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President’s Message

Let me begin by saying I consider it an honor to be your new president. I realize it’s a big job and I look forward to the challenges it presents.

A few words about me, I have lived, hunted, fished and otherwise enjoyed the outdoors of Arizona for about 25 years. My education included a Bachelor of Science degree from Arizona State University with a major in fisheries under the late Dr. W. L. Minckley. For various reasons I have not pursued a career in wildlife management, but I continue to participate in several ongoing research projects at ASU.

I was introduced to the AWF a few years ago while enrolled in a post-graduate wildlife biology class that I never got around to taking in my undergraduate days. I quickly realized that joining the AWF was a great way to help Arizona’s wildlife without having to work for a wildlife agency. My only regret is not having joined AWF sooner.

Founded in 1923, the AWF has a long history of fighting to protect Arizona’s wildlife and sportsmen’s rights. With the help of other conservationists with similar concerns, I will do my best to continue the AWF’s efforts.

Our past president, Jerry Thorson, did a great job last year. While doing double duty as Treasurer and President he oversaw some big changes in the AWF. We hired a new executive director and created the new position of Education Outreach Coordinator. Ken Haefner took over as office manager and as editor and producer of AWF’s quarterly publication, Arizona Wildlife News. Unfortunately, the funding we expected for these positions did not arrive and we have had to temporarily suspend these new positions.

THE MISSION OF THE ARIZONA WILDLIFE FEDERATION IS TO EDUCATE, INSPIRE, AND ASSIST INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS TO CONSERVE, ENHANCE, MANAGE, AND PROTECT WILDLIFE AND OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES OF OUR STATE AND UNION.

I agree 100 percent with this statement and with the placement of education as first among our concerns. There is a huge need for education to replace the misinformation, myths, half-truths, and outright lies being spread by individuals, organizations, and the media. Through education, we can limit the effect that such misinformation can have on the sporting and general public.

The wildlife and conservation issues we face today are complex. Their resolution won’t be enhanced by simplistic slogans such as: YOU ARE EITHER FOR WILDLIFE OR AGAINST IT. Not all groups will agree on methods or be willing to compromise. In pursuit of its goals, the AWF may find it necessary to be allied with some groups on one issue and be against them on others. We should put wildlife first and choose the best course of action based on the best available science.

There are many issues deserving of attention by any conservation organization. Available time and resources precludes the AWF taking them all on. A few of the more urgent, on which I hope AWF can focus increased attention, include urbanization, access to public lands, degradation of wildlife habitat, declining wildlife populations.

Another result of education is inspiration. I hope that through our educational efforts we can inspire Arizona’s sportsmen and conservationists to join the AWF, either as individual members or by getting their club to become an AWF affiliate.

In any conservation organization there is strength in numbers. A major concern of mine as AWF president will be increasing the membership of our organization. If you are not already a member you can remedy that situation by sending us the membership form on page 23 in this issue of Arizona Wildlife News.

If you are already a member, or want to do more than be a member, you can make a monetary donation to the AWF. You can do so with a check made out to the Arizona Wildlife Federation or by donating to the AWF Wildlife Relief Fund at any branch of Arizona Bank One.

You can also donate office equipment (we really need an LCD projector so we can make quality presentations) or volunteer time at our office in Mesa. We also have work projects such as fence removal and fence modification where volunteers are greatly needed and appreciated.

To become better acquainted with us and learn more about our goals, dreams and aspirations come to one of our monthly board of directors meetings. Everyone is welcome.

We generally meet on the third Saturday of the month at 10:00 a.m. at our main office at 644 N. Country Club Drive, in Mesa. The time and date does vary at times and it is best to call or email to confirm the meeting date.

If you have any questions or want to get involved, please call us at 480-644-0077, visit our web site at www.azwildlife.org or email us at awf@azwildlife.org.

Thank you for giving me a chance to serve Arizona’s wildlife.

Mike Perkinson,
President

Arizona Millennium Trophy Book

Great Christmas Gift

Call Arizona Wildlife Federation or visit www.azwildlife.org

(480) 644-0077

Only $55!
The AWF has long been concerned about the declining antelope population on Anderson Mesa. For those of you who are new to the issues, I will give a short summary. Anderson Mesa is mainly a high-elevation grassland located South Southeast of Flagstaff, AZ most of the land is within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest. It is generally described as the area bordered by I-40 on the north, Forest Highway 3 on the West, and State Highway 87 on the south and southeast. It encompasses approximately 250,000 acres. At the higher elevations, the habitat is Ponderosa Pine and Piñon and Juniper dominate the lower elevations. The mesa is home to over 230 Bird Species – Including the Goshawk and 22 other raptors along with the Cinnamon Teal and other waterfowl. There are 36 mammal species – Including the Pronghorn Antelope, Mule Deer, and Gunnison’s Prairie Dog found on the mesa. Anderson Mesa provides recreational opportunities to a variety of users, both consumptive and non-consumptive.

The pronghorn antelope on Anderson Mesa used to be called Arizona’s “mother herd”. The population was once so strong it was used as the transplant source when re-introducing antelope to depleted herds in other parts of the state. Now the herd whose population estimate was once 5000 is now estimated at 150 individuals, perhaps to few to sustain the herd. The loss of these animals is bad enough but the fact that the pronghorn antelope is a management indicator species (MIS) for the Coconino National Forest (CNF) makes their loss tantamount to a crime.

Management Indicator Species are used to measure the general “health” of the forest. The state of the MIS indicate the state of the forest. Cinnamon Teal is another MIS for the CNF; it no longer nests on Anderson Mesa.

Nearly all of the wetlands have been altered to enhance livestock production. Stock tanks have been dug into the lowest points of the land. This effectively drains the wetland and causes several changes to the landscape. The once diverse plant community that included rushes, sedges, forbs, and grasses is reduced to two or three grass species. After years of domestic livestock grazing, the topsoil is washed into the stock tanks. There is not enough plant material to slow down and filter the rainfall and snowmelt. These tanks become sterile ponds full of muddy turbid water that resemble a giant bowl of stinky chocolate milk. Algae can’t even grow in these tanks.

So, Anderson Mesa is not just an antelope issue any more. It is a riparian/wetland issue, a waterfowl issue, and most importantly a restoration issue.

To get involved in Anderson Mesa issues contact the AWF at ARIZONA WILDLIFE FEDERATION 644 N. Country Club Drive, Suite E Mesa, Arizona 85201 or call 480 644 0077 or email:awf@azwildlife.org or visit our web page at www.azwildlife.org
Horse Lake
Supposed to be livestock excluded. Listed as a permanent wetland.

Fisher/Frye Lake
Classified as semi permanent wetland.

Boot Junior Tank in Boot Lake
Classified as a semi-permanent wetland.
ARIZONA WILDLIFE FEDERATION invites you to its **FIRST ANNUAL WOMEN ONLY FISHIN’ FUN**

Join us on Saturday, January 25, 2003 at 9:00 a.m. for **FISHIN’ FUN** at Chaparral Park in Scottsdale. All equipment and bait provided compliments of Arizona Game & Fish. Walt Oxley from Arizona Game & Fish will provide instruction to the novice lady anglers. No fishing license is required for this special event.

A small fee of $7.00 will guarantee participants **FISHIN’ FUN**, goodie bag and lunch at Chaparral Park. Come on your own, bring a friend, or bring your daughter (no children under 8 please). **FISHIN’ FUN** starts at 9:00 a.m. and will end at noon with lunch.

Please call the Arizona Wildlife Federation office at 480-644-0077 or email www.azwildlife.org to reserve a spot.

You can reach Chaparral Park from the Pima Freeway (101) by exiting at Chaparral Road and going West to Hayden Road. Turn North on Hayden Road. Chaparral Park is located at 5401 N. Hayden Road, in Scottsdale. We will meet at the Central Ramada in Chaparral Park. Look for the Arizona Wildlife Federation sign.

In case of rain, check our website www.azwildlife.org for status.

---

**Leave a Legal Legacy That Will Last for Generations**

Arizona has been blessed with a natural beauty and wildlife heritage that is unique in all of the world. It has a beauty and biological richness that touches all who spend time here. Most of us not only live here, we fall in love with Arizona. Like any lover, we can remember special times and places - a bull elk bugling in the cold frostiness of early morning on the rim; a herd of pronghorn antelope surrounded by a sea of golden grass at the foot of Mingus mountain; a mother Gambel’s quail leading her tiny chicks out for a morning meal in the desert foothills; a desert bighorn sheep poised impossibly in the middle of a sheer cliff; an Anna’s hummingbird feeding on a cascade of fiery Ocotillo flowers in the crystal clearness of a spring afternoon. This is a legacy we all want to leave for future generations - a gift beyond compare.

---

**Dates Set!!**

**Becoming an Outdoors Woman’s (BOW) Spring Workshop April 4-7, 2003**

Learn to:
- Canoe & Kayak!
- Fly Fishing!
- Basic Firearms Safety!
- Beginning Fishing!
- Basic Shotgun Shooting!
- Birdwatching!
- Dutch Oven Cooking!
- Basic Camping!
- Beginning Archery!
- Rifle Marksmanship!
- Map and Compass!
- Rappelling!
- Outdoor Survival!
- Arizona’s Wildlife
- Wildlife Photo Safari!
- Big Game Hunting!
- Backpacking!
- Falconry!
- GPS!

Visit: www.azwildlife.org or email BOW@azwildlife.org

---

You can help give this gift by including a bequest to the Arizona Wildlife Federation in your estate. The Arizona Wildlife Federation has been working to conserve Arizona’s wildlife and outdoor heritage since 1923. Your legacy will be put to work fighting on behalf of Arizona’s wildlife and to conserve and protect those special places you have come to love.

A contribution to the Arizona Wildlife Federation is a gift that will keep on giving for generations to come. If you would like further information on how to include the Arizona Wildlife Federation in your planned giving, please give Ken Haefner a call at (480) 644-0077.
An Open Space in the Taxpayers’ Wallets

By Jeff Burgess

The Arizona State Parks board recently awarded about $2 million in grants to Arizona public lands ranchers for doing nothing. That’s right, nothing. The money came from the Growing Smarter Open Space Reserve grants program, which was created through a backroom deal between Arizona’s Governor Jane Hull and rural Arizona legislators, led by state Rep. Jake Flake, R-Snowflake, a cattle rancher.

Acting upon recommendations from the Arizona Department of Agriculture, the grants approved by the State Parks board in May included a $90,000 award to Hal Earnhardt, of Phoenix’s Earnhardt auto dealing empire. Another $90,000 was awarded to Gaylan Flake, a cousin of Rep. Flake. The Page Land & Cattle Company received an award of $23,508. Its president and CEO is Stephen Brophy, who’s also a member of the governor’s Growing Smarter Oversight Council. Tucson insurance broker Boyd Drachman was awarded $7,870.

One of the most disturbing things about the grants program is the way it was fashioned. In 1998 the legislature put Proposition 303 on the fall ballot asking voters if they wanted to make a $20 million annual appropriation from the general fund into a new land conservation fund that had been created as part of Governor Hull’s Growing Smarter plan. According to Proposition 303’s ballot language, the purpose of the new conservation fund was to provide matching funds, “to purchase or lease state trust land to be preserved as open space.” But the ballot failed to mention that approval of Proposition 303 would also divert 10% of the conservation fund to the Open Space Reserve grants program. The voters subsequently passed Proposition 303.

The grants were the product of an earlier deal between Governor Hull and Rep. Flake, in order to get rural legislators to support the creation of the state land conservation fund. Ranchers considered it a threat because most state land is leased for livestock grazing. The intent, according to Rep. Flake, was to provide financial compensation to public lands ranchers who had experienced mandatory reductions in their permitted livestock numbers.

Another disturbing thing about the grants is that the State Parks board signed an agreement in 2000 with the state Department of Agriculture to have that agency administer them. This was after the new advisory committee that was supposed to administer them, the Conservation Acquisition Board, balked at the idea of awarding subsidies to ranchers.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture did not hold any public meetings to draft the eligibility criteria for the new grants, nor did they follow Arizona’s official rulemaking process. They declared 1995 as the “base year” for the applicants, meaning their currently permitted livestock numbers. They declared 1995 as the “base year” for the applicants, meaning their currently permitted livestock numbers. The intent, according to Rep. Flake, was to provide financial compensation to public lands ranchers who had experienced mandatory reductions in their permitted livestock numbers.

Another disturbing thing about the grants program is the way it was fashioned. In 1998 the legislature put Proposition 303 on the fall ballot asking voters if they wanted to make a $20 million annual appropriation from the general fund into a new land conservation fund that had been created as part of Governor Hull’s Growing Smarter plan. According to Proposition 303’s ballot language, the purpose of the new conservation fund was to provide matching funds, “to purchase or lease state trust land to be preserved as open space.” But the ballot failed to mention that approval of Proposition 303 would also divert 10% of the conservation fund to the Open Space Reserve grants program. The voters subsequently passed Proposition 303.

The grants were the product of an earlier deal between Governor Hull and Rep. Flake, in order to get rural legislators to support the creation of the state land conservation fund. Ranchers considered it a threat because most state land is leased for livestock grazing. The intent, according to Rep. Flake, was to provide financial compensation to public lands ranchers who had experienced mandatory reductions in their permitted livestock numbers.

Another disturbing thing about the grants is that the State Parks board signed an agreement in 2000 with the state Department of Agriculture to have that agency administer them. This was after the new advisory committee that was supposed to administer them, the Conservation Acquisition Board, balked at the idea of awarding subsidies to ranchers.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture did not hold any public meetings to draft the eligibility criteria for the new grants, nor did they follow Arizona’s official rulemaking process. They declared 1995 as the “base year” for the applicants, meaning their currently permitted number of livestock would be compared to the number permitted in 1995, three years before the grants were even created. The difference was the size of the mandatory reduction for which compensation could be awarded. There was no attempt to discover if the size of the herd a rancher was grazing in 1995 was less than the number permitted, a common situation. Nor was there a financial needs test.

According to agency officials, none of the contracts the ranchers must sign to receive their awards will prevent them from selling or subdividing their private ranch base properties during the 18-month term of the contracts, despite the fact they are called Open Space Reserve grants. They claim it isn’t necessary because the language in the law allows awards “to provide wildlife habitat.” This requirement will be met, they explain, by their compliance with the mandatory reductions in permitted livestock numbers. In other words, the ranchers will be getting paid for simply complying with the environmental laws that help guide the management of our public lands.

The long overdue application of these laws to livestock grazing is not unfair. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly held that federal grazing permits do not convey a private property right, but are a privilege that can be modified or revoked. What’s unfair is that it has taken years of pressure from conservationists to get federal land managers to start doing a better job of protecting publicly owned natural resources from abuse by livestock.

Moreover, many of the ranchers awarded grants in May were eligible only because the Forest Service and the BLM have recently required temporary livestock removal due to the drought. If you ask me, paying ranchers in Arizona because there’s a drought is like paying someone who is growing bananas in Michigan when they are hurt by a freeze.

Men!!

What is the perfect Christmas gift for your significant other???

A gift certificate for the Spring 2003 Becoming an Outdoors Woman (BOW) workshop.

(See page 6 or visit www.azwildlife.org for more information)
The Annual Big Game Trophy Award Presentations took place at a luncheon at the Arizona Wildlife Federation’s Annual Meeting June 9, 2002. *Left to right: Douglass Baker; Bradley Johns, Bronze Award-Coues Deer Typical; Duanne Edwards, Bronze Award-Desert Bighorn Sheep; Jay Senkerik, Honorable Mention Award-Desert Bighorn Sheep; Fred Peters, Bronze Award-Black Bear & Cougar; Steve Christensen, Honorable Mention Award-Desert Bighorn Sheep; Billie Bechtel accepting for Robin Will Bechtel, Annual Competition Arizona Big Game Award; Marvin and Justin Pennell accepting for Michael L. Pennell, Bronze Award- Javelina.*

**2001 Thomas E. McCullough Memorial Awards**

The Thomas E. McCullough Memorial Award, the most prestigious award given by the Arizona Wildlife Federation, is presented annually at the AWF Conservation Banquet to two persons: one to the “Outstanding Conservationist of the Year” in the professional category, and one to the “Outstanding Conservationist of the Year” in the non-professional category. The professional category focuses on nominees who work in fields of wildlife biology, natural resources, or other areas involved in the welfare of Arizona’s wildlife and natural resources and have contributed above and beyond their normal duties to the promotion of wildlife and natural resources conservation in Arizona. The non-professional category focuses on nominees who work as volunteers in the conservation of Arizona’s wildlife and natural resources and have made outstanding contributions in time, and effort on projects or issues, etc. on a voluntary basis.

The 2001 Professional Category was presented to Dr. Eddie J. Alford of the Tonto National Forest for his extraordinary contribution to the drought management on the 3 million acres of rangelands on the Tonto National Forest. Due in large part to his actions and program management, livestock numbers were reduced by 90% on one district and by almost two-thirds on the entire Forest. His efforts led to management actions to protect some of the gains made by resource protection measures implemented by the Forest over the last two decades.

The 2001 Non-Professional Category went to Jerry Nelson for outstanding efforts in volunteering for conservation. Jerry worked on Tonto Forest’s Saguaro and Bartlett Lake Projects, regularly recruiting other volunteers for these fish habitat improvement projects. He fostered the “Adopt a Drinker Program” whereby volunteers maintain wildlife drinkers. Through Southwest Walleye Anglers he raised money to research rearing methods for walleye and assisted the Arizona Game & Fish Dept. with monitoring, surveys and research studies.
Americans Spend $108 Billion on Wildlife Activities

In 2001, 39 percent of all U.S. residents 16 years old and older participated in activities such as hunting, fishing and birdwatching according to the comprehensive “2001 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation.” “This National Survey is created in a partnership with the U.S. Bureau of Census, and State fish and wildlife agencies, and has become one of the most important sources of information on fish and wildlife recreation in the United States,” said Service Director Steve Williams. “It is a useful tool that quantifies the human economic impact generated by wildlife-based recreation. Federal, State, and private organizations use this detailed information to manage wildlife, market products, and look for trends.” The 2001 Survey is the tenth in a series that began in 1955.

The Survey reports that more than 34 million Americans fished, 13 million hunted and 66 million observed wildlife. These recreationists spent more than $108 billion pursuing their activities. This expenditure accounted for 1.1% of the gross domestic product. Of the total amount spent, $28.1 billion was trip-related, $64.5 billion was spent on equipment and $15.8 billion was spent on other items.

America’s 34 million anglers spent $35.6 billion in pursuit of their hobby. More than 28 million people went freshwater fishing, while nine million people went saltwater fishing. The Great Lakes, one of the most widely fished freshwater areas, attracted two million anglers.

Meanwhile, 13 million Americans age 16 or older hunted. They spent more than $20 billion on their activities and equipment. Nearly 11 million hunters sought big game such as deer and elk on 153 million days. Roughly five million hunters pursued small game, including squirrels and rabbits, on 60 million days. Three million migratory bird hunters spent 29 million days hunting for birds such as doves and ducks. And one million hunters spent 19 million days hunting other animals such as raccoons and woodchucks.

More than 66 million adults participated in feeding, observing, and photographing wildlife and spent $38.4 billion. Nearly 22 million people, or 33 percent of this total, took outings of one mile or more away from home to participate in these activities. Nearly 63 million, or 95 percent, enjoyed wildlife-related activities around their homes. Some 54 million enthusiasts fed birds and other wildlife around the home, while more than 42 million observed wildlife and 14 million photographed wildlife around the home. Almost 13 million people maintained plants or natural areas for the benefit of wildlife around the home, and 11 million visited public parks or natural areas to enjoy wildlife within a mile of home.

A comparison of estimates from the 1991, 1996 and 2001 Surveys reveals that millions of Americans continue to enjoy wildlife-related recreation. In 1991, there were 35.6 million anglers and 14.1 million hunters. In 1996, 35.2 million fished and 14.0 hunted. And in 2001, there were 34.1 million anglers and 13.0 million hunters.

Cont'd on page 21 - “Billions”

Recovery of the Apache Trout

Despite months of delays, the final recovery actions for Apache trout were scheduled to begin in September.

The actions were described in an Environmental Assessment issued by the U.S. Forest Service in mid February, and include construction and maintenance of fish barriers to block upstream passage of non-native trout, as well as chemical applications to remove non-native trout. Once actions are completed (estimated Autumn 2004), the Department will submit a delisting proposal to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. If this is successful, Apache trout will be the first fish to be removed from the Endangered Species list through conservation efforts and not extinction.

Recovery of Apache trout has been approached from two perspectives. The primary emphasis has been selective removal of non-native fish, such as rainbow trout, that hybridize with Apache trout, as well as removing brook and brown trout that compete for resources and prey upon them. The second emphasis has been improving poor habitat conditions.

These recovery actions are not without opposition and it is too early to predict the final outcome. Nevertheless, we are making progress, due in large part to the strong commitment of cooperating federal, state, and tribal agencies, and angler groups, land owners, permittees, and other interested stakeholders. We hope that recovery of the Apache trout will some day be a model for conservation success, so other species of native fish can get some much needed attention. Efforts to recover the Gila trout, a close relative of the Apache trout, and other native fish, are also underway. Stay tuned for more progress reports on activities from around the state! USFWS-Fisheries
**Ash Runoff Not Hurting Roosevelt Lake**

*(High Nutrient Loading May Help Sport-fish)*

Currently there are no discernable negative impacts to Roosevelt Lake from ash and soil-laden runoff due to the Rodeo-Chediski Fire. But there may be some positive impacts for lake fertility and sport-fish growths, said Arizona Game and Fish Department biologists.

“The sludge from the Rodeo/Chediski fire coming into Roosevelt Lake is a mixture of ash and topsoil. A lot of good nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) are bound up within this black soup, but not readily available to plants (i.e. algae) immediately. They must oxidize or be broken down first,” explained Jim Warnecke, Mesa regional fisheries program manager.

Warnecke explained that some of those nutrients settle onto the lakebed, others are transported downstream. “This can be good for Roosevelt and downstream lakes as slow release of these nutrients can be a boom for primary production that starts the food chain with microscopic plants, followed by microscopic animals (zooplankton), the small fish that feed on these plankters (young sport-fish species and forage fish), and larger fish that feed on them.”

The department’s water quality expert, Marc Dahlburg, explained that water monitoring and testing conducted this summer indicates the run-off sludge is not toxic to fish (carp have been feeding on the organics within it!) nor to humans. “It just looks like it should be,” he said.

However, department wildlife officers are advising caution to boaters traveling throughout the lake to watch for floating debris that is incorporated within the sludge flows. Launching can also be tough, and four-wheel drive is recommended.

Warnecke added that there has been no increase of the algal bloom that was prevalent in Roosevelt Lake since March, 2002. “If anything, there has been a decrease of algae in portions of the lake due to the turbidity of the water and shading effect on them (interferes with their ability to photosynthesize).”

Fishing continued to be very good in Roosevelt right up until the lake “turned over” late in October, particularly for bass. (Turn over is when the lake water becomes the same temperature from top to bottom).

Catches of 30 to 50 bass per night were not unusual (based on angler reports to the Regional office and depositions from guides at the lake). Fish appear extremely healthy, plump from feasting upon crawdads and threadfin shad.

Art Chamberlain, a guide at Roosevelt Lake, had been catching around 60 bass or so bass a night with his clients until the turnover.

Game and Fish is working with the U.S. Forest Service to try to acquire the necessary permits to install some temporary launch ramps around the lake. “This was somewhat difficult while the water was constantly dropping. Lake level reports from Salt River Project show the lake to be at 12 percent capacity and the project has ceased releases from Roosevelt Dam. This is enough water to sustain the fishery through the winter.”

However, run off is needed from the winter snow pack to begin to refill the lake for the upcoming spring and summer. “Forecasts for favorable winter precipitation/snow are a result of a moderate El Nino event that’s been building in the Pacific,” he said.

Game and Fish completed a fish health assessment survey late in October and while the survey is not final, preliminary findings are showing that all the fish are feeding normally, they don’t appear to be stressed and their body conditions show robustness and reflect general good health. The survey found that many crappie that were in the 6-7 inch range in the spring are now measuring 9-10 inches. Next spring the fishery should produce a lot of 10” crappie.

---

**BOOK REVIEW**

**WELFARE RANCHING**

Edited by: George Wuerthner and Mollie Mateson

Over the last 25 years there have been a number of books calling attention to the devastation of our western rangelands by abusive livestock grazing. WELFARE RANCHING is a recent release, which is certain to raise the hackles of both conservationists and ranchers. The photos alone are worth the price of the book (not cheap, being listed at $75.00 for the hard back and $45.50 for the paperback. Amazon.com however, will sell them for a lot less.)

The book consists of a series of essays by a variety of individuals concerned about the condition of our public lands after more than 100 years of grazing by domestic livestock. This is a BIG book, the type most often seen displayed on coffee tables. It measures 13 ½ by 11 ¾ inches and many of the photos sprawl across two pages.

There is a lot of meat in the essays, all of them worth reading, but the photos alone tell the story of what happened when the Garden of Eden which used to be our western range lands were invaded by an exotic brute, the range cow, brought here from Europe. A lot of people will be sickened by many of these photos. Others will react by thinking: “What’s wrong with these pictures? I’ve never seen these areas look any different.” They will, that is, until they see other photos of lush landscapes ungrazed by domestic livestock on our protected national parks and monuments.

The contrast is nothing less than spectacular. These photos come from all western states. As you might expect, this collection of “dirty pictures” includes quite a few from Arizona.

I even recognize some of the areas shown.

This book would make a great gift for anyone concerned about the condition of our public lands, and interested in efforts to restore them to something near to their pre-livestock condition.
Comments on Quail Symposium

by Steve Gallizioli

The quail symposium sponsored by the Arizona Game and Fish Department on October 22-23 was apparently the result of agitation by some quail hunters who felt that the current hunt regulations were too liberal. Some want a reduction in daily bag limit, others in season length (especially that portion of the season extending into the new year). Others thought there were too many hunters and that hunters with dogs were bagging an inordinate number of quail. Some were also convinced that quail mortality from hunting was “additive”, not “compensatory”, meaning that quail taken by hunters did not replace “natural mortality” but were in addition to it. Whatever the reason for the program, the various presentations did nothing to address the concerns of those hunters worried about overhunting.

Presentations were made by Game and Fish employees plus four outside “experts”.

Three of the outsiders were bobwhite quail biologists from Oklahoma and Texas; one was a retired AGF employee.

Most of the first day was given over to discussions of quail management, current and past, by AGF employees and the retired AGF biologist. Several of their talks briefly mentioned a landmark research study on Gambel quail done in the 1950s, but they failed to present any details or to discuss the significance of this study to quail management in Arizona. One talk was an hour-long presentation by the retired biologist on the history of southwestern quail management. He mentioned the restrictive hunting in the 1940s and the reason for the short or closed seasons back then. The historic 1950s study that turned quail management in Arizona on its head was barely alluded to. This was the ten year investigation that led to the extremely liberal four month season and 15 bird bag limit that hunters have been enjoying for the past 30 years or more.

It was the study that determined that, contrary to popular belief of that time, hunting was not a factor in the ups and downs of desert quail populations. No other wildlife study in Arizona has produced information as critically important to the management of any species as did this study. Not only did it increase hunting opportunity to an incredible degree, but it also contributed importantly to the economy of Arizona through the increased spending for guns, ammunition, other hunting equipment, bird dogs and their maintenance, transportation, food, lodging and other expenses of hunting.

Another AGF biologist’s presentation was titled ARIZONA QUAIL MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW and another GAMBEL QUAIL—INDIVIDUAL SPECIES MANAGEMENT. Neither saw fit to discuss the 1950s study except in brief generalities. One limited his reference to the study to one sentence: “Bag limit and season length gradually increased through the 1950s to the present day because of an increasing body of research showing that the effects of rainfall amount and rainfall patterns were responsible for most fluctuation of Arizona quail numbers”. No mention of hunting. Had details of this study been presented it might have laid to rest the concerns, (expressed later) of hunters convinced that hunting is the most significant mortality factor for Gambel quail. The study was conducted in two of the most heavily hunted areas of the state—one near Oracle Junction north of Tucson and the other near Pinnacle Peak north of Phoenix. Consider some highlights of that study.

Most important finding: The percent of the quail population removed by hunters was found to be directly correlated to quail population size. Returns of banded quail showed that when quail numbers were high hunters not only shot more quail than when numbers were low, but they removed a higher percent of the population. The heaviest harvest (30 percent, including lost downed quail) was achieved at Oracle Junction in the hunt season following the best quail hatch of the ten year period. In the worst year of the study, when few young were produced, hunters removed only about five percent. The average harvest for the ten year period was about 20 percent. These results surprised both hunters and AGF people. It had long been assumed that the reverse was the case, and that quail were most vulnerable to hunting when numbers were low. This had been the rationale for the closed seasons and token quail hunts of years past.

This study also found the explanation for this paradox. Everything else being equal, we might expect the number of quail harvested to fluctuate with the abundance or scarcity of quail, but we would also expect the percent harvested to be about the same. We learned, however, that “everything else was not equal”. The explanation was found to lie in the behavior of both hunters and quail: When quail numbers were low fewer hunters went afield—even on opening weekend (544 hunters in 1959, a poor quail year, compared to 926 in 1960, a high quail year). Contributing also to this phenomenon was the fact that, when quail numbers were low, it was invariably due to a poor hatch. The fall population then consisted largely of adult quail that had been...
Canyon Creek Hit Hard by Wildfire

By: Jim Warnecke-Fish Prog. Mgr.-AGFD

The Chediski wildfire burned up the Canyon Creek watershed on June 28, 2002 and, combined with the Rodeo fire, scorched nearly 400,000 acres of coniferous forest through the heart of Arizona’s high country. Initially only the terrestrial flora and fauna were affected. The trout, dace and suckers in Canyon Creek remained unaffected for days after the fire was put out.

The seasonal monsoon rains, however, changed all that by washing in ash and sediment from the surrounding burnt hillsides. Tributary streams like Mule creek contributed tons of silt into Canyon Creek. Aquatic habitats and the various niches occupied by the resident fish species were filled during these debris flows that physically washed the fish from the stream and increased water turbidity nearly off the scale.

Aquatic creatures were either left high and dry on the banks or choked in the debris-laden water.

The road to recovery seemed bleak at this point. By post flooding estimates conducted by Arizona Game and Fish Department biologists, nearly 99% of the fish population had disappeared.

Historically, Canyon creek has the unique distinction as being managed by the Arizona Game and Fish Department on a split management concept. The upper 1-mile of stream immediately below the Hatchery and near campgrounds was a rainbow trout “Put-and-Take” fishery – daily bag and possession limits of 4 trout applied. The lower 2 miles below the OW Bridge was a no-kill brown trout “Blue Ribbon” fishery, that is trout caught on gear restricted artificial flies or lures only must be immediately released.

Rebuilding and rehabilitating the Canyon Creek ecosystem will require working with Mother Nature to achieve lasting results. Waiting to allow the...
debris floods to subside is the first step. Spring run-off flows may further contribute more sediment to the stream or it may provide the flushing action needed to remove the silt that covers the stream bottom. After the creek has settled down from this seasonal flooding, Department and US Forest Service biologists plan on measuring the streambed for stability. Once the steam is stable, macroinvertebrates should once again thrive and recolonize the creek bottom and provide the beginning of the food chain for native dace and suckers and resident trout species. New vegetative growth along banks will begin to shade the creek and developing in-stream plants will provide cover for aquatic creatures. Reconstructing the cattle/elk exclosure in the riparian area will protect these newly forming plant communities, thus allowing for quick revegetation of the area.

Only after this stabilization process can trout once again be stocked for anglers to catch and native dace and sucker species re-introduced to balance the fish populations within Canyon Creek.
Non-Resident Hunt Permit Restriction System Threatened

Arizona’s 10-percent cap on nonresident hunt-permit tags for bull elk and deer north of the Colorado River is headed for the U.S. Supreme Court. The Arizona Game and Fish Commission Oct. 2 voted unanimously to appeal a decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that jeopardizes Arizona’s cap on nonresident tags for bull elk and deer north of the Kaibab.

The Arizona Game and Fish Commission was sued by a professional hunting guide service in New Mexico, United States Outfitter Inc., which claimed that the 10-percent cap on nonresidents violates the Commerce, Privileges and Immunities and Equal Protection Clauses of the U.S. Constitution and requested “a declaration of invalidity as well as damages.”

The federal district court granted the Game and Fish Department’s cross-motion for summary judgment dismissing the Commerce Clause claim as a matter of law. The guides, Lawrence Montoya, Filberto Valerio and Carole Jean Taulman, appealed the district court’s decision.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on Aug. 20 overturned the lower court decision and ruled that Arizona’s 10-percent nonresident cap “substantially affects” commerce such that the dormant Commerce Clause applies to the regulation. “We further hold that the regulation discriminates against interstate commerce, but that Arizona has legitimate interests in conserving its population of game and maintaining recreational opportunities for its citizens,” the court ruled.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the case back to the lower court for “further proceedings” to determine whether Arizona “has met its burden of showing that these interests could not be served adequately by reasonable nondiscriminatory alternatives.”

The federal court opinion points out that Arizona is home to what is considered by many hunters to be some of the best deer and elk hunting in the world, exemplified by the world record animals harvested from its lands. The area north of the Colorado River known as the Kaibab Plateau and the Arizona Strip are particularly scenic areas known internationally for their trophy-class mule deer.

“The quality of the hunting in Arizona is in large part a result of the conservation efforts supported by Arizona citizens and administered by the Arizona Game and Fish Department,” the court files state.

For many years, Arizona distributed the limited hunt tags for antlered deer and bull elk through a lottery (draw) without regard to the residence of the applicant. In the late 1980s, however, the Game and Fish began to receive vocal complaints by Arizona hunters objecting to competition with nonresidents. Many felt that nonresidents were getting more than their fair share of the hunt opportunities, especially for premium hunts.

“In early 1990, the department conducted a poll of resident big game hunters and found that nearly 75 percent favored restricting the number of hunting tags issued to nonresidents, many expressing the opinion that nonresidents
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Judge Rules National Forest Violates ESA Livestock Grazing Program In New Mexico and Arizona Threatens Mexican Spotted Owl

FRONTLINE NEWS - November 7, 2002

A federal judge has ruled that the U.S. Forest Service is in violation of the Endangered Species Act throughout the 11 national forests of New Mexico and Arizona by failing to monitor and restrict livestock grazing on more than 15 million acres. The 10-16-2002 ruling by Judge Raner Collins came in response to a lawsuit filed by Earthjustice on behalf of a coalition of environmental groups, led by Forest Guardians. In his ruling (http://click.topica.com/maaaC4VaaUjiia3YoXub/), Judge Collins agreed with the environmental groups in concluding that the Forest Service had failed to comply with standards put into effect in 1996 that required the Forest Service to monitor and restrict livestock grazing on more than 15 million acres of land, are currently violating one or more of the grazing standards. Moreover, Forest Guardians and the other environmental groups have gathered information from the Forest Service showing that streamside ecosystems and fragile grassland areas are being severely overgrazed. In other areas, the agency is blindly permitting grazing without monitoring its effects.
Arizona Wild Fires, Wildlife, and Politics

By Robert D. Ohmart

Much has been written since the containment of the Rodeo-Chediski fire this summer. Some of what has been written is correct while much is totally false. A number of elected officials immediately pointed fingers and blamed “radical environmental” groups as being the cause since their lawsuits had prevented the U.S. Forest Service from doing needed forest management activities. A well written column by Kieran Suckling, Southwest Center For Biological Diversity, in The Arizona Republic on 16 July 2002 demonstrated the lack of culpability by environmentalists.

Further, a recent report by the Pacific Biodiversity Institute demonstrates that environmental groups were not to blame as well. Interestingly enough, both of the fires started on tribal lands and burned extensively on these lands before it finally entered Forest Service lands. Approximately 60 percent of the total burn was tribal land, 37 percent was Forest Service land, and 3 percent was private or State Trust land. If logging and roads could have prevented the spread of the fires, or had allowed them to be controlled, then they should have been contained while they were burning on tribal lands. Most of the areas burned on tribal lands have numerous miles of roads, have been extensively logged, and heavily managed for over 50 years. Further, environmental laws are not applicable to these tribal lands so environmentalists have had no power or control over management of these lands.

To appreciate and understand why our forests are ripe for fire and more will burn until management actions are applied, we need to examine these forest habitats starting even before they became public lands. Early fire scar data from mature ponderosa pine trees shows that our forests burned on a fairly regular basis, fire was a natural part of these forest ecosystems. When large numbers of domestic livestock were introduced into the Southwest the incidence of fires declined. These animals consumed the forbs and grasses that normally carried cool ground fires that burned the litter and killed any young trees that had become established since the last fire. Cool ground fires scar the old trees, but do not damage them. Previous to becoming public forests these were open lands that were grazed and used by those with the power to control the water on them.

The U.S. Forest Service came into existence in the early 1900’s and the first Grazing Regulations gave grazing permittees the benefit of the doubt when it came to adjudicating livestock numbers. That is plainly stated in the regulations, which were written in 1905 and went into effect in 1906. Grazing continued on these now fenced lands and some contend that breaking of these lands into fenced allotments has actually caused more erosion and damage to the lands than before when cattle could move freely or be herded to fresh pasture.

Our forests have been logged for many years with only the larger and more profitable trees being taken in the process. As the forests were opened this allowed sunlight to penetrate to the forest floor and as pine seedlings became established they thrived in direct sunlight. Previously they were shaded and most did not survive, those that did were generally killed in cool ground fires. Generally many seedlings establish at once in very close proximity to one another giving an even-aged stand of young trees. These dense stands are referred to as “dog-hair thickets” and if not thinned will never produce decent timber.

The Forest Service has always fought fires, but when a big fire occurred some decades ago on the Lincoln National Forest in New Mexico a badly burned bear cub (then named Smokey) was found during the fire. This event focused the public’s attention to forest fires with the perception that fires were bad. This ushered in the “Smokey The Bear” syndrome where public pressure called for the Forest Service to extinguish all wild fires as quickly as possible. Logging continued and more and more “dog-hair thickets” developed over the forests.

In the past two decades fire data has demonstrated that fires are a natural part of the forest ecosystem, but they were, in general, cool ground fires and not hot crown fires that kill all trees regardless of their maturity. Cool ground fires recycle nutrients, kill young trees, and improve the health of the forest. Today when a human-caused or natural fire occurs in our forest these stands of smaller trees act as a ladder and allow the fire to climb to the canopy and burn and kill all the trees in its path. We now find ourselves overwhelmed with thousands of acres of forests that need management attention relative to thinning of young trees and controlled burns to eliminate slash or litter buildup on the forest floor. When the Forest Service has attempted to do this near some home sites some residents have complained of smoke and ash. Possibly this attitude will have changed.

As I pointed out earlier, a recent study by an independent group, Pacific Biodiversity Institute, has released information on the Rodeo-Chediski fire. They are a well respected group out of the state of Washington that does contract work using photographs, satellite imagery, and computer mapping to examine fires and other land-based changes. Fire lines were provided to the Institute by the Forest Service itself and the summation of the findings were provided in a press release. The fires started on and burned mostly tribal lands which have been heavily managed for many decades and environmentalists have no input over the management of these lands. Their study is available on their website at and the experts can be contacted who put the study together.

The setting in our forests today remind me of the movie “The Perfect Storm”, where all factors are positioned just right for the worst fire conditions possible. Our forests are filled with “dog-hair thickets” and there is no forb and grass layer to carry a cool ground fire. Even if
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Chronic Wasting Disease Discovery

Chronic wasting disease “CWD” was first recognized by biologists in the 1960s as a disease syndrome of captive deer held in wildlife research facilities in Ft. Collins, CO, but was not recognized as a transmissible spongiform encephalopathy until the late 1970s. This disease was subsequently recognized in captive deer, and later in captive elk, from wildlife research facilities near Ft. Collins, Kremmling, and Meeker, CO and Wheatland, WY, as well as in at least two zoological collections. More recently, CWD has been diagnosed in privately-owned elk residing in game ranches in several western states and provinces. Although CWD was first diagnosed in captive research cervids, the original source (or sources) of CWD in either captive cervids or free-ranging cervids is unknown; whether CWD in research animals really preceded CWD in the wild, or vice versa, is equally uncertain.

Occurrence

CWD is relatively rare, and its geographic distribution is limited. Fewer than 500 naturally occurring clinical cases, mostly in captive research and free-ranging mule deer, have been documented. Based on data from a combination of surveillance methods, CWD is most prevalent in 11 contiguous counties in northeastern Colorado (5 counties), southeastern Wyoming (5 counties), and the Nebraska Panhandle (1 county). Since 2000, additional detections have been made in Saskatchewan, South Dakota, Wisconsin, New Mexico, northwestern Nebraska, and in western Colorado. Although the disease doesn’t appear to be common, the number of cases detected has increased in recent years. This trend may be explained by increased vigilance by wildlife and animal health officials, the wildlife farming industry, and the public in reporting cases, but it may also reflect increased disease occurrence.

Based on random, preclinical testing of brain or tonsil tissues from animals harvested in specific management units, it appears that on average CWD probably infects about 5-15 percent of the deer in a small core endemic area of northcentral Colorado and southeastern Wyoming, and 1 percent or fewer of the deer in other surrounding mountain and plains areas. Testing of harvested animals indicates less than 1 percent of the elk in endemic areas are probably infected. To date, outside of the areas listed above, no evidence of CWD has been detected in examinations of thousands of deer and elk from other states and Canadian provinces where surveys have been conducted in recent years; additional surveys are ongoing.

In addition to cases in captive research and free-ranging deer and elk, CWD has been diagnosed in privately-owned elk on game farms in Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Kansas, South Dakota, and Minnesota in the US, and Alberta and Saskatchewan, in Canada since 1996. Infection has been particularly severe in a group of interconnected facilities near Rapid City, South Dakota, that appear to be the original source of infection for other South Dakota game farms as well as the Saskatchewan epidemic. In contrast, infected elk in two of three Nebraska farms originated in Colorado, and infected elk in Oklahoma apparently originated in Montana; CWD has been confirmed in the Montana and Colorado source herds. Epidemiology of the Canadian cases has been under study, and South Dakota appears to be the likely source of CWD in Saskatchewan; it also appears that CWD was imported into Canada prior to 1990, and has spread among at least 18 farms via live animal sales over the last decade. The overall distribution and occurrence of CWD among farmed elk operations should become clearer as industry-wide surveillance programs are developed. There are no apparent epidemiological connections between the Colorado-Nebraska, South Dakota-Saskatchewan, and Montana-Oklahoma foci; moreover, there are no apparent epidemiological connections between any of the cases in farmed elk and cases in free-ranging or captive research deer and elk.

Transmission

Neither the agent causing CWD nor its mode of transmission has been definitively identified, but clinical disease is associated with the accumulation of protease-resistant prion protein (PrPsc) in brain tissue (as in other transmissible spongiform encephalopathies). Experimental and circumstantial evidence suggests that infected deer and elk probably transmit the disease laterally through animal-to-animal contact and/or contamination of feed or water sources with saliva, urine, and/or feces. CWD seems more likely to occur in areas where deer or elk are crowded or where they congregate at man-made feed and water stations. This may in part explain the intensity of infection in some cervid populations housed in farm or research settings.

According to public health (Centers for Disease Control, World Health Organization) and animal health officials, data available to date indicate that CWD is not currently known to be naturally transmitted to humans, or to animals other than deer and elk; data from recent molecular studies provide quantitative evidence of the apparent inefficiency of cross-species transmission. As a general precaution, however, public health officials recommend that people avoid contact with deer, elk, or any other wild animal that appears sick. Although there is no evidence that CWD can be naturally transmitted to domestic livestock, CWD is similar in some respects to two livestock diseases: scrapie, which affects domestic sheep and goats worldwide and has been recognized for over 200 years, and bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), which is a more recent disease of cattle in the United Kingdom and Europe. Despite some similarities, there is no evidence suggesting either scrapie or BSE are caused by contact with wild deer or elk, or that wild deer or elk can contract either scrapie or BSE in countries where these diseases occur.

Due to uncertainties associated with the mode of transmission, transporting any of the following may be prudent to minimize risk of spreading CWD:

1. Meat that is cut and wrapped (either commercially or privately);
2. Quarters or other portions of meat with no part of the spinal column or head attached;
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Can Commercial Buffer Protect Ben Avery Range?

Is it possible to create a commercial development buffer along the Carefree Highway corridor west of Interstate 17 to protect Arizona’s premier sport-shooting complex – the Ben Avery Shooting Facility adjacent to Phoenix?

“We have watched as other shooting ranges, airports, and even major military installations have fallen prey to encroaching development. Having a sport-shooting complex in the Phoenix area is too important to sit idly by and let that happen – if we can prevent it,” said Arizona Game and Fish Department Director Duane Shroufe.

The Ben Avery Shooting Facility near the junction of Carefree Highway and Interstate 17 is in a development squeeze area. The ever-burgeoning community of Anthem is north of the facility. Other residential developments are rapidly marching north from Phoenix toward Anthem. The Ben Avery Range is in between.

Arizona Game and Fish Department officials said it is not a matter of “if” development will eventually surround the shooting complex, but when and what type. Estimates are that within five to 10 years, the shooting facility could be in jeopardy from surrounding development. Maybe even sooner.

The Arizona Game and Fish Commission wants to see if it is possible to take action now to help protect the range for future generations.

The commission is exploring the idea of taking a 130-acre piece of commission-owned land on the southeast corner of the 1,650-acre Ben Avery Facility immediately adjacent to Carefree Highway and Interstate 17, and seeing what type of shooting-facility-friendly commercial enterprises are feasible that might act as a “buffer” to encroaching development.

It’s a prime location.

The Carefree Highway-I-17 Junction is one of the ingress-egress routes from the Cave Creek/north Scottsdale area. Major housing developments and custom-built homes are sprouting up in the area east of I-17 and Carefree Highway like desert wildflowers following a wet winter.

Hordes of recreationists on their way to Lake Pleasant pass along the corridor. It’s also the premier route for Phoenix-area motorists heading for Wickenburg or Las Vegas.

The Game and Fish Department is putting together a “request for proposal” seeking ideas on what type of enterprises might be willing to locate along that high-profile corridor. There is a caveat, however – any proposal must be compatible with a shooting range.

During the Game and Fish Commission meeting in Flagstaff on Aug. 9, shooting sports enthusiasts packed the meeting room. There was a common theme – the Ben Avery Shooting Range is not just a Phoenix treasure, or even an Arizona one – it’s a national treasure. Many pleaded with the commission not to consider selling the facility – not even a small part of it.

The fear expressed is that once any small part of the range is sold or even leased, it will be a case of the camel getting its nose under the tent – pretty soon the whole camel will be inside.

The commission explained that it can’t sit idle now and let future development dictate what Ben Avery will become.

“We cannot operate in a vacuum. We must know what our possibilities might be for that corridor. We must collect sufficient information from a variety of sources so we can eventually make a decision that is correct today, yet ensures that future generations also have a quality shooting facility,” said Commissioner Hays Gilstrap of Phoenix.

The hope is to create a protective buffer for Ben Avery now, while at the same time creating a revenue stream to help shooting sports needs throughout the state.

The commission is currently working to create a new range in the Flagstaff area. Other communities have also approached the commission seeking help in creating shooting ranges. There are lots of needs but not a lot of revenue sources.

“We want to make sure that both present and future generations of Arizonans across the state have shooting ranges available. We are looking for those magic win-win situations for everyone,” said Commission Chairman Mike Golightly of Flagstaff.
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Hunters Advised to Take Precautions Against Chronic Wasting Disease

The Arizona Game and Fish Department is advising hunters harvesting meat from deer and elk in other states to take precautions.

Chronic wasting disease (CWD) is a fatal neurological disease that affects deer and elk. It is in a group of diseases called transmissible spongiform encephalopathies, which include bovine spongiform encephalopathy in domestic cattle (also called “mad cow disease”) and scrapie in domestic sheep and goats.

Surveillance in Arizona has thus far shown that CWD is not present in our deer or elk populations, but the Game and Fish Department has implemented steps to reduce the potential for this disease so that it doesn’t establish itself in our state.

Very little is known about how the infectious agent of CWD is transmitted from one animal to another. Nonetheless, we are concerned that CWD might be inadvertently brought into our state through the transport of some infected animal tissues.

Is hunting mortality “additive” or “compensatory”? Data from this study (and from another study of Mearns quail hunters to be discussed) strongly suggests it is not “additive”. The proof of this fact came from the control area. A large area adjacent to the main hunted area was closed to hunting for the duration of the study. In the last year this area was opened to hunting and hunter success was compared to success on the area hunted every year. As measured by average bag per hunter day, bag per hour of hunting, or percent hunters with limit bags, success was higher on the hunted area (AB-4.8, BPH-1.6, Limits-14%) than on the “control area” (AB-3.4 BPH-1.3, Limits-4%).

If hunting mortality had indeed been additive, hunt success should have been significantly higher on the control area, instead of the reverse.

The above facts have allowed the Game and Fish Department to set the same liberal quail season and bag limit year after year regardless of winter precipitation and the certainty of poor hunting in the season following a dry winter. The Department no longer had to be concerned about the possibility of overhunting. Why these facts were not brought out by the symposium participants is puzzling indeed.

There is more. In 1968 a Mearns quail investigation was begun that would run for another nine years. In addition to an objective to determine the influence of hunting on year to year population levels of Mearns quail, this study also investigated the effects of precipitation on food production and the effects of livestock grazing on Mearns numbers.

A hunted and a control area were established in some of the most heavily hunted Mearns habitat in the Santa Rita Mountains south of Tucson.

Despite an average annual removal by hunters of 58 percent of the pre-hunt population, much higher than in the Gambel quail study, this study found that the pre-hunt population of both areas was about the same year after year—except for one year. Here is a direct quote from one report: “During the first three years... both populations remained approximately equal and increased annually as a result of progressively more favorable food production. During the fourth year, the hunted population pulled way ahead of the non-hunted...”
The Arizona Game and Fish Commission is seeking to make permanent its current emergency ban on the import of deer and elk to help protect the state’s native and captive cervids from spread of chronic wasting disease (CWD).

The Game and Fish Commission has begun the formal rule process to make its temporary “emergency ban” permanent on the importation of cervids (elk and deer family).

“This is an animal health issue, not one dealing with human health risks,” emphasized Research Branch Chief Jim deVos. “Both the World Health Organization and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration have said that there is no scientific evidence that links CWD with human health risks.”

DeVos added that much of the information on this disease comes from the endemic area of northeastern Colorado and southeastern Wyoming where it appears that, on average, CWD probably infects about five to 15 percent of the deer.

In addition to cases involving captive research and free-ranging deer and elk, CWD has been diagnosed in privately owned elk on game farms in several states beginning in 1996. “At this time, the detection of CWD in new areas is expanding rapidly. There have been detections of CWD in free-ranging deer in additional areas of Nebraska, Alberta, Wisconsin, New Mexico and South Dakota during 2002.

“Infection has been particularly severe in a group of interconnected facilities near Rapid City, South Dakota, that appear to be the original source of infection for other South Dakota game farms, as well as the Saskatchewan epidemic. In contrast, infected elk on two of three Nebraska farms originated in Colorado. Infected elk in Oklahoma apparently originated in Montana,” deVos said.

In addition to the problems associated with this disease in wild populations, there is also a significant economic impact with the detection of the disease in both free-ranging and captive herds. “As an example, Saskatchewan has spent approximately $30 million in attempts at eradicating the disease in infected game farms. In Wisconsin, it is costing millions of dollars for additional detection of the disease and for information dissemination,” deVos said.

Further, managing this disease in Wisconsin calls for removing approximately 15,000 white-tailed deer to reduce densities in the area where this disease was detected. If CWD were to become established in Arizona, Game and Fish officials would expect to see a decrease in the demand for deer and elk permits.

“There could also be a significant loss to local, mostly rural, economies if fewer hunters were afield. In addition to the loss of revenues, Game and Fish would also be faced with spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in increased surveillance and other management issues associated with this disease. This is not a budgeted item and would result in the loss of many existing programs the department maintains,” deVos explained.

Game and Fish has already mounted some surveillance activity beginning in 1998 and continuing this hunting season to spot check harvested animals. This is done by collecting spinal and brain tissue from harvested animals and submitting samples for laboratory testing.

Department biologists added that the importation ban only applies to “live” animals, not animals legally harvested in other states. “Yes, if you harvest an elk or deer in some place such as Colorado, you can bring the meat home with you, but make sure to check the regulations in areas where you hunt. Some states are requiring hunters to submit heads for testing. Many states recommend removing the head and spinal column from the deer before removing it from the area where it is harvested,” deVos said.

Your Arizona Wildlife Federation membership entitles you to discounted premiums and/or enhanced benefits on a variety of our insurance products and financial services.

For more information without obligation, call

Bob Polley
1-800-224-1120, ext. 217

Tell us you belong to the Arizona Wildlife Federation.

AFN31803
there was a ground-fuel base the uneven aged stands of young trees would carry any fire to the crowns of mature trees. We have experienced four years of extremely low rainfall and have now entered one of the driest and hottest years ever recorded in our climatological record. Consequently we are ripe for fire and should expect to see more.

**WHAT CAN AND SHOULD WE DO?**

First we need to help the people who have been displaced from their homes, whose homes have burned, and get these people and their communities functioning again. Once this has been accomplished we need to remove or thin dense tree stands and use controlled burns to reduce fuel loads around homes and communities that are in imminent threat of fire. This must be done to curtail future fires to homes and communities. Once this has been completed, the remainder of the forests have to be examined and remedial efforts be undertaken where conditions are the worst. We shouldn’t expect to eliminate fire from our forests, nor should we want to.

Other protective measures are needed such as increasing soil stability. A certain amount of soil erosion is to be expected. We can minimize this by seeding burned areas with annual and perennial grasses. The annual grasses serve as a beginning and as a cover crop for perennial grasses. Annuals germinate quickly and though their roots are shallow and not very extensive they do serve to hold the soils until the perennial grasses can become established. They also provide new forage and cover for wildlife.

Habitats for endangered species should be examined and, if in jeopardy, thinning and controlled burns might be desired to protect these habitats from fire. We need to examine watersheds housing good fisheries to determine if remedial actions in these watersheds should be undertaken to insure the health of these streams. Large fires in a watershed have eliminated the production of a fisheries for years. Small controlled burns might be used, but management and people on the ground would need to make those decisions.

The wildlife group hardest hit by these fires and will take the longest time for recovery of their habitats are the tree nesting birds and tree squirrels. The vertical component or tree component of their habitat has been eliminated and it will take years for these trees to be recovered. The burned area was so large that thousands of acres of forest habitat was lost. Aerial photographs show small islands of forest habitat that was not burned and these may house small populations of some of these species. It may be that in coming years we will see volunteer groups planting seedling trees to expedite the re-forestation process. That is a commendable effort on the part for wildlife.

---

**Applicable References**


---

**Diagnosis**

At present, the diagnosis of CWD is based on microscopic examination of brain (specifically, the medulla oblongata at the obex) and tonsil tissues from suspected cases. Both histopathological examination and immunohistochemistry (IHC) are used in routine diagnosis of clinical cases, and may also be used to detect preclinical cases in surveillance and monitoring programs; of these, IHC appears to offer greater sensitivity in detecting early preclinical cases. Western blots and negative-stain electron microscopy have also been used to further confirm diagnoses, and other diagnostic tests are being evaluated. Research has validated the use of tonsilar biopsy as a diagnostic tool for mule deer, however, this test has limited field application due to the requirement that animals have to be captured and anesthetized for biopsy. This test has not proven reliable for elk or white-tailed deer. Research is underway to evaluate several promising avenues for ante mortem diagnosis.

---

**Cont’d from page 16 - “Discovery”**

3. Meat that has been boned out;
4. Hides with no skull attached;
5. Upper canine teeth, also known as “bugler,” “whistlers,” or ivories;
6. Finished taxidermied heads.
7. Skull plates with the antlers attached if the skull has been scraped with to eliminate any tissue. The skull plate and cleaning utensils should be cleaned with bleach.

It is recommended that you avoid the following:

1. Moving the brain, intact skull, or spinal cord from the area of harvest.

**Clinical Signs**

Deer and elk affected with CWD show progressive loss of body condition accompanied by behavioral changes. In the later stages of disease, emaciation, excessive salivation, increased drinking and urination, stumbling, trembling, drooping ears, and depression may precede death. As with other TSEs, the clinical course of CWD appears to be progressive and irreversible, ultimately leading to the death of affected animals. Because the clinical signs of CWD are relatively nonspecific, laboratory examination of clinical suspect is essential for confirming this diagnosis.

---

**Applicable References**


---

**Cont’d from page 15 - “Wildfire & Politics”**
The Environmental Fund for Arizona!

This Organization of Conservation now includes the Arizona Wildlife Federation

Two ways to help dramatically increase donations to the Arizona Wildlife Federation … and they are free!

**Number One**

Through its partnership with the Environmental Fund for Arizona, the Arizona Wildlife Federation is reaching out to thousands of Arizona employees and their workplace giving programs!

Concerned citizens, some learning about the AWF for the first time, are now taking the opportunity to participate through workplace giving.

Still most “United Way type” campaigns in Arizona do not give their employees a conservation choice. Your support as an employee of various companies is key to opening campaigns for AWF as well as other excellent non-profit groups working on behalf of our State’s wild places.*

If you work for an Arizona company or governmental agency, please…take a few minutes to make a big difference!

- **Call or Email** the Environmental Fund for Arizona at (480) 969-3682…efaz@efaz.org
- Leave your name, company name, and a phone number.
- **Fill out** the information directly on our web site:
  

  IMPORTANT: Your name will not be shared and will be used for the sole purpose of broadening your workplace giving campaign.

  * For a complete list of EFA member groups: www.efaz.org

**Number Two**

**Shop at Bashas’**

*Everytime you shop, Arizona’s conservation programs will benefit!*

From September through January, Bashas’ will donate 1% of your bill! Just give the Bashas’ cashier the AWF’s “charity” code: #29173

---

Cont’d from page 9 - “Billions”

While the number of hunters and anglers has decreased slightly since 1991, expenditures by these sportspersons increased from $53 billion (in 2001 dollars) in 1991 to $70 billion in 2001.


The $110 billion figure reported in the preliminary findings last Spring has changed to $108 billion.

The U.S. Bureau of Census interviewed 80,000 households in the United States to determine participants in wildlife-associated activities. From this initial phase, 30,000 sportsmen and sportswomen and 15,000 wildlife watchers were selected for detailed interviews about their participation and expenditures in 2001.

**USFWS-October 1, 2002**

Cont’d from page 14 - “Permit Restriction”

should be excluded from hunting in Arizona entirely,” the court opinion states.

To better meet the overwhelming desires of the resident hunting public, the Game and Fish Commission in 1991 amended Rule 12-4-114 of the Arizona Administrative Code to place a 10-percent cap on the number of tags that could be awarded to nonresidents for the hunting of bull elk throughout the state and for antlered deer in the area north of the Colorado River.

The department explained that the continued management of Arizona’s big game “is dependant on the continued support of Arizona residents” and that Arizona residents should be afforded the opportunity “to hunt Arizona’s best.”

Each plaintiff in the case is a professional hunter and guide residing in New Mexico who applies for hunting tags around the country in order to “obtain the meat of the animals, their hide, their ivories, and especially their head and rack of antlers to profit from the sale and use of the non-edible parts,” the court filings show. The plaintiffs argued that profit seeking is their sole purpose in hunting these animals in Arizona, and that they do not hunt for recreational enjoyment.

**AZGF News Release 10-3-02.**
one (118 coveys versus 81 coveys)... During the fifth year the populations were again equal. During the sixth, the unhunted population climbed to 100 coveys while the hunted declined to 60 coveys... The pre-hunt populations were again equal and normal just prior to the next hunting season (about 85 coveys in each). “The conclusion: “Climatic factors and subsequent food production, rather than sport hunting, were responsible for the population fluctuations of both study areas”. These data also clearly refute the notion of “additive” hunt mortality.

This study also found that there was an inverse relationship between grazing intensity and number of coveys: Heavily grazed areas had few or no coveys, lightly and ungrazed areas had the most coveys while moderately grazed areas were intermediate in covey numbers between heavily grazed and lightly grazed areas.

While he skipped most of the important details, the biologist who discussed Mearns quail at the symposium did a much better job of reporting on the Mearns study than others did on Gambel quail research. The subject of habitat condition received surprisingly little attention considering that it is widely recognized that livestock grazing has devastated vast areas of desert quail habitat. The Mearns study had settled that question for that species, and perhaps it would be worthwhile addressing the issue with another study of desert quail habitat. What level of forage removal by livestock could be tolerated without adversely impacting Gambel and scaled quail habitat? Such evidence could be used to demand that National Forests and BLM lands be managed to consider the needs of quail as well as livestock.

As for the out-of-state bobwhite experts, they formed the makeup of three different panels: “Compensatory and Additive Mortality with Applications to Arizona Quail Management”, “Habitat Requirements of Desert Quail” and “Round Table Discussion About Arizona Quail”. In my opinion the “experts” contributed absolutely nothing of value to Arizona quail management. That should have been expected considering that the bobwhite is not even a near relative of Gambel, scaled, or Mearns quail. Nor is bobwhite habitat even remotely similar to Arizona quail habitats. Why anyone would have thought they could make a worthwhile contribution to a symposium on Arizona quail is beyond understanding.

It was obvious from comments from the floor that some people in attendance were convinced that hunting was a depressing influence on Arizona quail populations. Whether they would have been persuaded to change their minds if confronted with evidence to the contrary from past Arizona studies we will never know.
JOIN!
The Arizona Wildlife Federation

YOU BELONG IN THE AWF

IF YOU ARE A HUNTER ANGLER CAMPER CONSERVATIONIST Or just WATCH WILDLIFE,
WHAT IS THE ARIZONA WILDLIFE FEDERATION?
AWF is a state-wide, non-profit, politically non-partisan association of persons interested in the present and future well-being of Arizona's wildlife and wildlife habitat. They are concerned with the conservation of our wildlife, waters, forests, soil and air so that future generations may enjoy the recreational, economic, and aesthetic benefits they provide.

WHAT IS AWF DOING?
• Representing the needs of Arizona's wildlife, and the interests of sportsmen and outdoor enthusiasts before the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Legislature, the US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, and National Park Service.
• Fighting to conserve habitat critical to wildlife such as pronghorn antelope, mule deer, Gambel's quail, and other species.
• Working for the restoration of wildlife habitat degraded by years of neglect and abuse
• Educating Arizonans about their wildlife heritage, and the critical issues confronting Arizona's wildlife.
• Protecting threatened natural resources and forcefully advocating for better management of Arizona's public lands.
• Speaking out against unreasonable firearms legislation and unreasonable restrictions on recreation.

WHAT'S IN IT FOR ME?
Your future hunting, future fishing, future wildlife watching, and future enjoyment of Arizona's outdoors. Had not the early founders of AWF taken the proper steps when they did, chances are you would not be enjoying the amount of hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing that you do today. The AWF and its affiliate clubs have been instrumental in establishing a professional system of fish and wildlife management, and improving conditions for Arizona's wildlife. However, the fight is not over. To protect these resources and opportunities for your children, YOU SHOULD BE AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE AWF!

AS AN AWF MEMBER YOUR SUPPORT WILL:
• Help protect and restore wildlife and wildlife habitat;
• Fund programs to help educate Arizonans about the unique wildlife heritage of our state;
• Ensure that there is a voice speaking to politicians, bureaucrats, and journalists on behalf of the needs of wildlife and the interests of sportsmen;
• Fund needed wildlife research;
• Help ensure that our wildlife is managed according to the best professional principles - free from political and economic pressures from special interest groups.

WHAT BENEFITS DO MEMBERS RECEIVE?
Membership in the largest, oldest, and most powerful conservation organization in the state, and affiliation with the largest and most powerful international conservation organization in North America - the National Wildlife Federation. A subscription to the 24 page quarterly Arizona Wildlife News, and the companion newsletter, AWF Outdoors Advisor, issued 8 times per year. E-mail alerts on issues of interest. The opportunity to attend all AWF functions, events, and outings. The opportunity to participate in AWF habitat restoration projects. A membership card for your wallet and a decal for your windshield.

New Member
Address
City State Zip
Phone Email
Referred by (full name)
Address City State Zip
Phone Email
Please Make Checks Payable and Mail TO: Arizona Wildlife Federation - 644 N. Country Club Drive, Suite E Mesa, AZ 85201

☐ Check enclosed! Please Bill my: ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa ☐ Discover
Credit Card #: ____________ ____________ ____________ ____________ Expiration Date: ______ / ______

Name on Card ___________________________ Signed ___________________________

Arizona Wildlife Federation Pledge: “I give my pledge to save and Faithfully Defend from waste, the natural resources of America, its soil and minerals, its forests, water, air and Wildlife. I further pledge to support The Arizona Wildlife Federation, to abide by its by-laws and to abide by the game and fish laws of the State of Arizona and the United States”

☐ $25 Individual Membership
☐ $40 Family Membership
☐ $50 Small Business Membership
☐ $100 Patron Membership
☐ $500 Life Membership
51ST ANNUAL
ARIZONA SPORTSMEN,
VACATION AND
RV SHOW
THE OUTDOOR SHOW

THE LARGEST RV SELECTION IN ALL OF ARIZONA

Jan 30-Feb 2, 2003 • Phoenix Civic Plaza

No other show or store can offer you more for the sports, vacation and RV lover. It's the ONCE A YEAR 4-DAY SUPER SHOW. Don't miss it.

MOTOR HOMES, CAMPERS,
5TH WHEELS, TRAVEL TRAILERS, BOATS,
VACATION GET-AWAYS, TRUCKS & MORE!

FABULOUS FEATURES

• LIVE ACTION RIVER – Top Pro Fishermen Show
  How To Catch the Big Ones
  VACATION DESTINATIONS – Resorts, tours,
  getaways
  ROCK CLIMBING WALL – By Rock'n Challenge

• ARIZONA CAMPGROUND – Hunting Dog
  Demos by Leland Labs
  CAMPING CLINICS
  FLY TYING THEATER
  ARIZONA GAME & FISH Shooting Range

Good Exhibit Space Still Available.
Call (602) 230-7660

Only $5 admission with this coupon
Valid with regular $6 admission only. Not valid with any other coupon. Limit one coupon per adult $6 admission.

SHOW HOURS
Thursday, 2-10 p.m.
Friday, Noon-10 p.m.
Saturday, 10 a.m. - 10 p.m.
Sunday, 10 a.m. - 6 p.m.

ADMISSION
Adults $6
Seniors $5
Kids 7-12 $4
Under 7 Free

Jan 30-Feb 2 - PHOENIX CIVIC PLAZA

SAVE $1.00