# State of California The Resource Agency Department of Fish and Game Wildlife Management Division Bird and Mammal Conservation Program

BOBCAT HARVEST ASSESSMENT

1995-96

## State of California THE RESOURCES AGENCY Department of Fish and Game

### BOBCAT HARVEST ASSESSMENT 1995-96

Prepared by
William E. Grenfell Jr.
Wildlife Management Division
Bird and Mammal Conservation Section

November 1996

#### **ABSTRACT**

An estimated 1,131 bobcats were taken during the 1995 hunting year and the 1995-96 trapping season. Trappers took 660 bobcats, and hunters took 410. The total take was a decrease of 39 percent from the 1994-95 year. The average pelt price increased from \$24.72 last year to \$33.66 this year (Table 5). The average take per successful trapper increased, but the number of bobcat trappers decreased from 102 to 62.

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

The annual bobcat harvest increased in the 1960s and continued through the late 1970s. This increase was brought about by high fur prices. The sale of bobcat pelts provided the most income to trappers of any species trapped and sold in California since the 1975-76 season. In order to determine the magnitude of the bobcat harvest and the effects on bobcat populations in the state, several studies were initiated. Field studies of local population dynamics were conducted on unharvested populations in Siskiyou, Riverside and San Diego counties and on a harvested population in San Diego county. Also, a statewide harvest monitoring program was initiated to determine the age, sex structure, and harvest of bobcats on a regional basis. Currently, only the harvest is being monitored because the harvest and demand have been low since 1981-82.

Public interest in the bobcat increased in the early 1970s on both domestic and international fronts due to an increase in the demand for bobcat pelts. Prior to 1971, the bobcat in California was a non-protected mammal, and there were no restrictions on its take. In 1971, this species was given nongame status by the California Legislature.

In 1973, the United States became party to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna. 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 selected by the parties to the treaty as a possible candidate for future endangerment, primarily because of concern for the Mexican bobcat. The Endangered Species Authority (ESSA) was established as the scientific body to monitor the bobcat's status in the United States, and The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was given authority over trade as provided in the treaty.

In 1974 a six month season was established for the take of bobcats. This season was reduced to the standard 3 1/2 month furbearer season in 1976.

In 1977 The Defenders of Wildlife petitioned the Secretary of Interior to place the bobcat on the endangered species list. This action was taken because of the high demand and prices for bobcats at that time. The Secretary of Interior found that Defender's petition was not warranted. Also in 1977, the California Fish and Game Commission enacted regulations that required pelts from bobcats taken for commercial purposes under a trapping license be tagged with a United States Fish and Wildlife Service shipping (export) tag. This was done to comply with the provisions of CITES as the bobcat had recently be designated an Appendix 2 species. The issuance of export tags allowed the Department to closely monitor the take and sale of bobcat pelts.

In November 1979, Defenders brought suit against the ESSA, claiming that ESSA did not make its findings based on biological information. The suit was heard in December, and the court reversed ESSA's findings for several states, but not for California. Later, the ESSA was dissolved, and responsibility was transferred to the USFWS Office of Scientific Authority (OSA). OSA was given responsibility for scientific monitoring. OSA reviewed California's biological data and analysis that resulted from several years of harvest monitoring field studies of the bobcat. California's pre-breeding estimate of 72,000 adult bobcats, and harvest quota of 14,400 animals per year was approved by OSA.

Defenders of wildlife appealed the Court's ruling. This resulted in a court order that prohibited the export of bobcat pelts taken after July 1, 1982. This ban was imposed until OSA could satisfy the court that export of bobcat pelts was based on reliable population estimates, and that each state would enforce a predetermined take limit. 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.

During the 1978-79 trapping season, the export tag quota of 14,400 animals was reached by the end of January, effectively shortening the season by one month. During 1979-80, the trapping season was reduced to 2 1/2 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 trapping zones, each with a different season length, depending on 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 zone, in order to have the bobcat trapping season coincide with the trapping season on gray fox. In 1982-83, the northeastern California trapping season was set back two weeks, and its length was increased by one week.

The season limit for hunting bobcats was set at two for the 1980-81 hunting season, and increased to five for the 1984-85 season. Prior to 1982-83, the hunting season length and timing coincided with the trapping (commercial) season. In 1982-83, the hunting season was extended by two weeks past the end of the trapping (commercial) season in Del Norte, Humboldt, Kern, Lake, Mendocino, Trinity, and San Diego counties. For the 1985-86 season, the hunting season was extended statewide to open one week before the commercial season through February 15.

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

Bobcat hunting and trapping regulations were again adjusted for the 1994-95 season. The season length of the three trapping zones were made the same, and ran from November 24 through January 31. The hunting season was adjusted to run from October 15 through February 28, statewide. The reason for this action was to provide more opportunity for hunters and trappers. The total bobcat take in recent years has been substantially less than 20 percent of the OSA quota, and therefore is not in danger of overharvest.

Since 1982, the bobcat harvest has been monitored closely, the results of this monitoring for the 1995-96 season are discussed in this report.

#### **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 1995-96 season, the total estimated take of bobcats was 1,131 individuals (Table 1). This was a 39 percent decrease over the 1994-95 trapping year. Commercial trappers continue to take the majority (58 percent) of bobcats. The total hunter take of 410 (Tables 1 and 2) was lower (16 percent) than in 1994-95. The total take of bobcats ranged from none in IO counties to 135 in Kern County (Table 2). In the 1995-96 season, over 100 bobcats were taken from each of three counties.

ESTIMA	TABLE I ESTIMATED ANNUAL TAKE OF BOBCATS BY HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN CALIFORNIA 1977-78 TO 1995-96											
Season	Total Commercial Take (IA+IB)	Commercial Trapper Take (IA)	Commercial Hunter Take (IA)	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						
1994-95	1,319	1,319	0	488	62	1,869						
1995-96	660	660	0	410	61	1,131						

<sup>\*</sup> Federal fiscal year data 10-1-94 to 9-30-95. Other data in this table 7-1 to 6-30.

TABLE 2. TAKE OF BOBCATS BY COUNTY DURING THE 1995-96 SEASON										
County	Licensed Trappers	Sport Hunters	Animal Damage Control	Total County						
Alameda		3	1	4						
Alpine				0						
Amador	9	1		10						
Butte		2		2						
Calaveras		3	4	7						
Colusa	51			51						
Contra Costa				0						
Del Norte		11		1						
El Dorado	6	4	2	12						
Fresno	85	16		101						
Glenn	6			6						
Humboldt	40	17	7	64						
Imperial		3		3						
Inyo	1		·	11						
Kern	82	50	3	135						
Kings				. 0						
Lake	3	5	1	9						
Lassen	21	23	1	45						
Los Angeles	22	4		26						
Madera		10		10						
Marin		1		111						
Mariposa		3	2	5						
Mendocino	5	21	1	27						
Merced			1	11						
Modoc	53	21		74						
Mono	27	1		28						
Monterey		6		6						
Napa		2		2						
Nevada		2	11	3						
Orange		1 2		1						
Placer Plumas	12	10	2	. 2						
Riverside	15	12	<u> </u>	24 27						
Sacramento	15	12								
San Benito		10		0 10						
San Bernardino	81	25		106						
San Diego	8	20	7	35						
San Francisco	8	20		0						
San Joaquin				0						
San Luis Obispo	1	8	5	14.						
San Mateo	<del></del>	2	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2						
Santa Barbara		3	4	7						
Santa Clara		9		9						
Santa Cruz				0						
Shasta	9	15		24						
Sierra		1		1						
Siskiyou	54	26	7	87						
Solano		1		1						
Sonoma		5	11	16						
Stanislaus		1		1						
Sutter				Ö						
Tehama		5		. 5						
Trinity	16	5		21						
Tulare	20	33		53						
Tuolumne		10	1	11						
Ventura	33 .	6		39						
Yolo				0						
Yuba				0						
Unknown		1		1						
TOTAL	660	410	61	1 ,131						

Eight of the 10 counties reporting the highest commercial take of bobcats were the same in 1995-96 as in 1994-95. However, Colusa and Ventura counties replaced Los Angeles and Santa Barbara counties (Table 3).

2 San Bernardino Humboldt San Bernardino Humboldt Monte 3 Santa Barbara Tulare Shasta Tulare Santa 4 Shasta Santa Barbara Kern Kern San Lu 5 San Benito Kern Siskiyou San Bernardino Humb	ernardino rey Barbara iis oldt
Rank1976-771977-781978-791979-801980-801HumboldtSanta BarbaraHumboldtSanta BarbaraSan Bernardino2San BernardinoHumboldtSan BernardinoHumboldtMonte3Santa BarbaraTulareShastaTulareSanta4ShastaSanta BarbaraKernKernSan Lu5San BenitoKernSiskiyouSan BernardinoHumb	ernardino rey Barbara iis oldt
1HumboldtSanta BarbaraHumboldtSanta BarbaraSan B2San BernardinoHumboldtMonte3Santa BarbaraTulareShastaTulareSanta4ShastaSanta BarbaraKernKernSan Lu5San BenitoKernSiskiyouSan BernardinoHumb	ernardino rey Barbara iis oldt
3 Santa Barbara Tulare Shasta Tulare Santa 4 Shasta Santa Barbara Kern Kern San Lu 5 San Benito Kern Siskiyou San Bernardino Humb	Barbara is oldt
3 Santa Barbara Tulare Shasta Tulare Santa 4 Shasta Santa Barbara Kern Kern San Lu 5 San Benito Kern Siskiyou San Bernardino Humb	Barbara is oldt
4 Shasta Santa Barbara Kern Kern San Lu 5 San Benito Kern Siskiyou San Bernardino Humb	iis oldt
5 San Benito Kern Siskiyou San Bernardino Humb	oldt
·	ocino
6 Mendocino Inyo Santa Barbara Siskiyou Tulare	ocino
7 Tulare Mendocino Inyo San Diego Mendo	
8 Fresno Modoc Modoc Mendocino Kern	
9 San Diego Shasta Mendocino Monterey San D	iego
10 Inyo Monterey Tehama San Luis Obispo San B	-
Rank 1981-82 1982-83 1983-84 1984-85 1985-	86
1 San Bernardino San Bernardino Kern Kern	
· ·	ernardino
3 Monterey Kern Santa Barbara Monterey Tulare	•
4 Santa Barbara Santa Barbara San Luis Obispo San Bernardino Monte	rey
5 Tulare San Luis Obispo Los Angeles Santa Barbara Santa	Barbara
6 Humboldt Tulare Monterey San Luis Obispo San D	iego
7 San Diego Humboldt Tulare Los Angeles Ventul	a
8 Ventura Los Angeles San Diego Humboldt Humb	oldt
9 Fresno San Diego Ventura Siskiyou Los A	ngeles
10 San Luis Obispo Ventura Humboldt San Diego Inyo	
Rank 1986-87 1987-88 1988-89 1989-90 1990-	91
1 San Bernardino San Bernardino Kern Kern	
2 Kern Kern San Bernardino Tulare	
3 Santa Barbara Monterey San Diego Ventura Colusa	
	ernardino
5 Ventura Santa Barbara Monterey Monterey Fresno	
6 Monterey Siskiyou Los Angeles Los Angeles Siskiy	
•	ngeles
8 San Diego Ventura Fresno Siskiyou Ventu	
9 Humboldt San Diego Tulare Tulare San D	-
10 Fresno San Luis Obispo San Luis Obispo Humboldt Shasta	
Rank         1991-92         1992-93         1993-94         1994-95         1995-           1         Kern         San Bernardino         San Bernardino         Siskiyou         Kern	96
·	ernardino
2 Shasta Tulare Fresno San Bernardino San E 3 Siskiyou Siskiyou Los Angeles Kern Fresno	
4 Humboldt San Diego Humboldt Modoc Siskiy	
5 Tulare San Biego Humboldt Modoc Siskiy 5 Tulare Santa Barbara Siskiyou Los Angeles Modo	
6 San Bernardino Modoc Santa Barbara Santa Barbara Humb	
7 San Diego Shasta Tulare Fresno Tulare	
8 Ventura Kern Modoc Lassen Colusi	
9 Santa Barbara Los Angeles Ventura Tulare Lasse	
10 Trinity Tehama Riverside Humboldt Ventu	

The 1995-96 commercial take of bobcats increased in two of the geographic regions, decreased in seven, and remained the same in one (Table 4). The Northeast region decreased from 236 (1994-95) to 122 (1995-96), but is still well below the management threshold quota of 425 animals.

				TABLE	4					
GEOGRAPHIC	<b>DIFFERENCES</b>	IN	THE	<b>AMOUNT</b>	OF	COMMERCIAL	TAKE	OF	<b>BOBCATS</b>	IN
				CALIFOR	NIA					
			199	0-91 TO	199	5-96				

Area	90-91 Take	Change <to> (%)</to>	91-92 Take	Change <to> (%)</to>	92-93 Take	Change <to> (%)</to>	93-94 Take	Change <to> (%)</to>	94-95 Take	Change <to> (%)</to>	95-96 Take
North-east	90	-2	88	26	111	12	124	90	236	-48	122
North-west	115	126	260	-31	180	4	187	40	261	-66	88
North Coast	111	-50	55	-27	40	55	62	-42	36	67	60
Central Coast	36	-100	0	N/A	28	-79	6	67	10	-100	0
North Sierra	0	N/A	3	0	3	0	3	-100	0	N/A	0
Central Sierra	32	-88	4	150	10	0	10	320	42	-64	15
East Sierra	42	10	46	-39	28	-75	7	0	7 -	300	28
South Coast	180	20	216	-5	205	-12	181	-1	180	-77	42
South Sierra	375	-23	287	-34	188	18	221	19	264	-29	187
So. California	167	-22	130	89	246	37	337	-16	283	-58	118
Total	1,148	-5	1,089	-5	1,039	10	1,138	16	1,319	-50	660

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. In 1994-95, the pelt price again dropped by 39 percent to \$24.72. In 1995-96, the average pelt price increased to \$33.66. That price is expected to remain the same or increase slightly for 1996-97.

In the 1995-96 season, the average take per commercial trapper increased to 10.1 animals, as compared to 8.61 during 1994-95. The number of bobcat trappers decreased from 102 to 62. In the last 12 years, the highest number of bobcat trappers was 488 in the 1983-84 season (Table 6).

The commercial take of bobcats was primarily by trapping (81 percent) (tables 7 and 8). Hunting with dogs remains the second most common way to take bobcats. Five percent were taken through the use of a predator call. Predator calling is used occasionally as a hunting method by persons holding a commercial trapper's license. There were no reports of bobcats being taken by other hunting methods.

Informationon 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 8,990 bobcat hunting tags

during the 1995-96 season. Four hundred and ten were returned to the Department. The hunting take by county is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 5 BOBCAT PELT PRICES 1970-71 TO 1995-96									
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							
1994-95	24.72	35.00							
1995-96	33.66	37.61							

	TABLE 6  AVERAGE BOBCAT HARVEST PER SUCCESSFUL TRAPPER PER SEASON IN CALIFORNIA*											
County	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96
Butte												
Fresno	10.0	12.1	17.6	15.3	16.1	17.4						
Glenn	5.8			10.7								
Humboldt	9.3	18.0	12.5	13.0	8.6	2.3						
Inyo	5.6	14.2	9.7	6.2								
Kern	18.4	14.7	13.0	14.2	9.1	11.7	16.9				11.1	
Lake			7.2	7.9								
Lassen	4.8	4.4	4.4	9.8	3.9	5.6					6.3	
Los Angeles	15.8	14.9	15.6	11.1	12.0	14.4	5.9					
Madera	12.7			7.3								
Mariposa	9.6	7.2	10.1	19.9								
Mendocino	5.9	5.1	6.5	6.2	5.4							
Modoc	7.2	6.3	6.2	7.2	7.2	3.0					10.5	-
Mono					6.5							
Monterey	18.0	17.8	21.4	24.8	14.0	16.1						
Plumas												
Riverside	10.3	10.1	9.8	12.0	8.7	16.5						
San Benito	8.3		14.2									
San Bernardino	11.6	14.6	14.6	13.3	12.3	14.0	5.2	5.5	16.5	14.6	11.7	8.1
San Diego	11.8	10.8	11.6	14.0	16.9	16.8						
San Luis Obispo	11.1	10.8	14.7	14.4	10.4	7.5						
Santa Barbara	16.3	16.1	13.9	13.9	11.7							
Shasta	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.9	6.3	4.9		·				
Siskiyou	0.2	5.6	5.9	9.9	6.5	5.0	2.5	6.8	9.1		14.0	
Sonoma	4.6		6.8		9.3							
Tehama	6.3	3.8	3.9	5.8								
Trinity	3.5		8.5	5.0	2.2	·						·
Tulare	13.4	14.5	12.3	17.1	8.5	6.2	6.7					
Tuolumne				5.2								
Ventura	13.5	12.6	18.4	16.6	9.9	16.1						
Statewide	12.01	12.71	14.75	13.55	12.61	12.06	7.00	6.19	10.71	13.67	8.61	10.1
# Trappers Harvesting Bobcats	398	547	584	664	443	303	124	113	97	84	102	62
#Trappers Licensed	1,650	1,417	1,347	1,460	1,244	834	511	371	338	300	313	257
* County dat	a from cou	inties and	years w	here mor	e than 1	0 trappei	rs per co	unty repo	orted.		···	

Т	TABLE 7. METHODS OF COMMERCIAL TAKE OF BOBCAT, 1995-96										
County	% by Calling	% by Dogs	% by Hunting	% Misc.	% Trap	Sample Size					
Amador	0	100	0	0	0	9					
Colusa	0	0.	0	0	100	51					
El Dorado	0	100	0	0	0	6					
Fresno	0	0	0	0	100	85					
Glenn	0	0	0	0	100	6					
Humboldt	0	43	0	0	57	40					
inyo	0	0	0	0	100	1					
Kern	32	0	0_	0	68	82					
Lake	, О	0	0	0	100	3					
Lassen	6	6	0	0	88	21					
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	100	22					
Mendocino	0	0	0	0	100	5					
Modoc	0	6	0	0	94	53					
Mono	0	0	0	0	100	27					
Plumas	0	0	0	0	100	12					
Riverside	0	0	0	0	100	15					
San Bernardino	3	o o	0	. 0	97	81					
San Diego	0	0	0	0	100	8					
San Luis Obispo	0	0	0	0	100	1					
Shasta	0	75	0	0	25	9					
Siskiyou	2	23	0	0	75	54					
Trinity	0	81	0	0	19	16					
Tulare	0	100	0	0	0	20					
Ventura	0	0	0	0	100	33					
Total/ Percentage	4.5	13.9	0	0	82.1	600/100					

	TABLE 8. METHOD OF COMMERCIAL TAKE OF BOBCATS, 1980-96											
	Method of Take (Percent of Total Statewide Take)											
Season	Trap	Dogs	Calling	Other Hunt	Misc.	Unknown	Total %					
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					
1994-95	78.7	15.5	2.9	2.7	0.2	-	100.0					
1995-96	81.1	14.0	4.9	0	0	-	100.0					

#### DISCUSSION

The total bobcat harvest decreased in the 1995-96 season from 1994-95. The number of bobcat trappers decreased from 102 to 62, even though pelt price increased about 33 percent.

Since the 1982-83 season, the harvest has remained below the 14,400 statewide harvest limit. Harvest monitoring will continue. If the statewide harvest reaches 14,400 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 commercial 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 harvest has been below this level for the last eight seasons (Table 4 and 9).

RECENT	Γ COMMERCIAL HA		LE 9 DBCATS IN NOR	THEASTERN CAL	LIFORNIA					
Season		County								
	Eastern Siskiyou	Modoc	Lassen	Plumas	Northeastern California					
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	0.00	88					
1992-93	40	47	24	0.00	111					
1993-94	30	57	22	15	124					
1994-95	56	116	63	1	236					
1995-96	36	53	21	12	122					

#### **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.