plan), near-term (3-5 years) and long-term (6-10+ years). Because the Plan has to be updated at least every 10 years and, according to DFW staff, also will have a continuous update component, the Plan should clearly identify why any strategies and actions that are not expected to be implemented or have a demonstrable effect during the 10-year time frame of this update are included in the Plan.</p> | William Tippets | SWAP Document | | | |
| c. | <p>The basic segregation of the planning units into ecoregions (terrestrial species), hydrological units (aquatic species) and marine study areas (marine species) is reasonable. Parts of the state have implemented NCCP/HCPs that incorporate terrestrial and aquatic habitats and species. How will the SWAP address those areas with implemented NCCP/HP plans? For example, if the SWAP identifies certain vegetation communities or species as important to comport with SWAP goals/directives and that are also addressed in approved plans, will the SWAP defer to the priorities and actions outlined/committed to in those plans? This also has potentially significant bearing on how DFW would prioritize its SWAP projects and funding: would SWAP place greater emphasis on projects/funding in areas with active NCCP/HCP plans or would it consider those areas as having less need for SWAP-based funding?</p> | William Tippets | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| d. | <p>The staff presentation identified “Statewide Strategies” that it has deemed to be consistently important concerns across (most of) the state. The identified statewide strategies are quite varied and represent species groups (anadromous fishes, invertebrates, plants), threats (pollution, invasive species) and administrative/funding concerns (law enforcement). How will the Plan provide guidance at the statewide level and that can be applied at the planning unit level so that each of these can be effectively (and equitably) translated into conservation actions? It isn’t clear how the Plan anticipates these strategies will be implemented in each planning unit. Are the planning units expected to prioritize projects and funding that directly address problems for which these strategies have direct applicability?</p> | William Tippets | SWAP Document | | | |
| e. | <p>The staff presentation also identified a number of “Companion Plans” that appear to focus on certain human-driven activities that affect species and habitats. What is the relationship between the Statewide Strategies and Companion Plans? Will each Companion Plan contain sections that address their relevance of the Statewide Strategies in terms of both positive and negative considerations?</p> | William Tippets | SWAP Document | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| f. | For both the Statewide Strategies and Companion Plans, it would help the public to have the tables of contents and some explanatory information provided as soon as possible, so that DFW can receive input – particularly because it is likely that relative importance of some of those strategies and companion activities will vary among the planning units. | William Tippetts | SWAP Document | | | |
| g. | The Plan must address the variety and number of species of concern/species-at-risk, the incredible heterogeneity of California's landscape (geologically, topographically, biologically), and the variety and relative importance of “problems” affecting the state's wildlife. It must also consider the vast number of potential SWAP-oriented activities/responses to address those concerns. Conversely, to be useful, it must be simple enough to allow the public to understand how the Plan will be used/how they can be involved in its implementation as well as provide sufficient clarity to DFW – which will use it as the basis deciding what types of projects and what level funding should be approved under the SWAP program. | William Tippetts | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| 55 | I missed your public scoping meeting last night here in Bishop and I really wish I did not. Hopefully it is not too late to add my concerns about mosquito breeding near human population centers that cover the entire Owens Valley and the Mammoth Lakes area. Our mosquito program started because the mosquitos were so bad people could not live with them. Our program, like so many other mosquito control programs across our state, needs to preserve the ability to access all mosquito breeding areas so the mosquitoes can be controlled so the quality of life for our rate payers can be preserved. Please be sure to allow for mosquito control as part of your State Wildlife Action Plan. Additionally, any newly created wetlands should have a funding source to control new mosquito populations as part of the project's cost. | Chris Wickham | Invasive Species | | | |
| 56 | The first misunderstanding concerns beaver nativity: Your website lists the animal in your Non-Native and Nuisance Terrestrial Vertebrates. I wanted to make sure that you were aware of the new data on this issue, including our papers published in your own journal last year. [Image from database and journal]. An additional paper on beaver nativity in California coastal rivers has also been accepted for publication and should be emerging shortly. Obviously there is no longer serious question about beaver nativity in the state of California. | Heidi Perryman | Species- Terrestrial | | | |
| a. | The second issue has to do with beaver management, which until now has been poorly understood in our state. Landowners with beaver problems are routinely advised that their two options are doing nothing and depredation. In my city of Martinez, California many people called CDFG regarding the possibility of installing a flow device and were repeatedly told “those things never work, don't bother”. As you may know a flow device was installed to control pond height in 2008 and it has eliminated flooding problems since that time. The active colony is still in residence and the pipe is still controlling how high beavers build the dam, 6 years later. | Heidi Perryman | Species- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| b. | It is important that a better understanding of these tools is readily available through your work and website. Instructional tools include this book by the Grand Canyon Land Trust and this DVD by Mike Callahan of Beaver Solutions. There is no longer any excuse for saying these devices don't work or are too difficult or expensive to install. And I would be happy to show you our working device if you doubt me. Obviously understanding beaver nativity and management is essential not just for the animals themselves, but for bio-diverse acres of wetland that they maintain which protects and supports countless other wildlife, many of them species of special concern. I hope you will use my comments to think seriously about the role of beaver in the next state wildlife action plan. | Heidi Perryman | Species- Terrestrial | | | |
| 57 | I just wanted to thank you for your presentation last Monday in Bishop, it was very interesting and I will pass along your information to others that I know are interested. You have done a tremendous amount of work since this program was put into the "works" due to a lot of lawsuits etc. This is quite an undertaking. I believe a lot of local Inyo-Mono residents thought the meeting might have included more on the Mountain Yellow Legged Frog, as you noticed there were many comments throughout the evening. It is a big issue with a lot of residents, business owners and vacationers that have summer residences in Inyo or Mono Counties. Thank you again. | Carolyn Webb | Species- Aquatic | | | |
| 58 | In the newspaper recently, I saw that the CA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife is working on updating its State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) and, as part of this, a scoping meeting was to be held on 10/25/13. I was not able to attend this meeting but I am interested in what, if any, provisions there are concerning once-through cooling systems for power plants. Will this issue be addressed in your update? I would appreciate you getting back to me on this. Thank you. | Monique Nelson | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| 59 | The CA DFW plan needs to address the DFW's refusal to cease issuing permits for the importation of non-native bullfrogs, and thus its role in the endangerment of many of California's native species, many of which are federally protected. To date the DFW has not shown any willingness to cease the permits even though its own educational literature acknowledges the damage to exosystems caused by the bullfrogs. Please feel free to contact me anytime to discuss this. Thank you. | Kerry Kriger | Invasive Species | | | |
| 60 | The private landowners I associate with are an engaged and active group. We all spend personal time in our forests and have the poison oak rashes, yellow jacket stings and stories to prove it. Everyone I talk to loves being surrounded by their wildlife and we generally know what lives on our land, where they will be and what they will be doing. Our lands, however, are not playthings. They are active businesses and earn their keep. We can only afford to keep our forests as forests for as long as we can meet our expenses. Any wildlife recovery activity done on our land will be financed by profits from these businesses, and any restrictions imposed by wildlife or other regulations cuts into what we have available to invest in habitat management. Sensitivity to business constraints is an important part of formulating wildlife recovery. | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| a. | From the landowners' perspective, the current wildlife restoration methodology is a failed model. We read all the time about new species being listed, but very seldom about successful recoveries and delistings. We wonder why the environmental organizations who are so eager to find and list species do not have an equivalent success story to trumpet. I keep waiting for an organization to step forward with the motto "500 species recovered and delisted since 1975" or something like it, but it never happens. I feel this is an important point to keep in mind when certain organizations start dictating policy. | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| b. | The theory that one can draw a boundary around a "critical habitat", then just stand back and watch it go successfully back to its original "natural" state fails to take post-Columbian changes into consideration. We now have invasive exotic species, blights and diseases that cross these boundaries at will. It also fails to take into consideration the impact of tribal land management activities. The books "1491", "Tending the Wild" and "California Indians and Their Environment" all discuss the considerable impact of human activity on the California environment. They burned, they weeded, they harvested seeds, plants, animals and fish. They scattered seeds and thinned overgrown bulb clusters. Extracting people from the landscape would be a radical change to environment processes and will not restore it to what was found here before Columbus. People have been in California since at least the close of the last ice age and they are an integral part of the environment. | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| c. | When we bought our land in 1989, one of our early dreams was to have a stream we could fish in. We contacted CDF&G to discuss how they could help us design and implement fish-friendly changes to our stream, which only runs an inch deep in the summer. The CDF&G representative jumped down our throats and threatened all sorts of fines and penalties if we so much as moved a stick or rock in the stream without an extensive list of permits. The clear message was that streams were untouchable by private citizens, only agency people had the authority. The attitude and list of regulations and penalties for mistakes were very off-putting, so we backed away from the idea. The second nail in the coffin came when we learned more about the forest practice rules and the riparian protection borders. Upgrading our stream from Class 2 (permanent, nonfishbearing) stream to Class 1 (permanent, fishbearing) would remove our best tree-growing territory from our harvestable lands. This essentially punishes people for improving riparian habitat. Some friends to the north had extensive equipment restrictions placed on them because of a raptor nest, while less than a hundred feet away, a state highway had large trucks going by at all hours of the day and night, which the birds tolerated happily. These people were being punished for supporting nesting birds. These practices do not inspire private landowners to invest their time and money in supporting endangered species. The current regulatory structures, with their management restrictions, extensive permit processes and penalties and fines are a deterrent to habitat restoration. | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| d. | <p>We need a watershed philosophy change away from the regulations and restrictions that try to extract people from the environment. We need, instead, programs that inspire people to get into the land and build habitat improvements, perform experiments on the effectiveness of various restoration techniques, and simply maintain what is already there. We need to make endangered species assets, not impediments. Any time we can find a way to help people make a living while restoring habitat or recovering the populations of listed species will be a win for the animals. Here are some ideas from other parts of the world.</p> <p>Mississippi does not require hunting and fishing licenses for hunting on your own land. In Mississippi, people are inspired to put a lot of time and money into developing attractive habitat for game species on their land. Attractive habitat for deer, turkeys, pheasants, ducks and fish is attractive habitat for a whole array of other species, too. Once people have these attractive habitats installed, they lease access rights to hunting clubs for income. This helps pay for maintaining the habitat and provides money for property taxes. It also keeps the poaching problem down, since the hunting clubs are active in maintaining security on their exclusive hunting ground. Give people extra privileges in exchange for habitat improvement activities.</p> | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| e. | <p>Another interesting observation about Mississippi was that they are very fierce about personal property rights. People are allowed to do pretty much whatever they want on their land, as long as it doesn't threaten the neighbors. We toured the forest production part of the state and observed that this led to a wide variety of management styles, depending on the ambition and energy of the landowner. We saw highly efficient timber row crops and we also saw patches of mixed woods and hardwoods interspersed with them. The borders may have often been straight lines, but it still made for a varied and diverse landscape. Many small visions can build a diverse habitat structure without governmental mega-planning.</p> | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| f. | <p>Green sea turtles are a delicacy in the Caribbean. They became over-hunted and hunting restrictions were imposed. This led to a poaching problem. Turtle recovery was not going well. Some enterprising entrepreneurs on Grand Cayman came up with the plan to build a turtle farm. The business plan is to breed and raise turtles in sea pools. Some of the turtles are raised until they are big enough to have a chance of surviving in the sea and released, and the rest are sold to local restaurants. This significantly reduced the market for the poachers. Grand Cayman has recently seen an increase in the number of wild nesting green turtles on its beaches and some of them have tags from the turtle farm. Species recovery does not have to be a losing business proposition.</p> | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| g. | When the endangered species lists were first starting, the idea was that there would be relatively few species on the list and at the time it made sense for recovery plan documents to exclusively focus on a single species at a time. Today, the lists are extensive, with hundreds of species, and when we manage our lands, we are generally dealing with multiple species and many environments at once. When land managers do undertake habitat restoration/enhancement projects, we find ourselves dealing with a lot of befuddling questions. We hope future recovery plans will take into consideration the following: | Catherine Moore | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| i | How do we manage for interspecies competition for the same resources? For example, coho salmon and steelhead trout occupy the same streams in the Central Coast and eat the same food. How do we enhance the viability of one species without destabilizing the other? | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| ii | What are we supposed to do if endangered species A is eating endangered species B on our land? San Francisco garter snakes and red-legged frogs are the classic example of this. | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| iii | What are we supposed to do if our efforts to recover a species draws in its predators? | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |
| iv | What are we supposed to do if we have multiple listed species on our land that have incompatible habitat requirements? Favoring one could adversely affect the others. | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |
| v | What are we supposed to do if a protected species starts eating our endangered species? How easily can we get a depredation permit for a mountain lions or ravens that are eating our endangered species? | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |
| vi | What do we do when the most appropriate action to enhance a habitat runs up against regulations prohibiting that action? There have been indications that the riparian shading requirements currently in place are impeding the growth of salmonid food supplies | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |
| vii | How are land managers informed of the latest science in species recovery? | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |
| viii | How well do recovery plans incorporate long term temporal cycles like timber harvests? The year of a timber harvest involves a lot of localized disturbance, but between harvests the land is relatively undisturbed for a decade or longer. Most animals will just shift off the disturbed land for that year then move back the next year, making timber production zones far better habitat over the long term than most commercial properties. | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |
| h. | I also feel the zero-take rule for some severely endangered species is actually an impediment to implementing its recovery. If a species truly cannot sustain any losses, then it should probably be in a captive breeding program. Any time people enter habitat to remove exotic invasive species, improve the viability of the animals' food supply or simply to monitor progress, they run the risk of a take. No matter how careful you are, something is going to find a way to run under the tires of your truck, or you'll step on a nest while you are weeding, or... No one is going to sign up for a recovery project under these constraints. | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| I. | California Department of Fish and Wildlife also needs to remember that they are not the only agency involved in habitat management and species recovery. The US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service have their own lists, regulations and protocols. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has a large book of regulations relating to timber harvest practices and watershed management. Each of the Water Quality Control Districts have their own take on water quality standards and how to enforce them. Then there's the Air Resources Board. Those of us on the receiving end of all of these agencies get ulcers from trying to reconcile regulations and goals that do not mesh gracefully. We would be eternally grateful if: | Catherine Moore | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| i. | CDF&W coordinated with USFW and NMFS when formulating recovery plans so restoration regulations/activities are seamless and not contradictory. It's really hard to put together an integrated recovery plan when each agency is running its own show. | Catherine Moore | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| ii | CDF&W knew the forest practices regulations. CAL FIRE may already be handling much of what CDF&W wants done. | Catherine Moore | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| iii | Share your goals and coordinate your practices with other agency people before arriving on our land for an inspection. We don't have the authority to mediate your regulatory conflicts and really don't want to be involved. In short, interagency awareness will make projects move more smoothly. | Catherine Moore | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| j | We have game animals on our land as well as endangered species, and we are just as concerned about their wellbeing as we are about the listed species. In the last few years we have noticed that our deer population is not doing well. The bucks are small with stunted antlers, and the does are not producing many fawns. We talked to the Quality Deer Management Association at the American Tree Farm conference this year, and one of their key suggestions was culling the does. Unfortunately, California does not issue hunting licenses for does. I'm sure this policy was forced on CDF&W by urban people whose entire experience with wild animals came from Disney movies. Bambi was a wonderfully sentimental story, but it's really bad biology. To refresh the deer genetic pool and reduce the populations pressures, we should cull the does. The Disney factor brought us the complete protection of mountain lions, and other laws that are going to come back to bite us in the future. What are we going to do when mountain lions become so bold that they snatch children out of their own back yards? What can we do together to find some way to allow what is biologically correct to supercede what is politically correct? | Catherine Moore | Miscellaneous | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| k | One of the biggest missing pieces in the California environment is fire. California is a known to be a fire-dependent ecology, but fire has not been in the land management toolkit for a long time. Somehow, we need to bring it back. There are several species of plant whose seeds need to be scarred by fire to germinate. Others need mineral soil to germinate. These plants provide food and nesting locations for local wildlife. Some plants benefit by being burned back to regenerate new crowns. Burning also knocks back several pathogens like plant diseases, fungi and insects like oak moths that spend part of their life cycle in the duff. If we're lucky, many of our invasive exotics will be less fire tolerant than the natives. When Indians managed California, seven million acres burned in an average year, far more than what happens in our "worst fire" seasons. We now have houses interspersed in the wilderness, an huge overgrowth of vegetation making a dangerous fire load and liability laws that make attempts to return fire overly risky financially. We hope CDF&W will join the Prescribed Fire Councils that are forming in the state to learn the exciting things they are sharing about how to use fire for habitat restoration. We hope CDF&W will confer with CARB and CAL FIRE about how to start introducing fire into the environment in ways that enhance habitat for endangered species. We hope CDF&W will add their voices to regulation reforms that will allow land managers, both public and private, to add responsible use of fire to their land management practices. | Catherine Moore | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| 61 | The Vision fails to address density and does not incorporate watersheds and ecosystems as part of the Vision. | Joyce Dillard | SWAP Document | | | |
| a. | Intended Audience is too restricted for any sustainable result considering the Vision statement of: <i>We seek to create a flexible but scientific process to respond to changing challenges, including population growth, the need for renewable energy, and global climate change</i> More than Conservation Planning is Land Use Planning and Management. This Vision needs to extend to the preservation of migration patterns and procreation of wildlife. | Joyce Dillard | SWAP Document | | | |
| b. | Urban Planners do not address Wildlife as part of an ecosystem and watershed sustainability. The deficiency is not just City Planning Departments such as the City of Los Angeles , but Metropolitan Planning Organizations like SCAG Southern California Association of Governments and COG Council of Governments. Watersheds are addressed by Water related departments such as Public Works or Water Utilities. Developers are the kingpins and the ultimate drivers of the City Planning management or Elected Officials (decision-makers). Not only do Developers not care about water or watersheds, they care less about wildlife. | Joyce Dillard | Miscellaneous | | | |
| c. | Mandatory Findings of Significance under CEQA should be addressed as a deterrent to the statewide goals. | Joyce Dillard | Miscellaneous | | | |
| d. | SEA Significant Ecological Areas should be adhered to as a viable designation. | Joyce Dillard | SWAP Document | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| e. | HIDDEN CREEK ESTATES PROJECT, a future development in LA County, wants to be annexed to the City of Los Angeles , while trying to bypass any LA County jurisdiction including the LA County Flood Control District. City of Los Angeles Planning Commission approved the project without even an application being filed with LAFCO Local Agency Formation Commission of Los Angeles County. This approval is not legal without an annexation and analysis of cost-benefits/loss. Watersheds and wildlife were not taken seriously. | Joyce Dillard | Enforcement | | | |
| f. | BALLONA WETLANDS ECOLOGICAL RESERVE is being designed for future development, as a catch basin without regard for the funding used for the preservation and the natural characteristics of the reserve. Without the Agency proactive comment input during the CEQA period, any Wildlife Action Plan will never be addressed on a serious level. Influences from Public-Private Partnerships outweigh the conservation planning and upset the natural flow. The economics are never analyzed as part of the process. | Joyce Dillard | Enforcement | | | |
| 62 | After years of seeing the current boundary as a problem in many various ways I would like to suggest that fish and game make Highway 20 become the north A zone boundary line, At least in the region west of Upper lake and east of Ukiah. If nothing else comes of this suggestion I would like to see Fish and game seriously consider using clearer boundaries in some of these regions and better management practices for these micro climates and the sub specie herds. Treating Deer that develop in higher altitudes that are heavily timbered as though they develop on the same timeline and cycle as deer in more temperate climates like grass lands, coastlands and southern CA is less than best management practice. There is a very definite climatic change that occurs east of highway 101 and north of highway 20 until upper lake that is profoundly different than the rest of A zones climate and It has a profound impact on the herd. F&G should consider breaking up some of the more unique regions of A zone, taking into account the multiple climate regions it traverses and the migratory patterns of the various sub species of dear near to the current north boundaries. This small region of A zone north should be included and managed very similarly to that of B1. It is profoundly different and the animals mirror B1, not any other part of A zone. | Todd Frediani | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 63 | <p>I am writing on behalf of The Xerces Society for Insect Conservation as part of our Bumble Bee Conservation Initiative. We are involved in a campaign to raise awareness about the plight of the bumble bee throughout North America, currently focusing on four species: the rusty patched bumble bee (<i>Bombus affinis</i>), the yellow-banded bumble bee (<i>Bombus terricola</i>), the American bumble bee (<i>Bombus pensylvanicus</i> (inc. <i>Bombus pensylvanicus sonorus</i>)) and the western bumble bee (<i>Bombus occidentalis</i>). Studies and reports have well documented the range restriction of all four of these species, and our evidence suggests that the rusty-patched bumble bee may be on the brink of extinction. Similarly, the western bumble bee seems to have disappeared from the western portion of its range and the American and yellow-banded bumble bees have experienced dramatic range restrictions. We are also in the process of using IUCN criteria to analyze the extinction risk of all North American bumble bees, and several California species appear to be in significant decline. These species include <i>Bombus crotchii</i> and <i>Bombus caliginosus</i>.</p> <p>Please let me know if you need any additional information or if you have any questions about our concerns. If this email would be better directed at another person, would you please forward it on, and CC me on the email so I can update my contact information?</p> | Rich Hatfield | Species- Terrestrial | | | |
| 64 | <p>I would like to submit the following comments for the 2015 SWAP Update:</p> <p>1) California Fish and Game Journal, a major peer-reviewed scientific publication, last year published two papers that contradict current CDFW policy regarding beavers, as shown on their website wherein beavers are named as "non-native and nuisance" species for many areas of the state. The first paper (James and Lanman 2012) addresses buried beaver dam wood that was dug up in Sierra's in the late 80's and carbon dated to 580, 1730 and 1850 A.D. This is significant because it serves as scientific proof that beaver occurred in the Sierras before European settlers arrived, thus refuting California Fish and Wildlife's long held belief that beaver are not native to the Sierras above 1000 feet in elevation. This erroneous belief was based on a reports issued in 1937 and 1942, back when there were few beaver left and no modern means to verify their historic presence.</p> <p>So, at a bare minimum, there should be a policy of non-lethal management strategies for managing beaver in the Sierras. An even better policy would be to relocate beavers to foothill and mountain areas, where appropriate habitat exists, to help restore wetlands and high mountain meadows, and to reduce drought impacts on stream flows thereby ensuring greater summer water supply in this era of decreasing Sierra snow pack.v So the best policy of all would be a ban on killing beavers in California accompanied by public education and facilitation of the use of the simple devices that eliminate the nuisances caused by beavers without removing the beavers. If such a thing is politically impossible right now, can we start with a ban in all regions except the Mojave, Sonoran and Colorado Deserts and Southern California Mountains, Valley and Coast? Can the SWAP play a significant role in this? Can the SWAP help create stewardship incentives for landowners with regards to beaver? EXCERPT ONLY- LINK TO COMMENT</p> | Brien Brennan | Species- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| a. | <p>This comment is in regards to the following language taken from the SWAP website, which reads: For example, the plan will be direct about how growth and development are replacing and fragmenting wildlife habitats. The directness of the description of threats should not be interpreted as a lack of appreciation for the legitimacy and benefits of activities and projects that also affect wildlife. Residential and commercial development, agricultural operations, diversions of state waters, and recreational activities are all necessary and important. However, the plan will recommend changes in human activities, such as improving conservation planning, to reduce the impact of development on important habitats.</p> <p>I appreciate the intent to be direct about the threats to life, but find the language used (apparently as a way to assuage mainstream views) to be offensive: I have yet to see a single modern-day approach to development, agriculture, water diversion or recreation that fully assesses the impacts on biological integrity of a locale. As done, none are necessary or important. So long as the economy remains the bottom line of land management decisions, instead of biological integrity, we are doomed to undermine the very life that sustains us. We are in a crisis state, and the language of the SWAP should reflect that, not cede to the social norms of a culture out of touch with physical reality.</p> | Brien Brennan | SWAP Document | | | |
| 65 | <p>I would like to get involved in the process of public comments. I am deeply concerned about my bio-region about the aquifer that sustains us and about the snow pack which we lack this year. I believe that clear cutting is contributing not only to climate change and desertification but to the lack of ability to prevent early run off from over-heated (5% higher temps and 35% lower humidity) sun exposed earth, a loss of natural water sequestration. The loss of habitat caused by clearcutting to all species dependent on the bio-diversity of mature trees and the understory that shelters and feeds them is also a huge concern. I hope we can get special wording to urge the governor to stop the practice of clear cutting for normal logging practices in the state of California and move to mandatory sustainable practices. Your strong support for this within your documentation about the loss of species numbers and diversity will assist in this process.</p> | Chris Nelson | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |
| 66 | <p>The State Wildlife Plan for the San Francisco Bay salt marshes should consider several uncommon species of invertebrates: tiger beetles (<i>Cicindela</i> spp.), the western tanarthrus beetle (<i>Tanarthrus occidentalis</i>), and the California horn snail (<i>Cerithidea californica</i>). Except for the sandy beach tiger beetle (<i>Cicindela hirticollis</i>), these species are not listed as species of special concern or as special animals. Nevertheless, these invertebrate species should be considered in the San Francisco Bay salt marsh portion of the State Wildlife Plan because they are indicators of important habitat of San Francisco salt marshes and they are in decline from habitat alteration or competition from non-native species. (Excerpt only)</p> | Clinton Kellner | Species- Terrestrial | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 67 | The Forum believes a unique opportunity exists for the 2015 plan update to discuss California's natural resources using both terms, "fish" and "wildlife" in appropriate places throughout the document, not assuming that all readers and users of the 2015 plan will equate the term "wildlife" with both aquatic and terrestrial species. | Kevin Shaffer | SWAP Document | | | |
| a. | Document and incorporate into the 2015 plan the natural resource consortiums that exist in the State of California that are committed to playing a role in advancing key natural resource issues will acknowledge the work of these groups and ensure ecoregional teams know they exist and can contact them for information, science, and expertise. | Kevin Shaffer | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| b. | Produce companion plans that focus on both consumptive and non-consumptive uses, validating the role both sets of activities play in the State of California's economy, natural resources, and quality of life for its citizenry and visitors. | Kevin Shaffer | SWAP Document | | | |
| c. | Acknowledge the importance of healthy, functional aquatic migration corridors to the many terrestrial species that benefit from their existence by discussing connectivity within an ecosystem framework and approach. | Kevin Shaffer | SWAP Document | | | |
| d. | Define the highest priority fish passage issues within each of California's coastal regions and watersheds. Define the greatest barriers to fish passage within each region, and key steps that should be taken to address those barriers. | Kevin Shaffer | SWAP Document | | | |
| e. | Similar to the acknowledgement of the Passage Assessment Database (PAD) in the 2005 SWAP, acknowledge the use of new tools, such as APASS (Anadromous Fish Passage Optimization Tool, a decision support tool for optimizing barrier mitigation developed by the Forum) that will help the State of California prioritize fish barriers within a watershed, and will help the state make strategic fish barrier investments within and among the highest priority watersheds. Encourage the regions to use tools, such as APASS in their decision making. | Kevin Shaffer | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| f. | Facilitate coordination and communication among agencies and other entities that may propose, review, or promulgate fish passage criteria in California. | Kevin Shaffer | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| g. | Identify, assess, and prioritize fish passage barriers on public land, and to the extent practical or consistent with landowner goals, private lands. | Kevin Shaffer | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| h. | Disseminate guidelines and design criteria for replacement of barriers. | Kevin Shaffer | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| i. | Coordinate funding mechanisms to remove fish passage barriers. | Kevin Shaffer | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| j. | Promote state and federal permit coordination and streamlining. | Kevin Shaffer | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| k. | Facilitate plans to monitor and evaluate fish passage restoration effectiveness to ensure accountability. | Kevin Shaffer | Coordination/Partnership | | | |
| l. | Work to promote state and national policy that supports fish passage. | Kevin Shaffer | Conservation Strategies- Aquatic | | | |
| m. | Implement education and outreach activities, targeting both the general public and fish passage practitioners. | Kevin Shaffer | Coordination/Partnership | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|----------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 68 | <p>I have just recently become aware of the SWAP and the solicitation of comments. I have just recently (October 2013) begun working for the CVRWQCB in Redding as an Environmental Scientist, but previously I worked for Caltrans (15+ years) as a Wildlife Biologist. During that time I was the coordinator for Caltrans North Region, District 2, for highway/animal collisions. As I read the SWAP species account for Columbian black-tailed deer, I noticed that there was no mention of deer mortality due to vehicles. The number of deer killed by vehicles is unbelievable. There are numerous deer/vehicle kill hotspots all over the state. It is imperative that this threat to deer (and several other animal species) be included as a threat to the species. This documentation in the SWAP will subsequently help Caltrans and other transportation agencies prioritize funding for avoidance and mitigation of this threat. The number of deer killed on highways is extremely high. Please contact Caltrans HQ Biologist Amy Bailey to obtain data on the number and distribution of deer kill (916-651-8166), amy_bailey@dot.ca.gov</p> | Daniel Whitley | Species- Terrestrial | | | |
| 69 | <p>I have evaluated the endemic marine silverside fish <i>Leuresthes tenuis</i>, the California grunion, according to the NatureServe Conservation Status Assessment Methodology and Factors for Assessing Extinction Risk. I believe this species should be included as a species of greatest conservation need, both as an endemic species and as one exposed to many stressors and threats because of its unique reproductive behavior and habitats. (Excerpt only)</p> | Karen Miner | Species- Aquatic | | | |
| 70 | <p>We note that you identify goals for protected riparian habitat (which we assume to be public ownership), buffers between agricultural activities and river corridors and acreage of riparian habitat. However, we do not see strategies, objectives or activities that directly address these goals. For example, while an HCP/NCCP would could lead to purchase of riparian habitat into public ownership, it could be addressed through other mechanisms. Additionally, we would like clarification on the goal to establish buffers between agriculture and river corridors. The Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum has a long history of working to reconcile conflicts between habitat restoration and agriculture and believe this goal could prove problematic for local communities along our river corridor. We believe that enhancement and expansion of riparian habitat along the Sacramento River can be enhanced by working together in partnership with agricultural landowners through a working lands program. We recommend that you include that approach in your strategies, objectives and activities. In these days of diminishing public resources for habitat land acquisitions, leveraging private ownership and management of habitat lands can reduce costs and promote local engagement with conservation programs. While landowner-based restoration may not be appropriate for all habitat sites, we believe it can play a critical role in enhancing valley riparian habitat.</p> | Jane Dolan | Goals and Objectives | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 71 | One is to consider what has worked in the past and what has not worked for conservation of fish and wildlife associated habitats. Has the SWAP 2005 plan allowed any species to be removed from the at risk, threatened or endangered species listing? Has the plan reduced the need for species conservation? Since this is a scientific process it would be important to utilize empirical standards and review the past 10 years or more of procedures to determine if they have worked and eliminate those that have not. | Chris Horgan | SWAP Document | | | |
| a | Another aspect that is not currently considered in the revision is the cost benefit ratio. It would be important to evaluate the cost of implementing SWAP 2005 over past 10 years, as well as the cost to the public in terms of recreation and tourism revenue gains or losses due to the plan. Then compare this to the value of any benefits produced over the past ten years by the SWAP 2005 plan, such as the improvement of targeted species status. The cost to benefit ratio numbers will help determine how the SWAP 2015 plan should allocate resources where they will do the most good instead of revising the plan without general economic or benefit consideration. This would add the proposed assessment of State Wildlife Grants in the revision process | Chris Horgan | SWAP Document | | | |
| b | Lastly the "Species of Special Concern" currently includes species which are not listed as threatened or endangered by the State. Species conservation is important and this is guided by them being listed as threatened or endangered. "Species of Special Concern" should only include species which have already been listed by the State in order to focus conservation efforts on those species most in need. Thank you for your consideration and for this opportunity to comment. | Chris Horgan | Goals and Objectives | | | |
| 72 | Hello, I hope the state wildlife action plan supports one clear action - planting trees. | Erica Stanojevic | Conservation Strategies- Terrestrial | | | |