California Department of Fish and Game 722 Capitol Avenue Sacramento 14, California

REPORT OF THE 1962 GAME TAKE HUNTER SURVEY

Hunter game bag questionnaires were mailed to an approximate two percent random sample of California hunting license buyers after the close of the 1962-63 waterfowl season which ended January 6, 1963.

Two changes were made in the 1962 survey procedures:

1. Sampling Procedure

Each license book contained one (1) self-addressed, pre-glued license stub. The sample was drawn from this group.

2. Questionnaire

The general format and language of the questionnaire was retained, but to expedite processing the outside dimensions of the questionnaire were altered.

It is of importance to bear in mind that, due to the statistical bias inherent in surveys of this kind and the fact that any change in procedure may affect the survey results, the principal value of the total bag figures included in this report is in their indication of game bag trends.

A total of 10,366 questionnaires was mailed and 5,393 useable questionnaires were returned. The 52 percent return was the highest percentage response recorded for the annual game take survey.

15	Questionnaires	Questionnaires	Percent
Year	Mailed	Returned	Response
1954	11,011	5,231	47.5
1955	11,016	5,082	46.1
1956	11,725	5,30 ⁴	45.2
1957	11,275	5,200	46.1
1958	10,478	5,036	48.1
1959	10,461	5,047	48.1
1960	10,676	5,314	49.8
1961	10,902	5, 590	51.3
1962	10,366	5,393	52.0

The estimated total hunting license sales figure divided by the number of questionnaires returned provides the projection factor for calculating total kill figures. The projection factor used for the 1962 hunting season calculations was 635,000 • 5,393 = 117.7.

HUNTING LICENSE SALES

An estimated 635,000 hunting licenses were sold in 1962, a slight increase over the number sold in 1961.

HUNTING REGULATION CHANGES

1. DEER

In Modoc and Lassen counties and portions of Siskiyou, Shasta and Tehama counties, the season closing date was two weeks earlier than the balance of the late season area.

2. BEAR

A uniform statewide season was effected.

3. SIERRA AND RUFFED GROUSE

The season was reopened after a one year closure.

4. CHUKAR

The season was one week shorter than 1961.

5. TREE SQUIRRELS

Counties of Mendocino, Sonoma, Monterey, and Tulare were added to the open season area.

6. DUCKS

The northeast portion of the State was zoned for a straight 75-day season in contrast to the split season in the balance of the State.

BAG BY SPECIES

UPLAND GAME

Pheasants - 1962 Bag - 724,600

The 1962 pheasant bag was higher, by 20 percent, than the 604,100 reported in 1961.

Pre-season population counts had indicated an excellent pheasant population in the traditional pheasant producing areas. However, due to several factors, among them adverse weather, the pre-season populations did not materialize in the reported bag in the Sacramento Valley.

Heavy rainfall in the latter part of October curtailed crop harvesting operations in the Sacramento Valley. Excellent cover was present during the season.

The contribution of the Sacramento Valley "pheasant bowl" area to the pheasant take was approximately the same numerically as in 1961. The most notable increase in kill was in the lower San Joaquin Valley and in southeastern California. These areas reported 49 percent of the statewide kill in 1962, compared to 39 percent in 1961.

The 1962 average seasonal bag of 3.6 pheasants per hunter was an increase over the 3.2 birds per hunter reported in 1961.

Quail - 1962 Bag - 2,147,800

An increase of 29 percent was recorded in the 1962 quail bag over the 1,659,200 reported in 1961.

Precipitation in the winter of 1961-62, which relieved drought conditions, also improved forage and contributed to higher quail populations in most of the State. The coastal and southwestern parts of California were benefited particularly, and bag figures there increased appreciably. Southeastern California, a traditional area of past quail abundance, was supplanted as a leader in the quail bag by the southwesterly portion of the State.

The average seasonal bag was 12.1 birds per hunter, an increase from the 10.8 average seasonal bag in 1961. This was accompanied by a 15 percent increase in the number of quail hunters in the field over the 154,200 reported in 1961.

Doves - 1962 Bag - 4,864,300

The dove bag reported in 1962 registered a 24 percent increase over the almost four million doves taken in 1961, with an increase of about 11 percent in the number of hunters over 1961 figures. The average seasonal bag rose to 21.8 doves per hunter from 19.4 in 1961.

Pre-season breeding surveys had indicated a good dove population.

Field checks of dove hunters indicated a higher kill in 1962 than was recorded in 1961.

Favorable weather held throughout the season, with very little movement of doves from preferred areas. As a result, most of the traditional dove hunting areas in the San Joaquin Valley and areas south of the Tehachapi Mountains had very good populations of doves during the 1962 season.

Chukar Partridge - 1962 Bag - 52,200

An increased kill over the 1961 figure of 19,300 was reported for the 1962 chukar bag. The reported 18,800 chukar hunters represented a 45 percent rise in hunter use over the 13,000 hunters in 1961.

The excellent spring vegetative growth of 1962 contributed to increased chukar populations.

The report of an appreciable chukar kill in areas where no known natural population is present, indicated that the stocking of chukars on licensed pheasant clubs also had an effect on the increased kill.

Sierra and Ruffed Grouse - 1962 Bag - 2,100

After a one year closure, the 1962 Sierra and ruffed grouse season produced a kill that was almost equal to the bag reported for the 1960 season.

Band-tailed Pigeons - 1962 Bag - 337,800

A marked increase of 45 percent over the 1961 bag of 233,100 was reported by survey respondents in 1962 and confirmed findings from in-season bag checks made by department personnel.

6/63 CHAPTER III A-I - 3

In general, the increased kill was apparent in the coastal area extending from San Francisco Bay in the north to the Mexican border.

In 1961, Monterey County accounted for about 41 percent of the statewide bag, whereas in 1962 a more widespread kill trend was in evidence.

The 44,800 pigeon hunters reported for 1962 exceeded the 27,600 hunters reported in 1961 by 62 percent, but the average seasonal pigeon bag of 7.5 birds per hunter in 1962 was less than the average bag of 8.4 pigeons reported in 1961.

Jackrabbits - 1962 Bag - 1,553,400

A 28 percent increase over the 1961 jackrabbit bag of 1,212,600 was recorded in 1962, with about six percent more hunters in the field.

Cottontail and Brush Rabbits - 1962 Bag - 537,100

The 1962 cottontail and brush rabbit bag represents an increase of about 16 percent over the 462,300 rabbits bagged in 1961. There were about three percent more hunters reported in 1962 than the 1961 figure.

Tree Squirrels - 1962 Bag - 79,300

The tree squirrel bag increased by two percent over the 77,900 squirrel take reported in 1961.

UPLAND GAME SUMMARY

All upland game species reported increases in their 1962 kill over the bag recorded in 1961.

Total hunter effort expended was about 12 percent higher than was reported in 1961.

An improvement, from 1961, of most upland game habitat resulted from rainfall, which was average or above, during the winter of 1961-62 and contributed to increased upland game populations.

WATERFOWL

Ducks - 1962 Bag - 1,705,500

The 1962 duck bag fell 19 percent below the 1961 reported bag of 2,099,000. About four percent fewer duck hunters reported hunting effort in 1962 than in 1961.

Pre-season duck population counts indicated that the 1962 population was approximately the same number as it was in 1961.

Severe pre-season storms, which produced flood conditions in the Sacramento Valley, made many unharvested crops available to ducks for feed.

Though the duck population was adequate, the availability of feed and the fair weather which prevailed during both halves of the duck season, it is felt, contributed to the decline in the duck bag in the 1962 season.

6/63 CIMPTER III A-I - 4

The 1962 average seasonal duck bag was 12.0 ducks per hunter compared with a 14.1 seasonal average kill in 1961.

Geese - 1962 Bag - 316,100

The goose bag was almost identical in both 1962 and 1961, but in 1962 about 10 percent fewer goose hunters reported goose hunting effort than were reported in 1961.

Siskiyou County, principally at Tule Lake, has been a traditionally fine goose hunting area and in 1962 produced about 19 percent of the statewide goose bag. In 1961 this area contributed only nine percent of the statewide kill.

Jacksnipes - 1962 Bag - 46,600

The 1962 jacksnipe kill declined about five percent below the 49,000 reported bagged in 1961.

WATERFOUL SUMMARY

The duck bag continued the decline which has been in evidence since 1959 and is paralleled by the drop in the sale of Federal duck stamps during the same period.

The total goose kill was about the same as was reported in 1961.

A total of 973,900 waterfowl hunter days was reported in 1962, an increase of about four percent over the 956,500 hunter days reported in 1961.

State-operated waterfowl management areas, in 1962, showed an increase in their kill, also in the hunter use of the areas, over 1959 figures. Prior to 1962 the waterfowl management area bag and hunter use inquiry was last included in the 1959 questionnaire. Comparative figures for these years are listed below.

	<u> 1959</u>	<u> 1962</u>
No. of Hunters	23,700	36,800
Total Bag	174,500	226,000
Avg. Seasonal Bag	7.4	6.1

BIG GAME

Deer - 1962 Bag - 112,300 (Deer tag count - 54,909)

The 1962 buck deer kill, as reported by survey respondents, was 11 percent less than the 126,100 bucks reported in 1961.

Hunters submitted 54,909 deer kill tags in 1962 compared with 69,118 tags in 1961, a 21 percent decrease in kill.

A comparison of these two methods of determining the buck kill during the regular season continues the trend of former years in which the reported kill by survey respondents has been about double the kill obtained from deer tag returns.

Bears - 1962 Bag - 2,500 (Bear tag count - 594)

The 1962 bear kill, as reported by survey respondents, exceeded the 1961 kill of 1,700 by 47 percent.

The 1962 bear kill, obtained from bear kill report tags was 594, a decrease of 29 percent from the bear kill of 841 reported in 1961.

The small sample of bear hunters included in this survey tends to make this portion susceptible to extreme bias.

BIG GAME SUMMARY

The 1962 deer season was below average. Several factors contributed to the lower kill; the drought years of 1959 through 1961 resulted in a reduced deer population and heavy storms during late October curtailed hunting effort with many preferred deer ranges inaccessible to hunters.

Survey respondents indicated a drop in the deer kill in 1962, but the percentage decrease was only about half as great as was indicated by deer kill tag returns.

Over three million big game hunter days were reported for 1962 compared with about 2-3/4 million hunter days in 1961, an increase of about eight percent.

There were a reported 19,100 archery hunters in 1962.

The following tables are appended to this report:

- 1. Summary of Statewide Game Bag 1962
- Ten leading counties in bag of pheasants, quail, doves, hand-tailed pigeons, jackrabbits, cottontail/brush rabbits, ducks and geese.
- 3. Major Game Species Bag, by Administrative Region 1962
- 4. Hunting Tags and Stamps Purchased 1962
- 5. Preferred Game Species as Indicated by Questionnaire Respondents 1962
- 6. Distribution of Hunting Tags and Stamps Purchased by Questionnaire Respondents 1962
- 7. Distribution of Pheasant Hunters by Type of Hunting Area 1959 and 1962
- 8. Mailing and Return by County of Residence 1962 Hunter Questionnaire

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF STATEWIDE GAME BAG - 1962

Species	Yearly Avg. 1956-60	1961	1962	% Change From 1961
Pheasants Quail Doves Chukar Partridge Sierra and Ruffed Grouse Sage Grouse Band-tailed Pigeons Jackrabbits Cottontail/Brush Rabbits Tree Squirrels Ducks Geese Jacksnipes Coots Buck Deer (Tag Count) Bears (Tag Count)	689,000 1,594,600 3,410,500 23,400 2,000 18,200* 202,700 1,097,600 472,600 73,800 3,358,300 3,358,300 3,42,100 47,800 377,400 68,665	604,100 1,659,200 3,906,700 19,300 No Season No Season 233,100 1,212,600 462,300 77,900 2,099,000 315,900 49,000 263,100 69,118 841	724,600 2,147,800 4,864,300 52,200 2,100 No Season 337,800 1,553,400 537,100 79,300 1,705,500 316,100 46,600 270,400 54,909	+ 20 + 29 + 24 +170 + 45 + 28 + 16 + 2 - 19 + 5 + 3 - 21 - 29
European Wild Pig	1,100	4,000	7,400	+ 85

^{*} No season on sage grouse since 1959.

TABLE II GAME BAG - 1962

(TEN LEADING COUNTIES)

					•		
PHE/	SANTS	% OF STATE TOTAL	POS IT I ON 1961	JACK	(RABBITS	% OF STATE TOTAL	POS 1T ION 1961
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	BUTTE FRESNO COLUSA SUTTER SOLANO YOLO MERCED SAN JOAQUIN SACRAMENTO STANISLAUS ALL OTHERS TOTAL	10.3 9.0 7.3 6.4 5.7 5.4 5.1 4.8 4.3 4.1 37.6	2 4 1 5 12 3 9 6 7	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	KERN MADERA SAN JOAQUIN MERCED SUTTER LOS ANGELES TULARE FRESNO YOLO SAN BERNARDINO ALL OTHERS TOTAL	9.0 6.7 5.7 4.8 4.2 4.0 4.0 3.9 3.9 49.8	2 14 8 1 12 7 5 3 16 4
QUA I	<u>L</u>			RABE	BITS (COTTONTAIL AN	D BRUSH)	
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	KERN SAN DIEGO RIVERSIDE FRESNO VENTURA TULARE MONTEREY SAN LUIS OBISPO LOS ANGELES IMPERIAL ALL OTHERS TOTAL	11.7 7.1 5.9 5.6 4.3 4.2 3.7 3.6 3.4 3.0 47.5	1 6 2 5 16 3 10 20 16 4	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	RIVERSIDE KERN SAN DIEGO ORANGE SAN BERNARDINO VENTURA LOS ANGELES MONTEREY IMPERIAL FRESNO ALL OTHERS TOTAL	13.6 12.2 11.8 8.7 6.4 5.7 4.8 3.9 3.5 3.1 26.3	1 3 2 16 5 9 6 4 8 10
DOVE	<u>.s</u>			DUCK	<u>s</u>		
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	IMPERIAL TULARE KERN FRESNO RIVERSIDE STANISLAUS SAN DIEGO MERCED SAN JOAQUIN LOS ANGELES ALL OTHERS TOTAL	9.6 8.9 7.6 7.5 6.1 3.9 3.5 3.3 3.2 3.1 43,3	1 2 5 3 4 6 13 8 7	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	MERCED COLUSA SOLANO IMPERIAL SISKIYOU FRESNO BUTTE SUTTER KERN A LAMEDA ALL OTHERS TOTAL	14.7 9.9 9.4 4.4 4.3 4.1 4.1 4.0 3.8 3.6 37.7	1 3 2 4 11 6 7 5 10 22
BA ND	-TAILED PIGEONS			GEES	<u>E</u>		
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	SANTA CRUZ KERN SANTA CLARA MONTEREY SAN LUIS OBISPO TULARE SAN DIEGO LOS ANGELES SONOMA SANTA BARBARA ALL OTHERS	14.5 10.8 9.3 7.9 6.2 5.4 5.2 5.0 3.8 3.1 28.8	2 27 18 1 7 19 12 25 3		COLUSA SISKIYOU MERCED GLENN MODOC BUTTE SUTTER YOLO SOLANO SAN JOAQUIN ALL OTHERS	22.9 18.7 10.1 7.1 6.8 5.5 3.8 3.4 3.3 2.5 15.9	1 5 4 3 7 2 9 13 8 6

TABLE III

MAJOR GAME SPECIES BAG - 1962 BY ADMINISTRATIVE REGION

Percentage of State Bag

<u>Species</u>	Region I	Region II	Region III	Region IV	Region V
Pheasants	6	52	14	26	13
Quail	9	12	21	28	30
Doves	3	15	15	35	32
Jackrabbits	6	28	12	34	20
Cottontail/Brush Rabbits	2	4	14	23	57
Ducks	11	40	13	26	10

TABLE IV
HUNTING TAGS AND STAMPS PURCHASED - 1962

	Reported by Questionnaire Respondents	Estimated* Sales	Difference	Percent Difference From Estimated Sales
	Number	Number	Number	Percent
Deer Tags Pheasant Tags Federal Duck Stamps Bear Tags	454,800 206,800 169,100 44,700	405,000 173,000 115,000 26,600	+ 49,800 + 33,800 + 54,100 + 18,100	+ 12 + 20 + 47 + 68

^{*}Supplied by Department of Fish and Game License Section and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

TABLE V

PREFERRED GAME SPECIES AS REPORTED BY
QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS - 1962

	Perce	ent		N	umber	
	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
Species	Hunters	<u> Hunters</u>	<u>Hunters</u>	Hunters	Hunters	Hunters
Door	7.77	æ i	771	04 700	21 5 000	4.10 000
- · · -						
		2				
		9			50,100	
Quail	26	5	31	151,800	25,900	177,700
Ducks	20	4	24	118,400	23,900	142,300
Jackrabbits	18	1				
Cottontail/Brus	sh	_	•		237	
•		1	14.	73,000	7,200	80:200
		3				
*				713100	279700	129000
	s 6	2	8	31.800	13.000	74.800
	Ť	5				
	<u>,</u>	í			-	
-	3	$\overline{\mathbf{T}}$	3			
	ze 2	ī	3			
	ì	ī	5			
_	ī	Tr.	ĩ			
	- ₩	1	علي	007 و	1400	00100
Ducks 20 4 24 118,400 23,900 142,300 Jackrabbits 18 1 19 103,100 5,900 109,000 Cottontail/Brush Rabbits 13 1 14 73,000 7,200 80,200 Geese 10 3 13 57,700 15,900 73,600 Band-tailed						
Grouse	T	T	T	£ y 400	800	0000 و

Of the estimated 635,000 license buyers in 1962, 581,300 indicated some degree of hunting effort.

Due to multiple hunting effort by individual hunters, percentage figures exceed 100 percent and numerical figures exceed the number of individual hunters reported.

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF HUNTING TAGS AND STAMPS PURCHASED
BY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS - 1962

Expressed in Percent of Total Respondents

(The "xx" indicates the individual type of stamp or tag purchased)

				Number of	
Deer Tags	Pheasant Tags	Federal Duck Stamps	Bear Tags	Respondents	Percent
xx				2,204	40.9
ЖX	xx	XX		517	9.6
XX	XX			490	9.1
	ХX			307	5.7
	XX	xx.		292	5.4
XX		xx		276	5.1
		жx		239	4.4
XX			жx	205	3.8
XX	XX	XX	жx	88	1.7
XX	ХX		жx	60	1.1
ХX		жx	XX	24	0.5
			xx	7	0.1
	XX		XX	2 1	${f T}$
	жx	хх	XX	1	T
		No Stamps or Tag	n Duraha and	681	10.6
		Mo Doguba of 198	a rurchaseu	201	12.6
		Total :	Respondents	5, 393	100.0

TABLE VII DISTRIBUTION OF PHEASANT HUNTERS BY TYPE OF HUNTING AREA

The following abbreviations are used in this table:

- 1. Co-op (State Operated Cooperative Pheasant Hunting Areas.)
- 2. Community (Community Operated or Pheasant Association Areas.)
- 3. Lic. Pheas. Club (Licensed Pheasant Clubs.)
- 4. W.M.A. (State or Federal Waterfowl Management Areas.)
- 5. Other (Unmanaged Public and Private Lands Open to Pheasant Hunting.)

	1	959		1962	
Hunters Using One Area Only	Number	Perc	ent	Number 1	Percent
1. Other 2. Co-op 3. Community 4. Lic. Pheas. Club 5. W.M.A.	104,000 27,800 15,600 14,600 5,700	52. 13. 7. 7. 2.	9 8 3	104,900 6,700 17,300 14,800 6,100	58.8 3.8 9.7 8.3 3.4
<u>Subtotal</u>	ı	67,700	83.9	149,800	84.0
Hunters Using More Than One Are	a _	32,200	16.1	28,600	16.0
Total Hunters With Area Indicate	<u>ed</u> 1	99,,900	100.0	178,400	100.0
Hunting Area Not Indicated	i	12,100		23,000	
GRAND TOTAL ALL PHEASANT HUN	IERS 2	12,000		201,400	

		Littat Maw Total Individual	_/au⊆ Area Hun	ter Use	$\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(t)},\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^{N}$
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.	Other Co-op Community Lic. Pheas. Club W.M.A.	127,700 46,200 26,600 21,900 10,700	54.8 19.8 11.4 9.4 4.6	126,300 18,200 26,600 24,900 14,000	60.1 8.7 12.7 11.8 _6.7
	*TOTAL	233,100	100.0	210,000	100.0

*Due to the fact that some pheasant hunters hunted on two or more pheasant hunting areas, this total exceeds the actual number of pheasant hunters reported.

TABLE VII D

MAILING AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY COUNTY OF RESIDENCE - 1962 HUNTER SURVEY

COUNTY	QUESTIONNAIRES Mailed	PERCENT OF TOTAL MAILED	NUMBER RETURNED	PERCENT RETURNED
ALAMEDA	507	4.9	263	51.8
ALPINE	1	Ŧ	1	100.0
AMADOR	26	0.3	12	46.1
BUTTE	266	2.6	139	52.2
CALAVERAS COLUSA	33 40	0.3 0.4	18 19	54. 5 47.5
CONTRA COSTA	370	3,6	194	52.4
DEL NORTE	38	0,4	18	47.4
EL DORADO	86	0.8	48	55.8
FRESNO	423	4.1	229	54.1
GLENN	59	0.6	37	62.7
HUMBOLDT	252	2.4	124	49.2
IMPERIAL INYO	79 44	0.8	33 28	41.8
KERN	329	0.4 3.2	161	63.6 48.9
KINGS	71	0.7	27	38.0
LAKE	47	0,4	26	55.0
LASSEN	58	0,6	35	60,3
LOS ANGELES	1,738	16.8	904	52.0
MADERA MARIN	69	0.7	40	58 ₄ 0
MAR IPOSA	110 11	1.1 0.1	57 7	51.8 63. 6
MENDOCINO	123	1,2	61	49 . 6
MERCED	138	1,3	63	45.7
MODOC	28	0.3	15	53,6
MONO	19	0,2	12	63,1
MONTEREY	153	1.5	84	54.9
NAPA NE VADA	88 58	0 . 8 0 . 6	47 31	53 . 4 53 . 4
ORANGE	264	2,5	136	51.5
PLACER	116	1,1	59	50.9
PLUMAS	53	0.5	22	41.5
RIVERSIDE	140	1.4	72	51.4
SACRAMENTO	598	5,8	319	53.3
SAN BENITO SAN BERNARDINO	22	0.2	13	59 . 1
SAN DIEGO	210 365	2,0 3,5	106 196	50 . 5 53. 7
SAN FRANCISCO	234	2.3	131	56.0
SAN JOAQUIN	296	2.9	147	49.7
SAN LUIS OBISPO	132	1,3	82	62.1
SAN MATEO	263	2,5	144	54.8
SANTA BARBARA	143	1.4	66	46.2
SANTA CLARA	440	4.2	236	53.6
SANTA CRUZ Shasta	88 234	0.8 2.2	53 122	60 . 2 52 . 1
SIERRA	10	0,1	6	60.0
SISKIYOU	147	1,4	71	48.3
SOLANO	135	1.3	76	56,3
SONCMA	211	2.0	105	49.8
STANISLAUS	215	2.1	107	49.8
SUTTER	96 95	0.9	51 43	53 . 1
TEHAMA TRINITY	85 35	0 . 8 0 . 3	43 17	50 . 6 48.6
TULARE	220	2.1	107	48,6
TUOLUMNE	43	0.4	22	51.2
VENTURA	112	1.1	63	56,3
YOLO	119	1.1	66	55.5
YUBA	74	0 ₂ 7	21	28,4
NON-RESIDENT	2	<u>T</u>	<u> </u>	50.0
TOTAL	10,366 10 28	100.0	5,393 🛵 🦠	52.0

	***************************************	Ducks		Geese		Jacksnipes	
1	ALAMEDA		1600	600	J :	1,900	
2	ALPINE	1,300	£33		/as		
3	AMADOR				***************************************		
	BUTTE	69,400	***************************************	17,300	***************************************	800	
5	CALAVERAS	-			******************************		· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
6	COLUSA	168,300	**************************************	72,500		4,200	
~	CONTRA COSTA	53,700	***************************************	2,800		1,800	i
ģ	DEL NORTE	3,500	***************************************			1,000	
	ELDORADO	کاباریوار		**************************************	***************************************		
ó	FRESNO	70 100	***************************************	2 000	2 24 3		•
		70,400	***************************************	2,900		500	·····
	GLENN	40,500		22,300		500	
2	HUMBOLDT	37,400		1,300		2,400	
3	IMPERIAL	75,000 3,900	······································	7,200	······································	1,300	.
+	INYO	3,900	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	400			
5	KERN	64,900	***************************************	1,300			•
	KINGS	4,000	***********************	200	*	-	
7	LAKE	4,000	- 3 7		***************************************		
ġ.	LASSEN	21,900		6,900	7 ,		
9	LOS ANGELES	3,500	633	Control of the Contro	***************************************	*	•
	MADERA	9,300		3,500		700	
	MARIN	27,800	·	900		1,900	
	MARIPOSA		**************************				······
	MENDOCINO	4,900	600	**************************************			
	MERCED	250 000		32,000		1 700	
		250,000	16,200	22,000		4,700	
	MODOC	27,800		21,400		700	
	MONO	10,800	2,000	2,600	1911		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	MONTEREY	6,600	705		 **********************************	2,800	
	NAPA	5,400	1400	200		200	
	NEVADA	***	***************************************				*******
	ORANGE	3,200	\$ 3.5				
	PLACER	3,100	Taa	900			
	PLUMAS	2,400	700	900			
	RIVERSIDE	33,800	3700	1,300	* .		
	SACRAMENTO		3800	5,900		3,700	
	San BENITO	2,400					
	San BERNARDINO		1300	· ·	-		
	San DIEGO		2 600	500		1,200	
	San FRANCISCO		······································			#32UU	
3	San TOACHTH	E2 JAA	COE 2 M	ø 000	er Silvi	6,100	
	San JOAQUIN	26,4UU 200		8,000		o too	
	San LUIS OBISPO			5- 14************************************			
	San MATEO		1,102		3		•
	Santa BARBARA			pm.	## b+ 12**** 4 & ****** 4 & *******************	#15	
	Santa CLARA		1,000	~~	~	\	
	Santa CRUZ		·	a	·	400	1.5
	SHASTA	9,400	2450	1,400	*******	·	
,	SIERRA	900	3.5	100	<i>j</i>		
	SISKIYOU		3443	59,200	7.5	200	
	SOLANO	159,700	12 403	10,500	5 1 4 4	2,200	/
	SONOMA	20,200	- 1 V.	200	4.,	2,200	
	STANISLAUS	15,900	1700	700	······································		•••••
	SUTTER	69,000	2 6 39	12,100	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	1,200	
	TEHAMA		600				
		3,300	100	800			•••••
	TRINITY	700			·** *********************************		
	TULARE	19,500	1500	900		2,200	
	TUOLUMNE	100	<u> </u>	æ.7	_\		
	VENTURA	17,500		200	<u> </u>	1,500	:
	YOLO	39,700	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10,800	٠	800	<i>.</i>
•	YUBA	32,500		3,500	. "	400	,,.,
ጥ	GIVEN	24,100	3.4	1,900	***	100	
. T							

		PHEASANTS	10 /2	QUAIL	Hunter.	DOVES	1 Konsto
-	ALAMEDA	3,900	1,300	22,100	(/:53	65,600	
?	ALPINE		•	700	<i>-</i>	1,100	-
3	AMADOR		; -4.,,,+,+,+,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	10,600		19,800	150
+	BUTTE	74,300	14,700	33,400		77,900	
5	CALAVERAS		}	8,800	.732	6,100	[15
b	COLUSA	53 , 100	11/310	12,000	1, •	39,000	
~	CONTRA COSTA	9,700	3, 700	18,500	1/32	122,000	
3	DEL NORTE						
9	ELDORADO			41,200		28,200	······
כ	FRESNO	65,100		120,500	14,3	365,600	1712 ×
1	GLENN	29,200	7 3 - 3	8,800	1 / 4		
2	HUMBOLDT	100	······································	27,200		53,700	
3	IMPERIAL	23 100	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	64,600		5,200	
) +	INYO	23,100 10,200		24,000		467,100	
		27, 600	Ot your district	26,800	•	59,100	
5	KERN	21,800		250,200		367,600	
5	KINGS	9,200 600		13,800		67,000	<u></u>
7	LAKE		की <u>ं</u>	38 , 700		35,100	
3	LASSEN	4,800	<u></u>	17,400	1,700	35,200	
9	LOS ANGELES	13,900		73,300		<i>2</i> 153,400	4 7
•	MADERA	7,200		45,800	2 101	74,300	5
L	MARIN	800	Z	13,800	1, 2, 11	10,200	én:
2	MARIPOSA	·	:	32,400		7,300	
3	MENDOCINO		400	23,800			د
) +	MERCED	37,100	18.300			6,900	
		<u>٥٠٠</u> ٠		12,700		158,700	
5	MODOC	8,200		29,900		10,600	ن به به نستونستنسته
5	MONO	600	570	3,100		11,700	
,	MONTEREY	2,000	<u></u>	79,100	f reg	96,400	
}	NAPA	3,400		11,700	2.5. ·	44,400	
7	NEVADA		168	19,500	2:0	2,600	
)	ORANGE	4,000	6.5	10,500		73,700	1
_	PLACER	5,600		31,400	**************************************	62,100	4:
2	PLUMAS		···	1,600		5,600	
3	RIVARSIDE	17,300		126,400			
, t	SACRAMENTO	. •	15,700	8,600		297 ,6 00	
						76,700	
	San BENITO	1,200	500	28,100		46,800	
		5,300	1,100	59,100		133,800	* 1 4
•		3 , 300		152,700		169,100	
}	San FRANCISCO				************		
)	San JOAQUIN	34,800	<u>. 14. Fra.</u>	37,000	*	158,100	
)	San LUIS OBISPO.	500		77,800	\$16.55	124,100	4
	San MATEO	4,400		4,600	i,3 an	8,000	Ţ,
				44,300		65,300	
,	Santa BARBARA Santa CLARA	2,000		42,000		44,800	\$, 1.
	Santa CRUZ	500 ·	**************************************	40,000	* * * * *		
	SHASTA	2,500			5,300	38,600	
		-		43,700	<u>, joo</u>	42,300	<u>. </u>
	SIERRA	17,100	*************	200	200	1,200	
	SISKIYOU	17,100		14,600	ୟ ଟିଡ଼	16,400	ديًا
	SOLANO	41,400		5,200	1,000	47,100	3,80
	SONOMA	3,400	<u> </u>			58,700	4 T 3.
	STANISLAUS	29 ,8 00		26,300	5551	191,000	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	SUTTER *	46,400	17 FA	6,700	600	54,800	₹ ID.
	TEHAMA	6,600	* ***	18,800	å,330	42,600	\$ 55
	TRINITY	-		16,200	မ်းပ		
	TULARE	12,900	5,700	90,500	7 300	3,500 432,400	(1) 6;
	TUOLUMNE	400		フレップレジ 1 ピーワハハ	5,33	9,100	
				15,700	1,5-	75 TO	
	VENTURA	11,900		93,000		131,500	
	YOLO	39,400		20,400	<u> 4.792</u>	76,100	بالأشار أرابيسي
	YUBA	14,100		20,800	2,400	33,300	
N	Not Given	10,500	1,000	4,400	600	28 ,800	\$ 50

		60.0	Lilinger I		r ,	:	
٠		COOTS	Lloures	DEER	tan si ra	BEAR	
1	ALAMEDA	4 , 600	ice j	1,800	4-7		
2	ALPINE	3,200	200	3,400	16 900	, p	
3	AMADOR			200	5 10		
4	BUTTE	7,800	1,500	2,500	15,300		
4770	CALAVERAS			900	2.5		
6	COLUSA	7,400	1,170	1,100		7	****************
~	CONTRA COSTA	35,100	-	600	***************************************		
ġ	DEL NORTE	700	100	······································	***************************************	**************************************	****
9	ELDORADO			2,100	** ***********************************	100	
10	FRESNO	3,700	······································	1,900		400	
11	GLENN	1,200	* .	2 600		200	***************************************
12	HUMBOLDT	1,800		2,800	****		
		17 000		6,700	************	100	
13	IMPERIAL	17,000		100			*********
14	INYO	3,500	12 - 1	600	?************************************	***************************************	
15	KERN	16,600		2,200	: 		*************
16	KINGS	~		100			***************************************
17	LAKE	1,800	-	3,800		100	****************
18	LASSEN	4,900		2,200	***************************************	- !	
19	LOS ANGELES	-		900			
20	MADERA	4,100	1.30	2,000	7 Jan		
21	MARIN	5,900		1,600			
22	MARIPOSA		,***********************************	700	*************************	100	
23	MENDOCINO			6,900	(************************************		
24	MERCED	20,800		500	•	200	
	MODOC	4,600		500		***************************************	
25		4,000		2,100	<u> </u>		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
26	MONO	600	# / /	3,100	<u> </u>	***************************************	******
27	MONTEREY	6,000		4,100	·····		,,
28	NAPA	80 0	******************************	2 , 900	; ;	***************************************	***************************************
29	NEVADA			2,100			
30	ORANGE	700	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	400			
31	PLACER			1,600			
32	PLUMAS			3,200			***************************************
33	RIVERSIDE	14,400		500		***************************************	
34	SACRAMENTO	2,900		100	***************************************		
35	San BENITO	500		2,200			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
36	San BERNARDINO	700	*	800	*******************************	*	
37	San DIEGO		***************************************	900		***************************************	***************************************
38	San FRANCISCO		······································	,		***************************************	***************************************
39	San JOAQUIN		*	200			
40	San LUIS OBISPO				- 		
				3,100			***************************************
41	San MATEO			400		***************************************	
42	Santa BARBARA			2,400		***************************************	
43	Santa CLARA			2,400		** - * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	
44	Santa CRUZ		***************************************	100	************************************	***************************************	
45	SHASTA	2,100	·	4,700	· · ·	400	*************************
46	SIERRA	2,900		800	***************************************		
47	SISKIYOU			6,600		500	***************************************
48	SOLANO	19,900			***	-	
49	SONOMA		***************************************	3,800	10 m		
50	STANISLAUS			2,000			
51	SUTTER	12,900				***************************************	******************************
52	TEHAMA		,	<i>ل</i> . 500	************************	200	*****************
53	TRINITY	b.	—· ,	4,100	***************************************	100	
54	TULARE	13,300		1,500		TUU	***************
55 55	TUOLUMNE	لايلال وليند			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	***************************************	
		1 400		2,000			***************************************
56 50	VENTURA			1,900	*****************	***************************************	
57	YOLO		······	800			
58 30 m	YUBA			500	***************************************	100	*******
NOT	GIVEN	3,900	•	900			
m 0m 1	AT	270,400			***************************************	2,500	
TOTI				112,300			

Wild Boar

		Wild Boar
1	ALAMEDA	
2	ALPINE	
3	AMADOR	
4	BUTTE	
	CALAVERAS	
5.6	COLUSA	
,,,	CONTRA COSTA	
8	DEL NORTE	
9	ELDORADO	
10	FRESNO	
11	GLENN	
12	HUMBOLDT	600
13	IMPERIAL	
14	INYO	
15	KERN	
16	KINGS	
17	LAKE	
18	LASSEN	400
19	LOS ANGELES	100
20		
21	MARIN	
22	MARIPOSA	**************************************
23	MENDOCINO	500
24		500
25 26	MONO	
27	MONTEREY	3,200
28	NAPA	23 500
29	NEVADA	
3Ó	ORANGE	
31	PLACER	
32	PLUMAS	
33	RIVERSIDE	
34	SACRAMENTO	
35	San BENITO	100
36	San BERNARDINO	
37		
38	San FRANCISCO	
39	San JOAQUIN	
40		
41 42	San MATEU	100
43	Santa DANBARA	400
45 44		
45		2.5
46	SIERRA	
47	SISKIYOU	
48		
49	SONOMA	1,500
5 0		
51	SUTTER	
52		100
53	TRINITY	
54		
55		
56		
57 58		
70	TUDA	
	. :	
TOT	'AL	7,400

OF		Chukar Partr	TORE	Sierra & Ruffed Grouse	Pigeor
1	ALAMEDA	Para Para Para Para Para Para Para Para			7,500
2	ALPINE		T		100
3	AMADOR				∂ 200
4	BUTTE				3 c 1 ,20 0
5	CALAVERAS				:::
6	COLUSA			4	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
ŗ.	CONTRA COSTA		***************************************		2,000
Ŕ	DEL NORTE		······		~,
9	ELDORADO				- 3 3,40 0
10	FRESNO	8,800		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
11			·····	***************************************	2,2,100
	GLENN	·····	7-4		
12	HUMBOLDT	2 500		200 201	11 7,800
13	IMPERIAL	3,500			91,400
14	INYO	4,500		Some Control	
15	KERN	21,200	16,100		36,400
16	KINGS			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
17	LAKE		******		
18	LASSEN	200	,	200	
19	LOS ANGELES	800	£25		16,800
20	MADERA				× 2,400
21	MARIN		***************************************		
22	MARIPOSA				²⁴ 400
23	MENDOCINO				14 6,400
24	MERCED	400	-	100 554	a 1,200
25	MODOC		*******************	200	್ 1,200
26	MONO	1,200	1,533	200	
27	MONTEREY	-,		4W	26 000
28				**************************************	26 ,80 0
-	NAPA				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
29	NEVADA		***************************************		3,700
30	ORANGE	500	······		700ء ک
31	PLACER				2,900
32	PLUMAS				9 1,400
33	RIVERSIDE	500		***************************************	6,200
34	SACRAMENTO		,		91,400
35	San BENITO	1,300			
36	San BERNARDINO	2,200	1 5 -		~78 1,500
37	San DIEGO	***********************			17,400
38					
39	San JOAQUIN	***************************************	******************		×/ 4.000
40	San LUIS OBISPO	1,100			21.100
41	San MATEO				100
42	Santa BARRARA	***************************************			// 10.7 <u>.</u> 00
43	Santa CLARA	*****************************	***************************************		27 KM
44					
44 45	SHACAN			1 00 " " "	ΑΩ
	CTEDD A	200		400 333 100	400 و ١
46	CTCVTVOIT	200		100	
47	SISKIYOU	200	F	200 100	5,300
48	SULANU	∪0⊥ور	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
49	SONOMA		*************		12,800
5 0	STANISLAUS	************************	******************		/ 1.400
51	SUTTER	*************************		100	
52	TEHAMA		****************	100	700
53	TRINITY	***************************************	.,	200	/ L.900
54	TULARE	repour.	1		18-400
55	TUOLUMNE			16.5	: »], _ \$CC
56	VENTURA	2,000	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		/ 5 700
57 57	YOLO				
-	CTUEN	£^^	,		
AOT	GIVEN	200	2		32 600
				2,100	

		Jackrabbi	.s 🤌	Cottontai	Jakki !	Tree Squip	mal c
7	AT AMEDIA	> 27,200	2,600			Tree 2dari	Ters
1	ALAMEDA ALPINE	4,600		12,800			
2	AMADOR	1,200	200	1,700 200		(00	***************************************
3	BUTTE	24 22,000	2,500	200		600	A
4		2 200				6,100	······································
7	CALAVERAS	2,300	135	400		1,900	E 25 m
0	COLUSA	14,000	1300	************************	100 354		
	CONTRA COSTA	13,800	600	1,700	354		
8	DEL NORTE			_			
9	ELDORADO	7,300	1.1	1,300		4,700	: \$ · ;
10	FRESNO	61,800	5510	16,600	5500	1,800	
11	GLENN	38,500	San I	400		1,300	
12	HUMBOLDT	4,900	ķγο	3 , 700		7,200	
13	IMPERIAL	ν (21 ,9 00	3 300	30 600		7,200	
		2 30 100		18,600			
14	INYO	/ 7 30,100	6,100	/6 7,300			***************************************
15	KERN	140,000	15.775	65,300	<u>(.34.4</u>	900	C., *
16	KINGS	18,200 15,500	1,000	5,200	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		************************
17	LAKE	15,500		700		2,600	1
18	LASSEN	73 22,800 62,200	á áco	3,400		800	` <u>*</u>
19	LOS ANGELES	62,200	7,850	25,900		100	3 3 5
20	MADERA	103,800	5,000	6,600	1 3:0	600	
21	MARIN	800			***************************************		6 44 · ·
22	MARIPOSA			2,800		100	
		2,000	/	یان و ی	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		* 1.0
23	MENDOCINO		<u> </u>			2,400	* *
24	MERCED	74,400	1,800	9,100		400	
25	MODOC		[.1.20	2,800	·····	100	100
26	MONO	7,500		2,400	************		
27	MONTEREY	34,000	A . 3	21,000		3,200	1,500
28	NAPA	7,500	1,300	200	100	200	
29	NEVADA	2,000		100	190	1,300	3.34
30	ORANGE	7,400	1 540	46,600	1732		
31	PLACER	32,200		1,300	1,133 Sis	1,500	, I I · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
32	PLUMAS	23,300		100		2,100	***************************************
33			* .			ب ۲۰۰۰ و	***************************************
	RIVERSIDE	77.47,100	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	73,200	13,230		
34	SACRAMENTO			2,100			\$ A .
35	San BENITO	11,500		5,200			
36	San BERNARDINO	₹5 60 ,100	7.4.4	34, 600	7.	700	ಸಿದಕ
37	San DIEGO	46,600	5, 1.1	34,600 63,300		********************************	***************************************
38	San FRANCISCO	-			*********		
39	San JOAQUIN	88,900	11.00	7,300	1.5%	600	* A.*
40	San LUIS OBISPO	6 33.000	* *	ir 12,500	Lico	······	
41	San MATEO	700		19 4,800 X	1.100	100	*
42	Santa BARBARA	2,600	1 4 2 2	1,700	***************************************		3
43				1. 400		2 000	
45 44	Santa CLARA Santa CRUZ			4,600		2,000	
	CHINGE ORUG	لاللدود	••••••	10,100		100	······································
45	SHASTA	9,500	***************************************	400	<u> ८</u> ११ ७	7,700	es a final control of the control of
46	SIERRA	8,400		400		700	
47	SISKIYOU			2,200		2,200	**************************************
48	SOLANO	33,200		500	2.50	***************************************	***************************************
49	SONOMA	9 28,900		800	210	2,200	7 · *
59	STANISLAUS	51,100	1.	2,700		#	134
51	SUTTER	65,700	.,,,,,	800			
52	TEHAMA	6,400				1,800	
53	TRINITY	5,200	1 - 1		······································	8,900	
54	TULARE	61,900	4 80c	- 3×12 ∧ ∩ ∩			، برود دروده بروده و المواقع ا المواقع المواقع المواق
	TUOLUMNE		(A C	² /12,000 1,800		3,200	**************************************
55 E 4		5,800		80U		4,600	8 40 1 50
56	VENTURA	24,900		30,700	4 25	500	***************************************
57	YOLO	60,300		2,600	1112.2	200	13
58	YUBA	14,700	Mer	200		1,800	
TO	GIVEN	6,400	120	4,200	753	2,100	
m. 	······································		·····	······		*******************************	
TOT		1,553,400		537,100		79,300	
		\$ ₹€	;		-,	1	
		i		;			
		,	,	·		1	