

**State of California  
The Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME  
Wildlife Management Division  
Bird and Mammal Conservation Section**

**BOBCAT HARVEST ASSESSMENT**

**1993-94**

State of California  
THE RESOURCES AGENCY  
Department of Fish and Game

**BOBCAT HARVEST ASSESSMENT**

**1993-94**

by

William E. Grenfell, Jr.

June 1995

**ABSTRACT**

An estimated 1,649 bobcats were taken during the 1993 hunting year and the 1993-94 trapping season. According to export tag reports, trappers took 1,148 bobcats, and hunters took 451. The total take was an increase of 15 percent from the 1992-93 year. The average pelt price decreased from \$43.92 last year to \$40.44 this year (Table 5). The average take per successful trapper increased, but the number of bobcat trappers decreased from 97 to 84.

Data on the bobcat harvest were gathered through the process of tagging bobcat furs for export, the annual trapping report and bobcat hunter report cards, and U.S. Department of Agriculture animal damage control records.

## INTRODUCTION

Bobcat harvest increased in California from the 1960s through the late 1970s. This increase reflected high fur prices and an abundant population of bobcats. The sale of bobcat fur has brought the highest dollar income to trappers of any species harvested and sold in California since the 1975-76 season. In order to determine the magnitude of the bobcat harvest and the resultant effect on bobcat populations throughout the State, a number of studies were initiated. Field studies of local population dynamics were completed on unharvested populations in Siskiyou, Riverside, and San Diego counties and on a harvested population in San Diego County. Reports on these studies have been previously distributed. A statewide harvest monitoring system was used where the age and sex structures of the harvested population were sampled to determine the effect of the harvest on various bobcat populations and to identify the amount of harvest. The age and sex structure of the various bobcat populations in California stabilized during the mid-1980s. Currently, only the monitoring of harvest quantity is being conducted, since the demand and harvest have been declining since 1981-82.

Public interest in the bobcat, on both the domestic and international fronts, has increased greatly over the last 20 years. Prior to 1971, the bobcat in California was a nonprotected mammal, and there were no restrictions on its take. In 1971, this species was given nongame status by the California Legislature. Subsequently, in 1974 a six-month season was imposed on the take of bobcats. This season was further restricted to the standard 3½-month furbearer season in 1976. During the 1978-79 season, the export tag quota was reached by the end of January, effectively shortening the season by one month. During 1979-80, the season was reduced to 2 months, but was closed on December 29, 1979, one month earlier than proposed, because the quota of export tags had been reached once again.

For the 1980-81 season, the State was divided into three harvest zones, each with a different season length, depending upon the status of the local bobcat populations. These regulations were a result of previous research and monitoring efforts. The 1981-82 season length was increased by one week, except in the northeastern California region, in order to have the bobcat season coincide with the season on gray fox. In 1982-83, the northeastern California season was set back two weeks, and its length was increased by a week.

The season limit for bobcat hunters was set at two for the 1980-81 season and increased to five for the 1984-85 season. Prior to 1982-83, the hunting season length and timing coincided with the commercial take season. In 1982-83, the hunting season was extended for two weeks at the end of the commercial season in Del Norte, Humboldt, Kern, Lake, Mendocino, Trinity, and San Diego counties. For the 1985-86 season, the hunting season was extended on a statewide basis to open a week before the commercial season and to last until February 15.

In 1973, the United States became party to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. The treaty restricted trade in endangered species and established procedures to monitor the trade of other species that might be faced with endangerment in the future. The bobcat was one of the species deemed by the parties to the treaty as a candidate for future endangerment. The Endangered Species Scientific Authority (ESSA) was established as the scientific body to monitor the species' status in the United States, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was given the authority over trade as provided by the treaty. ESSA evaluated data to justify harvest and export of bobcat furs for three years.

The Defenders of Wildlife petitioned the Secretary of the Interior in early 1977 to place the bobcat on the endangered species list. Subjective evaluation of data from animal damage control take,

along with increased fur prices and commercial demand and take of bobcats, led this group to take this action. The Secretary later found that the petitioned action was not warranted.

In November 1979, Defenders of Wildlife brought suit against the ESSA. The suit was heard in December, and the court's decision reversed ESSA's findings for five states and parts of two others, but not for California. After the suit, the ESSA was dissolved, and the responsibility was given to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, whose Office of the Scientific Authority (OSA) now has the responsibility for scientific monitoring.

An appeal by Defenders of Wildlife of the court's ruling to the Court of Appeals, District Court for the District of Columbia, resulted in a court order that prohibited bobcat pelts taken after July 1, 1982 from being exported. This ban was imposed until OSA could satisfy the court that export findings were based on reliable population estimates and that each state would enforce a predetermined take limit. Guidelines from OSA to the states to obtain this information were not accepted by the court. During 1982 there was legislative redefinition of the Endangered Species Act which effectively voided the court's ban on export. On December 1, 1982, the export ban was lifted and the major European market was reopened.

Since late 1982, there has been a period of intense management and monitoring of bobcat populations and harvest. The results of this management and monitoring are discussed in this report.

In 1993, legislation was introduced (Assembly Bill 380) to ban the hunting and trapping of bobcats in California. That legislation did not pass.

## **OBJECTIVES**

1. Determine the annual bobcat harvest on a regional basis.
2. Use this information, along with previously gathered information on bobcat biology and population dynamics, to manage local populations by manipulating season lengths and chronology, take methods, and harvest limits.

## **METHODS**

The commercial take is determined through assessment of mandatory annual reports of licensed trappers and an export tagging program for all bobcat furs. Commercial fur trappers report their take at the end of each license year (fiscal year), giving the quantity of take of each species by county. Anyone possessing or wishing to sell or to transport a bobcat fur must have it tagged. As part of the tagging process, the trapper must supply information on the place, date, and method of take.

Information on hunting is gathered through the sale of hunting tags and their return. Hunters of bobcat are required to report their kill and provide information on their take.

All depredation take must be reported to the Department. This information is reported directly by the person taking the bobcat or by the public agencies responsible for the depredation control work.

## RESULTS

For the 1993-94 season, the total estimated take of bobcats was 1,649 individuals (Table 1). This was a 15 percent increase over the 1992-93 trapping year. Commercial trappers continue to take the majority (70 percent) of bobcats. The total hunter take of 451 (tables 1 and 2) was higher (32 percent) than in 1992-93. The total take of bobcats ranged from none in eight counties to 219 in San Bernardino County (Table 2). In the 1992-93 season, the bobcat take exceeded 100 in four of 58 counties. In the 1993-94 season, over 100 bobcats were taken from each of four counties.

TABLE 1  
ESTIMATED ANNUAL TAKE OF BOBCATS BY HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN CALIFORNIA  
1977-78 TO 1993-94

Season	Total Commercial Take (IA+IB)	Commercial Trapper Take (IA)	Commercial Hunter Take (IB)	Total Hunter Take (II)	Animal Damage Control Take* (III)	Total Annual Take (IA+II+III)
1977-78	5,150	4,650	500	15,300	208	20,158
1978-79	8,325	6,825	1,500	5,811	56	12,692
1979-80	7,809	6,686	1,123	7,708	32	14,426
1980-81	9,595	8,702	893	3,737	24	12,463
1981-82	9,337	8,162	1,175	3,037	34	11,233
1982-83	8,513	7,427	1,086	2,951	48	10,426
1983-84	7,362	6,576	786	2,077	43	8,696
1984-85	8,897	7,495	1,402	2,993	48	10,536
1985-86	8,099	6,927	1,172	2,861	36	9,824
1986-87	9,123	8,003	1,120	1,739	44	9,786
1987-88	8,994	8,017	977	2,773	47	10,837
1988-89	5,586	4,877	709	1,778	52	6,707
1989-90	2,980	2,677	303	715	63	3,455
1990-91	1,148	962	186	881	46	1,889
1991-92	1,089	1,089	0	401	12	1,502
1992-93	1,039	1,039	0	342	48	1,429
1993-94	1,148	1,148	0	451	50	1,649

\* Federal fiscal year data 10-1-92 to 9-30-93. Other data in this table 7-1 to 6-30.

TABLE 2. TAKE OF BOBCATS BY COUNTY DURING THE 1993-94 SEASON

County	Licensed Trappers	Sport Hunters	Animal Damage Control	Total County
Alameda		3		3
Alpine	4			4
Amador		4		4
Butte	3	5		8
Calaveras	3	4		7
Colusa	34	1		35
Contra Costa				
Del Norte		6		6
El Dorado	4	4	1	9
Fresno	131	33		164
Glenn	23	2		25
Humboldt	85	13	4	102
Imperial		2		2
Inyo		2		2
Kern	31	19	1	51
Kings				
Lake	1	4		5
Lassen	22	30		52
Los Angeles	92	6		98
Madera		28		28
Marin				
Mariposa	2	3	7	12
Mendocino	8	7	6	21
Merced		1		1
Modoc	57	22		79
Mono	3	6		9
Monterey	16	12		28
Napa			2	2
Nevada		1		1
Orange		1		1
Placer		4	2	6
Plumas	15	12	1	28
Riverside	40	3		43
Sacramento		2		2
San Benito		7		7
San Bernardino	205	14		219
San Diego	34	19	9	62
San Francisco				
San Joaquin				
San Luis Obispo	21	17	2	40
San Mateo		2		2
Santa Barbara	60	7		67
Santa Clara	6	9		15
Santa Cruz		2		2
Shasta	16	34		50
Sierra		3		3
Siskiyou	75	41	4	120
Solano		2		2
Sonoma	4	2	9	15
Stanislaus		1		1
Sutter				
Tehama	23	10		33
Trinity	10	3		13
Tulare	59	25		84
Tuolumne	1	10	2	13
Ventura	50	3		53
Yolo				
Yuba				
Unknown	10			10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,148</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1,649</b>

Six of the 10 counties reporting the highest commercial take of bobcats were the same in 1993-94 as in 1992-93. However, Fresno, Humboldt, Riverside, and Ventura counties replaced Kern, Tehama, San Diego, and Shasta counties.

TABLE 3  
TEN COUNTIES REPORTING HIGHEST COMMERCIAL TAKE OF BOBCATS  
1974-75 TO 1993-94

Rank	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
1	San Diego	Humboldt	Humboldt	San Bernardino	Humboldt
2	Modoc	San Diego	San Bernardino	Humboldt	San Bernardino
3	Lassen	Modoc	Santa Barbara	Tulare	Shasta
4	Humboldt	Shasta	Shasta	Santa Barbara	Kern
5	Inyo	Inyo	San Benito	Kern	Siskiyou
6	Siskiyou	Siskiyou	Mendocino	Inyo	Santa Barbara
7	Colusa	Riverside	Tulare	Mendocino	Inyo
8	Riverside	San Bernardino	Fresno	Modoc	Modoc
9	Fresno	Solano	San Diego	Shasta	Mendocino
10	Lake	Lake	Inyo	Monterey	Tehama
Rank	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
1	Santa Barbara	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	San Bernardino
2	Humboldt	Monterey	Kern	Monterey	Kern
3	Tulare	Santa Barbara	Monterey	Kern	Santa Barbara
4	Kern	San Luis Obispo	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	San Luis Obispo
5	San Bernardino	Humboldt	Tulare	San Luis Obispo	Los Angeles
6	Siskiyou	Tulare	Humboldt	Tulare	Monterey
7	San Diego	Mendocino	San Diego	Humboldt	Tulare
8	Mendocino	Kern	Ventura	Los Angeles	San Diego
9	Monterey	San Diego	Fresno	San Diego	Ventura
10	San Luis Obispo	San Benito	San Luis Obispo	Ventura	Humboldt
Rank	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
1	Kern	Kern	San Bernardino	San Bernardino	San Bernardino
2	Tulare	San Bernardino	Kern	Kern	Kern
3	Monterey	Tulare	Santa Barbara	Monterey	San Diego
4	San Bernardino	Monterey	Tulare	Tulare	Santa Barbara
5	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	Ventura	Santa Barbara	Monterey
6	San Luis Obispo	San Diego	Monterey	Siskiyou	Los Angeles
7	Los Angeles	Ventura	San Luis Obispo	Humboldt	Ventura
8	Humboldt	Humboldt	San Diego	Ventura	Fresno
9	Siskiyou	Los Angeles	Humboldt	San Diego	Tulare
10	San Diego	Inyo	Fresno	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo
Rank	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94
1	Kern	Kern	Kern	San Bernardino	San Bernardino
2	San Bernardino	Tulare	Shasta	Tulare	Fresno
3	Ventura	Colusa	Siskiyou	Siskiyou	Los Angeles
4	Fresno	San Bernardino	Humboldt	San Diego	Humboldt
5	Monterey	Fresno	Tulare	Santa Barbara	Siskiyou
6	Los Angeles	Siskiyou	San Bernardino	Modoc	Santa Barbara
7	San Diego	Los Angeles	San Diego	Shasta	Tulare
8	Siskiyou	Ventura	Ventura	Kern	Modoc
9	Tulare	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Los Angeles	Ventura
10	Humboldt	Shasta	Trinity	Tehama	Riverside

The 1993-94 commercial take of bobcats increased in five of the geographic regions, decreased in three, and remained the same in two (Table 4). The Northeast region increased from 111 (1992-93) to 124 (1993-94), but is still well below the management threshold of 425 animals.

TABLE 4 GEOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES IN THE AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL TAKE OF BOBCATS IN CALIFORNIA 1988-89 TO 1993-94											
Area	88-89 Take	Change <to> (%)	89-90 Take	Change <to> (%)	90-91 Take	Change <to> (%)	91-92 Take	Change <to> (%)	92-93 Take	Change <to> (%)	93-94 Take
North-east	282	-28	230	-61	90	-2	88	26	111	12	124
North-west	694	-48	362	-68	115	226	260	-31	180	4	187
North coast	312	-64	112	-1	111	-51	55	-27	40	55	62
Central coast	40	-32	27	+33	36	-100	0	2,800	28	-21	6
North Sierra	8	0	8	-100	0	300	3	0	3	0	3
Central Sierra	127	-72	35	-9	32	-87	4	150	10	0	10
East Sierra	73	62	118	-66	42	9	46	-39	28	-25	7
South coast	1,753	-51	857	-79	180	20	216	-5	205	-18	181
South Sierra	1,026	-32	696	-46	375	-23	287	-34	188	18	221
so. Calif.	1,271	-58	535	-69	167	-22	130	89	246	37	337
Total	5,586		2,980		1,148		1,089		1,039	10	1,138*

\*This does not equal 1,148 as reported in tables 1 and 2. One trapper held 10 pelts for several years, and could not remember the county of take when he purchased export tags this year.

The average price of a bobcat pelt dropped by about 88 percent in the two years prior to 1990-91. It dropped from an all time high of \$167.33 in 1986-87 to \$17.91 in 1989-90 (Table 5). During 1990-91, the pelt price increased to \$49.50. There was no national or international regulatory action pending which might have influenced the demand for bobcat furs. The market appeared saturated during 1989-90 and 1990-91. During 1991-92 the price increased to \$71.32, but in 1992-93 the price dropped again to \$43.92. In 1993-94, the average price paid for California bobcat pelts dropped to \$40.44.



TABLE 5  
BOBCAT PELT PRICES 1970-71 TO 1992-93

Season	Average Price	Highest Price
1970-71	\$ 10.86	Not Recorded
1971-72	18.83	\$ 30.00
1972-73	29.33	60.00
1973-74	45.00	110.00
1974-75	50.00	110.00
1975-76	133.50	300.00
1976-77	76.00	225.00
1977-78	105.00	185.00
1978-79	120.00	426.00
1979-80	114.20	313.00
1980-81	129.90	325.00
1981-82	114.53	325.00
1982-83	105.85	342.11
1983-84	102.33	380.00
1984-85	121.96	368.00
1985-86	107.86	Not Available
1986-87	167.33	Not Available
1987-88	142.73	Not Available
1988-89	102.31	Not Available
1989-90	17.91	Not Available
1990-91	49.50	125.00
1991-92	71.32	74.15
1992-93	43.92	94.00
1993-94	40.44	70.20

In the 1993-94 season, the average take per commercial trapper increased to 13.67 animals, as compared to 10.71 during 1992-93. However, the number of bobcat trappers declined from 97 to 84. In the last 12 years, the highest number of bobcat trappers was 821 in the 1982-83 season (Table 6).

TABLE 6  
AVERAGE BOBCAT HARVEST PER SUCCESSFUL TRAPPER PER SEASON IN CALIFORNIA\*

County	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Butte												
Fresno	8.5	11.9	10.0	12.1	17.6	15.3	16.1	17.4				
Glenn	6.8		5.8			10.7						
Humboldt	4.8	7.6	9.3	18.0	12.5	13.0	8.6	2.3				
Inyo	5.3	7.8	5.6	14.2	9.7	6.2						
Kern	12.2	16.5	18.4	14.7	13.0	14.2	9.1	11.7	16.9			
Lake	4.6	5.9			7.2	7.9						
Lassen	6.5	3.6	4.8	4.4	4.4	9.8	3.9	5.6				
Los Angeles	8.8	13.5	15.8	14.9	15.6	11.1	12.0	14.4	5.9			
Madera		11.3	12.7			7.3						
Mariposa	6.3		9.6	7.2	10.1	19.9						
Mendocino	5.4	6.1	5.9	5.1	6.5	6.2	5.4					
Modoc	5.5	7.7	7.2	6.3	6.2	7.2	7.2	3.0				
Mono	6.9	9.2					6.5					
Monterey	11.7	14.7	18.0	17.8	21.4	24.8	14.0	16.1				
Plumas	4.5											
Riverside	9.0	7.4	10.3	10.1	9.8	12.0	8.7	16.5				
San Benito	9.8		8.3		14.2							
San Bernardino	10.0	12.0	11.6	14.6	14.6	13.3	12.3	14.0	5.2	5.5	16.5	14.6
San Diego	9.8	10.6	11.8	10.8	11.6	14.0	16.9	16.8				
San Luis Obispo	10.6	14.4	11.1	10.8	14.7	14.4	10.4	7.5				
Santa Barbara	16.6	17.4	16.3	16.1	13.9	13.9	11.7					
Shasta	3.3	4.1	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.9	6.3	4.9				
Siskiyou	5.1	5.2	0.2	5.6	5.9	9.9	6.5	5.0	2.5	6.8	9.1	
Sonoma	8.4	6.5	4.6		6.8		9.3					
Tehama	3.8	3.7	6.3	3.8	3.9	5.8						
Trinity	4.4	2.5	3.5		8.5	5.0	2.2					
Tulare	11.2	10.5	13.4	14.5	12.3	17.1	8.5	6.2	6.7			
Tuolumne	6.9	5.4				5.2						
Ventura	11.2	10.4	13.5	12.6	18.4	16.6	9.9	16.1				
Statewide	9.08	11.86	12.01	12.71	14.75	13.55	12.61	12.06	7.00	6.19	10.71	13.67
# Trappers Harvesting Bobcats	821	488	398	547	584	664	443	303	124	113	97	84
#Trappers Licensed	3,901	1,607	1,650	1,417	1,347	1,460	1,244	834	511	371	338	300

\* County data from counties and years where more than 10 trappers per county reported.

As usual, the commercial take of bobcats was primarily by trapping (88 percent) (tables 7 and 8). Hunting with dogs remains the second most common way to take bobcats. This method was most commonly employed in Humboldt County. About 0.2 percent of the bobcat furs were salvaged from bobcats found dead, 1.7 percent were taken through the use of a predator call, and 0.5 percent were taken by other types of hunting. Predator calling is only occasionally used as a hunting method by persons holding a commercial trapper's license.

TABLE 7  
METHODS OF COMMERCIAL TAKE OF BOBCAT, 1993-94

County	% by Trap	% by Dogs	% by Calling	% by Hunting	% Miscellaneous	Sample Size
Alpine	100%					4
Butte	100%					3
Calaveras	100%					3
Colusa	100%					34
El Dorado	100%					4
Fresno	100%					131
Glenn	100%					23
Humboldt	38%	62%				85
Kern	81%	19%				31
Lake	100%					1
Lassen	86%		9%	5%		22
Los Angeles	100%					92
Mariposa	100%					2
Mendocino	100%					8
Modoc	100%					57
Mono	100%					3
Monterey	100%					16
Plumas	100%					15
Riverside	98%				2%	40
San Bernardino	92%		8%			205
San Diego	100%					34
San Luis Obispo	100%					21
Santa Barbara	100%					60
Santa Clara	100%					6
Shasta	94%	6%				16
Siskiyou	57%	40%	3%			75
Sonoma	100%					4
Tehama	96%			4%		23
Trinity	90%	10%				10
Tulare	59%	41%				59
Tuolumne	100%					1
Ventura	100%					50
Unknown	100%					10
<b>Total Percentage</b>	<b>87.8%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>100%</b>

TABLE 8  
METHOD OF COMMERCIAL TAKE OF BOBCATS, 1980-94

Season	Method of Take (Percent of Total Statewide Take)						Total %
	Trap	Dogs	Calling	Other Hunt	Miscellaneous	Unknown	
1980-81	90.6	6.6	0.7	1.4	0.3	0.5	100.1
1981-82	86.2	9.5	1.3	1.8	0.3	0.9	100.0
1982-83	86.7	10.4	0.9	1.4	0.2	0.4	100.0
1983-84	89.0	9.3	0.4	1.1	0.2	<0.1	100.0
1984-85	82.8	13.5	0.7	1.7	0.3	1.0	100.0
1985-86	85.1	13.2	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.3	100.0
1986-87	83.4	10.6	0.8	0.8	0.1	4.2	99.9
1987-88	88.5	9.6	1.1	0.6	0.1	0.1	100.0
1988-89	85.5	11.8	0.9	0.4	0.1	1.4	100.1
1989-90	89.9	7.8	0.7	1.6	-	-	100.0
1990-91	83.7	13.2	2.4	0.5	0.2	-	100.0
1991-92	77.2	19.8	1.2	1.7	0.1	-	100.0
1992-93	75.6	19.2	0.6	4.5	0.1	-	100.0
1993-94	87.8	9.8	1.7	0.5	0.2	-	100.0

Information on the extent and distribution of the hunting take of bobcats is gathered through the hunting tag program. Obtaining these tags and returning them to the Department upon taking bobcat are legal requirements of bobcat hunters. The Department sold 6,070 bobcat hunting tags during the 1993-94 season. Four hundred and fifty-one were returned to the Department. The hunting take by county is shown in Table 2.

## DISCUSSION

The total bobcat harvest increased in the 1993-94 season from 1992-93. The number of bobcat trappers decreased from 97 to 84. The decrease in bobcat trapping activity appears to be related to changes in regulations recommended by the Department and enacted by the Fish and Game Commission in 1991-92. These regulations require that all leg-hold traps be of the commercially manufactured padded type (with some exceptions for aquatic sets). Many trappers apparently decided not to trap in 1993-94 because of the increased cost of converting to new traps and the relatively low bobcat pelt price.

Since the 1982-83 season, and with no change in season length, the harvest has remained below the 14,400 statewide harvest limit. Harvest monitoring will continue. If the statewide harvest reaches 14,000 bobcats, the age and sex structure monitoring will be reinstated.

The bobcat take in northeastern California has been monitored annually since 1980-81, based on the need to document and monitor the age and sex structures of this population. If the harvest in this local area increases to more than 425 for more than two successive seasons, additional management action will be taken to determine the effects on that population. The local harvest has been below this level for the last six seasons (Table 4).

**TABLE 9**  
**RECENT COMMERCIAL HARVEST OF BOBCATS IN NORTHEASTERN CALIFORNIA**

Season	County				Total Northeastern California
	Eastern Siskiyou	Modoc	Lassen	Plumas	
1978-79	81	306	246	47	680
1979-80	88	216	302	95	701
1980-81	82	126	96	39	343
1981-82	49	143	147	58	397
1982-83	74	238	177	35	524
1983-84	45	182	84	17	328
1984-85	54	231	188	33	506
1985-86	78	181	108	23	390
1986-87	78	237	139	60	514
1987-88	148	223	187	43	601
1988-89	60	107	85	30	282
1989-90	36	62	85	47	230
1990-91	22	30	29	9	90
1991-92	25	39	24	0	88
1992-93	40	47	24	0	111
1993-94	30	57	22	15	124

**RECOMMENDATION**

Continue to monitor the take of bobcats by geographical area, and use that information to determine the management needed to maintain viable bobcat populations throughout California.