

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

NATURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

FISH AND GAME COUNCIL

Game Code

Black Bear (*Ursus americanus*)

Proposed Amendments: N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6 and 5.24

Authorized By: Fish and Game Council, Dave Burke, Acting Chair, and Bob Martin, Commissioner, Department of Environmental Protection.

Authority: N.J.S.A. 13:1B-28, 13:1B-29 et seq., and 23:1-1 et seq.

Calendar Reference: See Summary below for explanation of exception to calendar requirement.

DEP Docket Number: 04-15-04.

Proposal Number: PRN 2015-051.

A public hearing concerning this proposed policy will be held on:

Tuesday, June 2, 2015, at 6:00 P.M.

New Jersey State Museum

205 West State Street

Trenton, NJ 08625

Submit comments by July 17, 2015, electronically at

<http://www.nj.gov/dep/rules/comments>. Electronic submittal of comments is encouraged. In the alternative, comments may be submitted on paper to:

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Department of Environmental Protection

Division of Fish and Wildlife

CBBMP

Attn: Carole Stanko

Mail Code 501-03

PO Box 420

Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0420

This rule proposal may be viewed or downloaded from the Department's website at <http://www.nj.gov/dep/rules>.

The Department of Environmental Protection (Department) and the New Jersey Fish and Game Council (Council) are seeking public comment on the following proposal of amendments to the Game Code, developed by the Council, and the New Jersey Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy (CBBMP), which has been developed by the Council and approved by the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection in accordance with N.J.S.A. 13:1B-28.

The Game Code (also Game Code or Code) at N.J.A.C. 7:25-5 states when, under what circumstances, in what locations, by what means, and in what amounts and numbers, game birds, game animals, and fur-bearing animals may be pursued, taken, killed, or had in possession.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Since the early 1900s, the Game Code has provided a system for the protection, propagation, increase, control, and conservation of game birds, game animals, and fur-bearing animals in this State and for their use and development for public recreation and food supply. Biennial revision of season opening and closing dates, bag limits, and other regulations based on scientific investigation and research ensures the greatest likelihood of success in reaching these goals.

The Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy, the Appendix to N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6, is a compilation of the Council's black bear preservation and management goals, the various means by which the preservation and management goals may be accomplished, and the factors to be considered in determining which means should be implemented to achieve those goals. The CBBMP includes several integrated tools to accomplish these goals, such as research and monitoring, non-lethal and lethal control of problem bears, public education on coexisting with bears, law enforcement to reduce human-bear conflicts, and a controlled hunt.

The agency proposal follows:

Summary

The Council is mandated by the New Jersey State Legislature, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 13:1B-24 et seq., to protect and conserve game birds, mammals, and fish and to provide an adequate supply for recreational and commercial harvest. The Council ensures long-term stable populations of game animals and maximizes and equitably distributes recreational opportunities to user groups by opening and closing seasons, setting season lengths, bag limits, and manner of

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

take. The Council accomplishes this primarily through the State Fish and Game Code, which it promulgates, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 13:1B-30, based on scientific evidence presented to it by the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife (“DFW” or “Division”).

The Council’s involvement with black bears dates to 1953. At that time, the Council designated black bears as a game animal, and the Council thereafter established a limited hunting season from 1958 through 1970. DFW assessed the bear population based on data gathered during the hunting seasons, and after review of this data, the Council closed the hunting season in 1971. DFW commenced a population research and monitoring project in 1988, which produced data showing that the bear population could support a regulated hunting season. Based on this data, the Council reinstated limited hunting seasons in 2003 and 2005. In 2010, the Council developed a comprehensive black bear management policy (CBBMP) that included the broad preservation goals of the Council, the tools at the Council’s disposal to accomplish those goals, and the factors that should be considered when determining which tools will be utilized. The CBBMP was then submitted to the Commissioner for his review and approval. From 2010 through 2014, DFW implemented the recommendations set forth in the CBBMP and collected and analyzed extensive data and information. The proposed amendments to the Game Code and to the CBBMP are based on these analyses.

The Commissioner and the Council are proposing amendments to the Game Code and the CBBMP as summarized below. In addition to the below-described changes, expired season dates are deleted and typographic corrections are proposed to the Game Code.

The proposed amendments to the Game Code include the following:

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

1. The Commissioner and the Council are proposing to add additional days to the black bear hunting season, during October, beginning in 2016. The bear season will then consist of two six-day segments, one in October and one in December. From 2010 through 2014, the bear hunting season was held concurrently with the six-day firearm deer season. This bear season structure was designed to be conservative, occurring in December when many bears had already entered winter dens and were not available for harvest. Bear seasons in December are also affected by winter weather events, which cause some bears to enter winter dens early and lessen the number of hunters afield. Additionally, some hunters who harvested a black bear lost interest in hunting for bears in subsequent seasons due to the great effort required to extract such a large animal from the field. The Council has determined that because of declining hunter participation and weather events, the number of bears harvested decreased between 2010 and 2014, and that the December season structure proved inadequate to properly manage the bear population. The Council determined that, as a result of the 2010, 2011, and 2012 bear hunting seasons, the bear population and the number of damage and nuisance reports in the hunt area (Bear Management Zones 1 through 4) decreased. However, the effects of consistent use of this conservative season became apparent, and the bear population and damage and nuisance reports began to increase after the 2013 bear season. The proposed additional hunting segment will occur over six days during the second week of October and will allow for more consistent harvests, with essentially all bears available for hunting and with fewer complications due to weather events. This new structure will provide appropriate long-term bear population management. In addition, farmers are expected to

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

experience relief from allowing bear hunting on their lands in October, since during this month a substantial amount of crop damage occurs. To ensure that overharvest does not occur, the season will close if the harvest rate reaches 30 percent of the estimated bear population (see item 2 below). Harvest rate equals the number of harvested bears that were tagged in the current calendar year within Bear Management Zones (BMZs) open to hunting divided by the number of bears that were tagged in the current calendar year that are available for harvest (total number of bears tagged in the current year within BMZs open to hunting minus known mortality of such tagged bears and number of such tagged bears known to have left the BMZs that are open to hunting). See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a).

2. A criterion for closure of the bear hunting season is proposed. If the harvest rate reaches 30 percent during the bear season, the season will be closed 24 hours from the day on which this harvest rate was achieved. Harvest rates are calculated at the close of each day of the season using data gathered both before and during each season. While the Council has determined that season harvest rates of at least 20 percent should be achieved in order to affect a population reduction, harvest rates higher than 30 percent may result in an excessive number of bears being taken. To institute a season closure, one day is needed to announce the closure by news release, radio, the Division's website (www.njfishandwildlife.com) and other media. By announcing the season closure on the day when harvest rates reach 30 percent, bear hunters will be notified of the closure in time to prevent excessive additional harvest. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a).
3. Only archery equipment and muzzleloading rifles are proposed for use during the October segment of the bear season. The first three days of this segment will be archery

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

only; the last three days will be archery and muzzleloader. Archery is a safe and effective hunting method used in all states with bear hunting seasons and will provide increased opportunity for bear hunters in New Jersey. New Jersey previously allowed the use of bow and arrow for bear hunting from 1958 to 1970, and today's archery equipment is more accurate and efficient than the longbows and recurve bows first used in New Jersey's archery bear hunts. The October bear season segment will be open concurrently with the fall bow deer season, providing bear hunting opportunities for deer hunters during this time. Current statutes allow archers to hunt no less than 150 feet from a dwelling, which is closer than is allowed for firearm hunting (450 feet). Since many bears spend part of their time close to dwellings, archery hunting is expected to increase the percentage of nuisance bears harvested during the bear season, as archers can hunt closer to dwellings than firearm hunters. Muzzleloaders have been used safely and effectively for bear hunting during past December seasons. The use of muzzleloaders during the October segment will increase hunting opportunity and promote more consistent firearm harvests of bears, as firearm harvests in December were affected by weather events and unavailability of bears already in dens. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a) 4.

4. The proposed amendments provide for the taking of a second bear. The proposed amendments would allow a hunter who harvests a bear during the October segment of the bear season to harvest an additional bear during the December segment of the season, provided another permit is available for the hunter to purchase for the December segment. Bear permits cost \$2.00. See N.J.S.A. 23:3-1c. This will provide additional hunting opportunity during December for those who harvest a bear in October, and will

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

maximize hunter participation in the December segment of the season and enhance bear population management. Permits are sold on a first-come basis. Even though all 11,000 permits will be made available prior to Segment A, the Council expects that a portion of these permits will be available for purchase between the end of Segment A and the beginning of Segment B. However, given that the permit is not hunt segment-specific, a hunter may purchase his permits early for the late segment. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a) 1 and 2.

5. New boundaries for some BMZs are proposed. Specifically, the boundaries of BMZs 5 and 6 are modified, and a new BMZ 7 is created. These new boundaries will allow for more efficient management of bears in northeastern, central, and southern parts of the State, based on current data on bear damage and nuisance activity as well as habitat use (see 6 below). BMZs 1 through 4 will remain unchanged. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a)3v, vi, and vii.
6. The newly delineated BMZ 5 (see 5 above) is proposed to be opened for bear hunting. As bears have spread into areas east of Interstate 287 and south of Interstate 78, bear damage and nuisance complaints in these areas have increased. BMZ 5 incorporates areas south of Interstate 78 and east of Interstate 287 not previously open to bear hunting. Opening BMZ 5 to bear hunting will provide relief from bear damage and nuisance to residents of Hunterdon, Somerset, eastern Morris and southern Passaic Counties. Hunting in this area is also expected to lessen the number of bears that disperse into urban areas which then require capture and removal at a significant cost to State and

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

municipal agencies. A total of 1,000 permits are proposed to be allocated to BMZ 5. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a)6.

7. The proposed amendments provide four additional days of bear hunting after the December segment of the season if the anticipated harvest of bears has not been achieved. A specific yearly rate of harvest must be achieved to effectively reduce the bear population to a level commensurate with available habitat and consistent with a reduced risk to public safety and property. Harvest rates are calculated at the close of each day of the season using data gathered both before and during each season. The Council has determined that in order to reduce the bear population, the harvest rate should reach 20 percent. If this harvest rate is not met by the end of the December segment of the season, the four additional days of hunting in December shall be instituted. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(b).
8. The lottery for bear hunting permits is proposed to be eliminated. The lottery for bear season permits remains undersubscribed. For several years permits have been available over the counter after the lottery in all Bear Management Zones. Eliminating the lottery is a convenience for the hunter and a cost savings for the Division. Information relating to applying for the lottery and the ability of persons who do not possess a valid hunting license to apply for the lottery provided they have applied for a hunter education course are removed since they are no longer applicable. Since bear permits have not sold out during the lottery and are proposed to be available through license issuing agents without the necessity of a lottery, new hunters who have satisfied education requirements

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

may purchase a bear permit at the same time they purchase their initial license or anytime thereafter if bear permits are still available. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6(a)1.

9. N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.24, Bow and arrow, general provisions, is proposed to be amended at subsection (c) to add “bear” to the list of species which can be hunted using bow and arrow. This modification is necessary since all species with an archery hunting season are listed in this section. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.24(c).

10. Bear hunters are proposed to be added to N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.24(d), which requires the use of hunter orange when bow hunting in ground blinds during the firearm deer seasons.

Currently, the regulation only applies to “bowhunter[s] hunting for deer and utilizing a ground blind during a time period when the bowhunting season is concurrent with a deer firearm season.” By proposing to include bear hunters and bear firearm seasons to this sentence, the required use of hunter orange would also apply to those who are bow hunting for bears in ground blinds during the firearm bear season. The use of hunter orange on ground blinds for archers was instituted for safety reasons during the firearm deer hunting seasons, and since the archery bear season will run concurrently with the firearm bear season, the Council has determined that archers hunting for bears should also be required to utilize hunter orange while in ground blinds to promote hunter safety. See N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.24(d).

11. The Commissioner and the Council are proposing amendments to the Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy (CBBMP), the Appendix to N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6. The proposed amendments to the CBBMP incorporate an integrated wildlife management approach for bear management that is consistent with the management efforts that DFW

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

has undertaken for many years. This integrated approach to black bear management utilizes available, practical methods for the management of the State's black bear population, taking into account the best scientific information and the fiscal and personnel resources of State and local agencies. The components of this integrated wildlife management plan incorporated into the CBBMP are (1) education; (2) control of human-derived food; (3) research and analysis of the State's black bear population; (4) analysis of the State's available black bear habitat; (5) cooperative research with other states, academic institutions, and other entities engaged in research on black bear management; (6) control of bears that threaten human safety, agricultural crops, or property by lethal means, or nuisance bears, by non-lethal means; (7) habitat protection; and (8) bear population management.

With regard to education, the CBBMP explains that DFW has conducted an intensive and extensive public education campaign about common-sense practices that may reduce the risk of impacts from negative black bear behavior on humans, their homes, their property, and their communities. DFW's public-education efforts started 30 years ago and have intensified over the last decade. Since 2010, over 50,000 people have received bear education presentations, and over 350,000 pieces of education material have been distributed. The proposed amendments to the CBBMP support the continuation of DFW's education efforts, call for increased educational efforts in urban areas and the central and southern parts of the State, and call for more web-based educational programs.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

With regard to control of human-derived food, the CBBMP explains the legislative and enforcement initiatives that have been undertaken in the last several years and supports the expansion of these initiatives. The CBBMP notes that the Legislature enacted a ban on the intentional feeding of bears in 2002, N.J.S.A. 23:2A-14, and that the Department has worked with local officials on enforcement of this ban while also implementing food and garbage management policies on Department-controlled land. During the last several years, law enforcement officers have inspected thousands of residential properties in high bear incident areas and found near complete compliance with black bear garbage management guidelines, suggesting that black bear education efforts have been effective, in terms of compliance. The CBBMP notes that the Council lacks the authority to mandate the use of bear-resistant garbage cans or to regulate municipal garbage containment; however, DFW has assisted several municipalities in efforts to secure bear-resistant containers and dumpsters for communities with high numbers of nuisance bear interactions. Recommendation 1 to part B. “Control of Human-Derived Food” of the Integrated Black Bear Management Strategy dealing with the statutory feeding ban is proposed for amendment to include as part of this strategy the Department support of a legislative initiative to strengthen the enforcement provisions and clarifying feeding restrictions by including an explicit prohibition on unintentional feeding of bears in addition to the current ban on intentional feeding of bears.

With regard to research and analysis of the State’s black bear population, the CBBMP explains that DFW has been conducting intensive and extensive research on black bears since 1980. This research has been conducted throughout New Jersey but has

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

focused on Bear Management Zones 1 through 4, located in prime black bear range. The CBBMP also explains that the data acquired by DFW provides a solid and extremely valuable database upon which to make bear management decisions, and that the State's bear population has maintained a high reproductive and survival rate. The proposed amendments to the CBBMP support the continuation of DFW's research and analysis of the State's black bear population, including the use of sophisticated statistical analysis as new data and data analysis tools become available to obtain the most accurate population estimates.

In the CBBMP, proposed boundary changes and an additional BMZ 5 are proposed. The newly delineated BMZ 5 (see item 5 above) is proposed to be opened for bear hunting. Proposed BMZ 5 incorporates areas south of Interstate 78 and east of Interstate 287 not previously open to bear hunting. As bears have spread into areas south of Interstate 78 and east of Interstate 287, bear damage and nuisance complaints in these areas have increased. From 2010 to 2014 in the proposed BMZ 5, Category I incidents increased 35 percent, Category II incidents increased 46 percent, and Category III incidents increased 19 percent (Figure 8b in CBBMP). New Jersey's bear population is highly correlated to the number of bear incidents reported each year (Figure 12 in CBBMP), and this correlation can be used as a predictor of bear population changes. In the proposed BMZ 5, there was a 29 percent increase in bear incidents (all categories combined) since 2010, which corresponds to an increase in the bear population in this zone of 39 percent during the same period. Opening the proposed BMZ 5 to bear hunting is expected to provide relief from bear damage and nuisance to residents of Hunterdon,

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Somerset, eastern Morris, and southern Passaic Counties. Hunting in this area is also expected to lessen the number of bears that disperse into urban areas and then require capture and removal at a significant cost to State and municipal agencies.

With regard to analysis of the State's available black bear habitat, the CBBMP notes that New Jersey contains suitable habitat to support a viable and healthy black bear population and that habitat analysis is necessary to properly manage the population. The CBBMP supports the ranking of bear habitat Statewide and the designation of BMZs as the most effective manner in which to make decisions concerning bear management. As a result of proposing an additional BMZ and adjusting the boundaries of BMZs 6 and 7, the bear habitat analysis for these zones is updated.

With regard to cooperative research with other states, academic institutions, and other entities engaged in research on black bear management, the CBBMP explains that DFW has participated in a number of cooperative studies with academic institutions in several states and has met with Federal and other state biologists and administrators to discuss bear management issues. DFW also is cooperating on research to evaluate non-lethal management techniques to determine their effectiveness. The proposed amendments to the CBBMP support the continuation of these efforts to expand the knowledge about black bears and to collect scientific information on which to base management decisions.

With regard to control of bears that threaten human safety, depredate agricultural crops, or exhibit nuisance behavior, either by lethal or non-lethal means, the CBBMP explains that, despite educational efforts, situations will arise that will require private

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

citizens, farmers, local police officers or Department personnel to take action against problem bears. The CBBMP finds that the DFW Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria (BBRRC) is the most effective operating policy for response to bears that are a threat to human safety, agricultural crops and/or property, or are a nuisance. The CBBMP also recognizes that the cooperation of law enforcement personnel from all levels of governmental agencies within black bear range is essential to the implementation of the bear response policy. DFW staff has trained nearly 1,400 local police officers, State Troopers, and State, county and municipal park rangers to assist in problem bear response. Thus, the CBBMP supports the continued use of DFW's BBRRC, as well as the use of non-lethal control techniques such as aversive conditioning, to modify the behavior of nuisance bears. Part B. "Bear Control: Lethal and Non-Lethal" of the Integrated Black Bear Management Strategy is proposed for amendment to increase the criteria for property damage to be classified as Category I behavior in the BBRRC from the current \$500.00 to \$1,000. The BBRRC provides examples of Category 1 behavior, including impacts to livestock. It is proposed that this example be clarified to refer to "protected" livestock with a definition added to describe what is considered to be "protected," with protected livestock meaning completely enclosed by a properly installed electrified fence or livestock otherwise enclosed in such a manner that it reasonably prevents access by bears. Farmers experiencing black bear damage are encouraged to allow bear hunting on their property and municipalities and agencies trained to implement the BBRRC are encouraged to report their activities to the DFW to allow better monitoring of bear related activity.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

With regard to habitat protection, the CBBMP explains that the Department's open space acquisition program has been instrumental in protecting valuable bear habitat and supports further open space acquisition and habitat improvement programs. The recommendation that the DFW prepare black bear management plans for newly acquired properties assigned to DEP is proposed to be removed since it is evident that bears must be managed at a much larger landscape level.

With regard to bear population management, the proposed amendments to the CBBMP explain that DFW bear population monitoring has shown growth and range expansion of the black bear population into eastern and southern areas of New Jersey. Based upon 2014 research data, the black bear population estimate for the portion of New Jersey north of I-78 and west of I-287 is 3,500 bears. The CBBMP explains that the growth of the black bear population has produced high levels of negative human-bear interactions, despite DFW's expanded non-lethal management initiatives. The proposed amendments to the CBBMP note that black bear hunts from 2010 through 2012 resulted in reductions in the bear population and reductions in bear related complaints received by DFW and law enforcement agencies. However, with reduced harvest rates during the 2013 and 2014 seasons due to the conservative December season structure and other factors, the bear population and human-bear interactions have returned to 2010 levels. The CBBMP finds that DFW should reduce and stabilize the bear population at a level commensurate with available habitat and consistent with reducing risk to public safety and property. Although fertility control and sterilization have been studied, these methods of population control are not effective. Regulated hunting seasons in 2003, 2005, and

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

2010 through 2014 demonstrated bears could be harvested safely; thus, the CBBMP, with proposed amendments, continues to support regulated hunting as a safe and effective management tool to provide recreation and to control the State's black bear population in a cost-effective manner. In addition, the proposed amendments to the CBBMP call for expansion of the hunting season structure, thereby increasing harvest rates and reducing the bear population to appropriate levels. The proposed expanded season structure includes season dates in October, adds archery equipment as a method of harvest, and opens the newly delineated BMZ 5, an area previously not open to bear hunting that has experienced an increase in nuisance bear incidents. In addition, the proposed amendments to the CBBMP propose criteria by which the hunting season would be closed or expanded based on harvest rate data collected and reviewed by DFW each day of the season.

Figures 1 through 5, Tables 1 and 2, and Appendices 1, 2, and 3 are proposed for deletion and are replaced with updated information on the same topics contained in proposed Figures 1 through 13, Tables 1 through 7, and Appendices 1 and 2.

The remaining changes to the CBBMP include grammatical corrections and the addition of data collected on the bear population, bear complaints, and bear hunting seasons that are referenced in the various sections and discussions.

As a 60-day comment period has been provided on this notice of proposal, this notice is exempted from the rulemaking calendar requirement pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:30-3.3(a)5.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Social Impact

The proposed amendments to add archery as a weapon choice for black bear hunting will provide bear hunting opportunity for those individuals who only hunt using archery, and will increase opportunity for those hunters who use firearms but want to try bear hunting with bow and arrow.

The addition of bear hunting season days in October will provide added opportunity for hunters in Bear management Zones 1 through 5, while limiting the potential for bear-human conflict by reducing the bear population.

The opening of Bear Management Zone 5 to bear hunting will provide increased opportunity for hunters who choose to participate in this area.

The addition of hunting days to the December segment of the season in seasons with low harvest rates will add opportunity for hunters and limit the potential for bear-human conflict by reducing the bear population.

The positive social impact anticipated from the proposed amendments includes improved conservation and management of black bears, and reductions in bear-human conflict.

The proposed amendments to the CBBMP will have a positive social impact by continuing all the components of an integrated approach to black bear management currently being implemented by DFW and by expanding some of the CBBMP's approaches in order to help manage the black bear population in a cost-effective manner. While the continuation of a hunt will be opposed by persons opposed to hunting in general or the hunting of bears specifically, bear hunts held in 2003, 2005, and 2010 through 2014 demonstrated that a hunt could be held safely and the harvest of bears could be controlled by restricting the season length,

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

the bag limit, and hunter participation via a limited bear permit quota. The reduction of the bear population and the decline in bear complaints and bear related property damage in communities within the bear hunting area, which occurred following hunts with high harvest rates, had a positive social impact. This positive social impact included the reduction of negative bear-human interactions and the reduction of the time and resources expended by State and local personnel in response to bear-related complaints, thus enabling local law-enforcement personnel to perform other law-enforcement duties and respond to other public safety matters.

Economic Impact

There will be a positive economic impact on local retailers serving the hunting population as a result of the proposed amendments, which include a longer bear season, bear hunting in additional areas, and the addition of archery hunting for bears. Although the Council anticipates that these changes will result in a positive economic impact, it is not possible to estimate their extent.

There will be positive economic impact resulting from amendment of the CBBMP and the implementation of recommendations contained therein. Continued educational efforts to advise citizens how to mitigate bear-related damage by altering practices such as storage of household trash, and placement of bird feeders to keep them out of reach of bears will result in less damage to personal property. Furthermore, expanding educational efforts in central and southern areas of New Jersey will enhance the reduction of bear damage in these areas. Continuing to allow farmers who have depredation permits to destroy bears found depredating crops such as corn, will positively influence crop yields and their economic value. Through

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

implementation of the proposed amendments to the CBBMP, DFW expects that Department and Department-trained local law enforcement officers will receive fewer calls about problem bears and fewer incident responses will be needed. This reduction in the number of calls and responses will have a positive economic impact on Department and local law enforcement budgets. The expanded hunting of bears will remove a portion of problem bears from the population, will decrease the overall bear population and, therefore, should slow the movement of bears into suburban/urban areas and will likely diminish associated property damage, bear/vehicle collisions, urban bear removals and associated costs. Expanding the regulated bear season will have a positive economic benefit to businesses that sell hunting related equipment. A DFW survey of hunters partaking in the 2011 bear season indicated that hunters expended an estimated \$1.8 million dollars per season on bear hunting related expenses, such as equipment, food, lodging, gas, and supplies.

Environmental Impact

The proposed amendments to the Game Code will have a positive environmental impact as they are designed to implement the management and control of bears based on the State's ongoing research efforts. The proposed amendments to the Game Code will improve the conservation and management of the State's black bears by the Division based on studies of the current population, distribution, and habitat status. The proposed amendments to season timing, season length, and weapon choice for bear hunting have been designed to reduce and then maintain bear populations at levels more compatible with natural habitats and land uses such as for agriculture.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Because New Jersey has a viable and sustainable black bear population and there are safeguards in the Game Code to protect the population, the proposed amendments to the CBBMP should have a positive environmental impact as they are expected to result in the conservation, management, and enhancement of the State's bear resource by categorizing bear habitat and supporting existing efforts to preserve habitat that not only supports a viable bear population but other associated wildlife species. The CBBMP's integrated approach of continued research and population monitoring, education, damage mitigation, enforcement, and a regulated hunting season is designed to maintain the black bear population at levels more compatible with natural habitats and other land uses.

Federal Standards Statement

Executive Order No. 27 (1994) and N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 et seq. require State agencies which adopt, readopt, or amend State regulations that exceed any Federal standards or requirements to include in the rulemaking document a Federal standards analysis.

The USFWS regulates hunting in National Wildlife Refuge areas in New Jersey pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, 16 U.S.C. § 668dd (1966), and implementing regulations at 50 CFR 32.49. The proposed amendments to the Game Code and the CBBMP do not contain any standards or requirements that exceed Federal regulations involving National Wildlife Refuge areas.

Therefore, the proposed amendments to the Game Code and the CBBMP do not contain any standards or requirements that exceed any standards or requirements imposed by Federal law.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Jobs Impact

The proposed amendments to the Game Code and the CBBMP will not have any effect on the number of jobs in the State. The amendments will help ensure continued recreational and economic benefits to the citizens of the State and continue to provide for the regulated use and proper management of the State's wildlife resources. The Council does not anticipate that the minor changes proposed will impact the number of jobs in businesses serving this recreational industry, such as sporting goods stores and eateries.

Agriculture Industry Impact

The proposed amendments to the Game Code regarding bear seasons should continue to decrease the economic losses incurred by the agricultural community from bears depredating agricultural crops, beehives, and livestock. The proposed hunting seasons should better ensure that bear populations are maintained at acceptable levels.

The proposed amendments to the CBBMP should continue to lessen the economic losses incurred by the agricultural community because these amendments continue the practice of allowing farmers to kill bears depredating crops under a permit issued by the Division. Expansion of the bear hunting season should further assist farmers to minimize their crop damage, especially if they allow hunters to hunt on their property to harvest resident bears that may be responsible for agricultural damage.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Regulatory Flexibility Statement

In accordance with the New Jersey Regulatory Flexibility Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-16 et seq., the Council has reviewed the proposed amendments for reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements on small businesses.

The proposed amendments do not impose reporting, recordkeeping, and compliance requirements on sportsmen engaged in recreational hunting beyond those already in the rules. Taxidermists and butchers are required by existing N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.22(e)1 to record contact information on the person submitting a bear for processing. The proposed amendments do not impose any additional reporting, recordkeeping, or compliance requirements on small businesses as defined under the Regulatory Flexibility Act. N.J.S.A. 52:14B-16 et. seq.

Housing Affordability Impact Analysis

In accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-4, as amended effective July 17, 2008, by P.L. 2008, c. 46, the Council has evaluated this rulemaking to determine the impact, if any, on the affordability of housing. The proposed amendments apply solely to hunting and do not involve the creation or construction of any type of housing units. Accordingly, the proposed amendments have no impact on housing affordability.

Smart Growth Development Impact Analysis

In accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-4, as amended effective July 17, 2008, by P.L. 2008, c. 46, the Council has evaluated the proposed amendments to determine the nature and extent of the impacts housing affordability and on housing production within Planning Areas

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

1 or 2, or within designated centers, under the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The proposed amendments apply solely to hunting and will have no impact on the housing production within Planning Areas 1 or 2, or within designated centers, under the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

Full text of the proposal follows (for N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6 and 5.24, additions indicated in boldface **thus**, and deletions indicated in brackets [thus]; for N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.6 Appendix, additions indicated in underlined boldface **thus**, and deletions indicated in brackets [thus]):

7:25-5.6 Black bear (*Ursus americanus*), bobcat (*Felis rufus*)

(a) There is a closed season for bobcat. It shall be illegal to intentionally take, kill, or attempt to take or kill a bobcat in the State of New Jersey at any time. Bobcat, including any part thereof, legally harvested in other U.S. states or Canadian provinces may be possessed provided they are affixed with a Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) tag from the state or province of harvest. It shall be illegal to use dogs to pursue or run black bears. There is a season for black bears in accordance with the approved [comprehensive policy for the protection and propagation of black bears] **Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy (CBBMP)** (see section Appendix, incorporated herein by reference). **Beginning in 2016, [The] the season [duration for black bear] for black bears shall consist of two segments. Segment A shall be a period of six consecutive days beginning on the second Monday in October. Segment B** shall be concurrent with the six-day firearm deer season as enumerated in N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.27(a). Legal hunting hours for black bears shall be 1/2 hour

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

before sunrise to 1/2 hour after sunset. Following the commencement of the season, the Director [may, after consultation with the Chairman,] **shall** close the season **if the harvest rate reaches 30 percent**. [To the extent possible, the Chairman will consult with available Council members prior to consultation with the Director.] The Director will announce such closure, which will become effective 24 hours from the daily legal closing time of the day on which [the decision is made] **the Division determines that the harvest rate reaches 30 percent**, based upon data obtained and reviewed by the Division **at the close of each day of the season. Harvest rate equals the number of harvested bears that were tagged in the current calendar year within bear management zones (BMZs) open to hunting divided by the number of bears that were tagged in the current calendar year that are available for harvest (total number of bears tagged in the current year within BMZs open to hunting minus known mortality of such tagged bears and number of such tagged bears known to have left the BMZs that are open to hunting)**. Season closure will be announced by news release, radio, the Division's website (www.njfishandwildlife.com) and other media.

1. Special black bear hunting permit requirement: All black bear hunters must have a current and valid firearm **or archery** hunting license and a current and valid special "black bear hunting permit" which will be issued by the Division. A total of [10,000] **11,000** special black bear hunting permits, allocated by bear management zone (BMZ), will be available to properly licensed [firearm] hunters. [A random lottery will be conducted, if demand exceeds supply in any BMZ.] Black bear hunting permits and special farmer black bear permits are not transferable and must be in the possession of the hunter while hunting black bears. Hunters are limited to **hunting**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

in no more than two [black bear hunting permits] **BMZs** per [year, as per (a)1iii below] **season**.

Hunters are limited to purchasing up to two permits per (a)1iii below, one for each BMZ hunted, until the end of Segment A. If a hunter harvests one bear during Segment A, the hunter may purchase an additional permit for that BMZ, if available, so that the hunter may hunt in that BMZ during Segment B. Any permits unfilled in Segment A are valid for use in Segment B. After Segment A, a hunter may purchase an additional permit in a second BMZ, if available, if that hunter had initially purchased only one permit for Segment A, and hunters who did not purchase any permits for Segment A may purchase up to two permits for Segment B, one for each BMZ hunted. Juvenile hunters aged 10 through 13 years of age must have a black bear hunting permit and be under the direct supervision of a properly licensed adult (21 years of age or older) while bear hunting. The adult must also possess a black bear hunting permit. Direct supervision means the juvenile hunter and the supervising adult are together at the same location. The juvenile hunter may not hunt independently of the adult.

i. Black bear hunting permits will be issued on an individual basis to holders of valid and current firearm **and/or archery** hunting licenses. Black bear hunting permits and special farmer black bear permits are valid only in the BMZ and year designated on the permit, and are not transferable.

ii. Black bear hunting permits consist of a back display and include a "Black Bear Transportation Tag." The back display shall be conspicuously worn in the middle of the back in addition to the valid firearm **or archery** license.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

iii. Black bear hunting permits shall be [applied for as follows: Holders] **issued on an individual basis to holders** of valid and current firearm **or archery** hunting licenses, including juvenile licenses,[shall apply by submitting an application] via the Division's ELS [which has been properly completed in accordance with instructions] or, in the event of ELS operating difficulties, by providing the same information at ELS locations through such alternate system as may be designated by the Division. [First time permit applicants who do not possess a valid hunting license may apply for a black bear hunting permit provided they have applied for a hunter education course prior to the application period and have provided such related information as may be required on the application. Only two applications may be submitted per individual--one application for an initial permit lottery and one application for a left-over permit for a different BMZ. Submission of more than one application for the initial permit lottery or for a left-over permit by an individual will cause all applications to be void.] All persons, while their hunting licenses are void under authority of law or as imposed by a court, are prohibited from [making application for, or otherwise] procuring[,] a black bear hunting permit. [The application shall be completed to include the applicant's Conservation ID Number or name, address, BMZ applied for, and any other information required by law or requested. Applications must be received no later than October 15, annually, to be included in the initial permit drawing. If the number of applications exceeds the BMZ permit quota, permit selection will be by random drawing. After the regular permit application period and initial permit selection process, nothing contained herein shall preclude the Division from issuing unfilled or unclaimed permits on a first come-first served basis to any properly licensed hunter.] Any permit obtained by fraud shall be void.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

iv. Special Farmer Black Bear Permits shall be applied for as follows:

(1) (No change.)

(2) Application forms may be obtained from the Division of Fish and Wildlife, **MC 501-03**, PO Box [400] **420**, Trenton, N.J. 08625-[0400]**0420**.

(3) (No change.)

(4) [Only one farmer application may be submitted per individual during the initial application period.] Application for a farmer black bear permit shall not preclude a farmer from [applying for and the Division's issuing] **procuring, as stated in (a)1iii above**, [one] **a** regular black bear season permit as a holder of a valid hunting license.

2. Bag limit: **One bear of either sex and any age may be harvested per permit, but only one bear may be harvested per segment, regardless of the number of permits the hunter holds.** [Only one bear of either-sex and any age may be taken per properly licensed hunter annually.] It is unlawful to take or attempt to take or continue to hunt for more than the number of black bear permitted. Properly licensed hunters who harvest a black bear shall immediately complete and affix to the bear the "Black Bear Transportation Tag" from their Black Bear Hunting Permit. Information included on the black bear transportation tag shall include: the hunters name, address and current firearm **or archery** license number; date and time of kill; BMZ, county, and municipality of kill; and the sex of the black bear. Successful hunters must take the black bear to a designated check station by **9:00 P.M. on the day of the kill during Segment A or by 7:00 P.M. on the day of the kill during Segment B.** Hunters shall surrender the black bear transportation tag and will be issued a legal possession tag. Any legally killed

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

black bear recovered too late to be brought to a designated black bear check station by **9:00 P.M. on the day of the kill during Segment A or by 7:00 P.M. on the date of the kill during Segment B** must be reported immediately by telephone to the [Northern Region Office of the] **nearest regional** Bureau of Law Enforcement **office**. Hunters must provide their name, address, and a telephone number where they can be reached on the telephone message recording device, if a Division representative is not available. Said black bear must be brought to a designated black bear check station on the next weekday to be registered and to receive a legal possession tag.

3. The black bear management zones are located as follows:

i. – iv. (No change.)

v. Zone 5. [That portion of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and Union Counties lying within a continuous line beginning at the intersection of Routes 78 and 287; then north along Route 287 to its intersection with the New York State line; then southeast along the New York state line to the Hudson River; then south along the west shore of the Hudson River to Upper New York Bay; then south along the shore of Upper New York Bay to the Kill Van Kull; then west along the north shore of the Kill Van Kull to Newark Bay; then west across Newark Bay to its confluence with the Arthur Kill; then south along the west shore of the Arthur Kill to its intersection with Route 440; then west along Route 440 to its intersection with Route 287; then northwest along Route 287 to its intersection with Rt. 78 the point of beginning.] **That portion of Hunterdon, Mercer, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and Warren Counties lying within a continuous line beginning at the intersection of Rt. 78 and the Delaware River; then east along Rt. 78 to its intersection with Rt. 287; then northeast along Rt. 287 to its**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

intersection with Rt. 202 in Oakland; then south along Rt. 202 to its intersection with Rt. 23; then south along Rt. 23 to its intersection with Rt. 80; then west along Rt. 80 to its intersection with the Passaic River; then west along the north bank of the Passaic River to its intersection with Rt. 80; then west on Rt. 80 to its intersection with Rt. 280; then south along Rt. 280 to its intersection with Rt. 632; then south along Rt. 632 to its intersection with Rt. 608; then south along Rt. 608 to its intersection with Rt. 124; then southeast along Rt. 124 to its intersection with Rt. 638; then south along Rt. 638 to its intersection with Rt. 531; then south along Rt. 531 to its intersection with Rt. 527; then south along Rt. 527 to its intersection with Rt. 533; then south along Rt. 533 to its intersection with Rt. 206; then south along Rt. 206 to its intersection with Rt. 518; then west along Rt. 518 to its intersection with Rt. 165; then west along Rt. 165 to its intersection with Rt. 179; then west along Rt. 179 to the Delaware River; then north along the east bank of the Delaware River to its intersection with Rt. 78, the point of beginning.

vi. Zone 6. [That portion of Warren, Hunterdon, Somerset, Middlesex, Mercer, Monmouth, Burlington, Ocean, Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, Salem, Gloucester and Camden Counties lying within a continuous line beginning at the intersection of Rt. 78 and the Delaware River; then east along Rt. 78 to its intersection with Rt. 287, then southeast along Rt. 287 to its intersection with Rt. 440; then south and east along Routes 287/440 to its intersection with the Arthur Kill at Perth Amboy; then south along the west shore of the Arthur Kill to Raritan Bay, then south and east along the shore of Raritan Bay to Sandy Hook; then north along the east shore of Sandy Hook Bay to the tip of Sandy Hook; then south along the Atlantic Ocean to the Delaware Bay shore; then north and west along the shore of Delaware Bay to its intersection

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

with the Delaware River; then north along the east bank of the Delaware River to its intersection with Rt. 78, the point of beginning.] **That portion of Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and Union Counties lying within a continuous line beginning at the intersection of Rt. 287 and the New York state line; then southeast along the New York state line to the Hudson River; then south along the west shore of the Hudson River to Upper New York Bay; then south along the shore of Upper New York Bay to the Kill Van Kull; then west along the north shore of the Kill Van Kull to Newark Bay; then west across Newark Bay to its confluence with the Arthur Kill; then south along the west shore of the Arthur Kill to its intersection with Route 440; then west along Route 440 to its intersection with Route 287; then west along Route 287 to its intersection with Rt. 533; then north along Rt. 533 to its intersection with Rt. 527; then north along Rt. 527 to its intersection with Rt. 531; then north along Rt. 531 to its intersection with Rt. 638; then north along Rt. 638 to its intersection with Rt. 124; then northwest along Rt. 124 to its intersection with Rt. 608; then north along Rt. 608 to its intersection with Rt. 632; then north along Rt. 632 to its intersection with Rt. 280; then northwest along Rt. 280 to its intersection with Rt. 80; then east along Rt. 80 to its intersection with the Passaic River; then east along the north bank of the Passaic River to its intersection with Rt. 80; then east along Rt. 80 to its intersection with Rt. 23; then north along Rt. 23 to its intersection with Rt. 202; then north along Rt. 202 to its intersection with Rt. 287; then north along Rt. 287 to its intersection with the New York state line, the point of beginning.**

vii. Zone 7. That portion of Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Ocean, Salem, and Somerset

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Counties lying within a continuous line beginning at the intersection of Rt. 179 and the Delaware River; then east along Rt. 179 to its intersection with Rt. 165; then east along Rt. 165 to its intersection with Rt. 518; then east along Rt. 518 to its intersection with Rt. 206; then north along Rt. 206 to its intersection with Rt. 533; then north along Rt. 533 to its intersection with Rt. 287; then east along Rt. 287 to its intersection with Rt. 440; then east along Rt. 440 to its intersection with the Arthur Kill at Perth Amboy; then south along the west shore of the Arthur Kill to Raritan Bay, then south and east along the shore of Raritan Bay to Sandy Hook; then north along the east shore of Sandy Hook Bay to the tip of Sandy Hook; then south along the Atlantic Ocean to the Delaware Bay shore; then north and west along the shore of Delaware Bay to its intersection with the Delaware River; then north along the east bank of the Delaware River to its intersection with Rt. 179, the point of beginning.

4. During the entirety of Segment A, bows as described in N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.24 may be used. During the last three days of Segment A, muzzleloader rifles of .44 or larger caliber may be used. During Segment A, no shotgun shall be used to hunt black bears. During Segment B, [Only] **only** shotguns no smaller than 20 gauge or larger than 10 gauge with rifled slugs, and/or muzzleloader rifles of .44 or larger caliber shall be used. Persons hunting with muzzleloader rifle must also possess a current and valid rifle-hunting permit.

5. Hunting manner shall be by stand hunting, still-hunting, or drive hunting with **bow**, shotgun, or muzzleloader rifle. Black bears may not be taken from dens. No person shall attempt to take or kill a black bear or have in their possession or control any firearm, or other weapon of any kind, while elevated in a standing tree or in a structure of any kind within 300 feet of a

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

baited area (N.J.S.A. 23:4-24.2). Persons hunting black bears **with a firearm** must wear a cap made of daylight fluorescent orange or an outer garment containing at least 200 square inches of fluorescent orange material visible from all sides at all times while hunting.

6. A Black Bear Management Zone Map is on file at the Office of Administrative Law and is available from the Division. The Black Bear Hunting Season Permit Quotas are as set forth by Zone as follows:

BLACK BEAR HUNTING SEASON PERMIT QUOTAS		
<u>Bear Management Zone</u>	<u>Hunting Season Permit Quota</u>	<u>Portions of Counties Involved</u>
1	2,000	Sussex, Warren
2	3,000	Sussex, Warren, Morris
3	3,000	Sussex, Passaic, Morris, Bergen
4	2,000	Warren, Hunterdon, Morris, Somerset, Sussex
5	[0] 1,000	[Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex] Hunterdon, Mercer , Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and [Union] Warren
6	0	[Warren, Hunterdon,] Somerset, Union , Middlesex, [Mercer, Monmouth, Burlington, Ocean, Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, Salem, Camden, Gloucester] Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, Passaic
7	0	Hunterdon, Mercer, Somerset, Ocean Middlesex, Monmouth, Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Atlantic Salem, Cumberland, Cape May

(b) If the season harvest rate of black bears is less than 20 percent at the conclusion of the last day of Segment B, the season shall be extended for four additional consecutive days, beginning the Wednesday after the six-day firearm season as enumerated in N.J.A.C.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

7:25-5.27(a), as an extension of Segment B. This extension shall be announced by press, radio, the Division's website (www.njfishandwildlife.com), and other media.

[(b)] (c) (No change in text.)

[OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW NOTE: The maps and graphs in Figures 1 through 5 of the Appendix include color shading that cannot be reproduced in the New Jersey Administrative Code; colored versions of the maps and graphs are included in the Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy available on the Division of Fish and Wildlife's website at <http://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/> (see "Wildlife," "Black Bear").]

APPENDIX

Comprehensive Black Bear (*Ursus americanus*) Management Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New Jersey Fish and Game Council (**Council**) has been mandated by the NJ State Legislature to protect and conserve game birds, mammals and fish and to provide an adequate supply for recreational and commercial harvest. Council ensures long-term stable populations and maximizes and equitably distributes recreational opportunity to user groups by opening and closing seasons, setting season lengths, bag limits and manner of take. Council accomplishes this based on scientific

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

evidence presented to it by the [NJ] **New Jersey** Division of Fish and Wildlife (**DFW**) through the rule-making Game and Fish Code processes.

Council designated black bears as a game animal in 1953 and provided a limited hunting season from 1958 through 1970. Based on data gathered during the hunting seasons, [NJDFW] **DFW** assessed the bear population and Council closed the hunting season in 1971. [NJDFW] **DFW** commenced a population research and monitoring project in 1988, providing data showing that the bear population could support a regulated hunting season, so Council reinstated a limited hunting season[, resulting in a harvest of 328 bears in 2003 and 298 bears in 2005] **in 2003, 2005, and 2010 through 2014**. The [hunting season has been closed since, but NJDFW] **DFW** continues to conduct population monitoring and research.

On February 28, 2005, the NJ Supreme Court issued an opinion that comprehensive policies for black bear management should include the broad preservation goals of the Council, the tools at the Council's disposal to accomplish those goals, and most importantly, the factors that should be considered when determining which tools will be utilized. The Court also said the Council may include consideration, among other things, of the absolute size of the bear population, the number of harmful bear-human interactions and the fiscal and human resources available to carry out the stated goals.

The Council finds that DFW uses an integrated wildlife management approach for bear management, using all available methods within its fiscal and personnel resources, including research, educational

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

programs, promoting the use of bear-resistant garbage containers, lethal control, and non-lethal control, including aversive conditioning. DFW staff has trained nearly [1,000] **1,380** local police officers, [state] **State** troopers, and [state] **State**, county and municipal park rangers to assist in problem bear response. Recent studies in New Jersey as well as other states conclude that aversive conditioning has a limited short-term effect on reducing the negative behavior of nuisance bears.

DFW has determined, through its long-term research and monitoring program, that NJ has a productive black bear population that can support a regulated hunting season. Based upon [2009] **2014** research data, **and using three different models**, the **average** black bear population estimate for [the portion of NJ north of I-80 is 3,400 bears] **Bear Management Zones 1 through 4 has returned to at least that of 2010 (approximately 3,500 bears; Figure 2)**. A [statewide] **Statewide** black bear population estimate cannot be generated without years of extensive population research and monitoring south of [I-80] **I-78**.

DFW has conducted an intensive and extensive public education campaign about common-sense practices that may reduce the risk of negative black bear behavior on humans, their homes, their property and their communities. [Over 100,000 people have received bear education presentations and over 3 million pieces of education material has been distributed. During the last several years,] Law Enforcement staff **has** inspected [over 4,600] **thousands of** residential properties in high bear incident areas and found [98% were in] **near complete** compliance with black bear garbage management guidelines[. This suggests], **suggesting** the black bear education effort has been effective **in terms of compliance**.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Despite these efforts [more], serious complaints have [not abated] **continued** as the bear population continues to expand. DFW uses lethal control on high-risk, dangerous bears and non-lethal aversive conditioning techniques on nuisance bears. DFW and [DEP] **the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)** have stepped-up law enforcement activities on bear feeding and garbage containment.

The Council also finds that DFW should reduce and stabilize the bear population at a level commensurate with available habitat and consistent with reducing risk to public safety and property. Although fertility control and sterilization have been studied, these methods of population control are not effective, evaluated either by an efficacy or cost metric. Regulated hunting seasons in 2003, [and] 2005, **and 2010 through 2014** demonstrated bears could be harvested safely[, and harvests could be accurately predicted]. **These seasons also showed that by using hunting as a management tool, nuisance complaints could be mitigated, and bear population growth could be slowed.** Regulated hunting [should] remains a safe and effective management tool to provide recreation and control NJ's black bear population.

Council has determined that [NJDFW] **DFW** is using all the tools available, as resources allow, to properly manage the black bear resource and further recommends [a regulated] **the adoption of a more liberal** bear hunting season, both to provide mandated recreational opportunity and to **more effectively** control the population in the most cost effective manner. The proposed [Policy] **Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy (CBBMP)** continues the commitment to a multi-

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

faceted bear management strategy and is guided by the latest science and data on the New Jersey black bear population.

I. INTRODUCTION

This document defines the [New Jersey Fish and Game] Council's [(Council)] comprehensive black bear (*Ursus americanus*) policy and recommendations regarding the management of resident black bears (bears) to ensure their continued existence in suitable habitat in New Jersey. Council periodically re-evaluates its policies, recommendations and regulations as information on the wildlife species under its jurisdiction and the needs of NJ's citizens warrant. [Council has established this] **The** black bear policy and management goals [should] consider the cultural carrying capacity, which is the number of bears that can co-exist compatibly with the local human population in a given area, in concert with the biological carrying capacity of the land to support bears[, just as it does for all wildlife species under its jurisdiction].

The Council's goals for bear management reflect the legislative mandate of the [Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)] **DEP** and the Council (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-28 et seq.) and the mission and goals of DEP and [the Division of Fish and Wildlife (JDFW)]. The NJ State Legislature mandated that Council has the responsibility of protecting and conserving game birds, mammals and fish and providing an adequate supply for recreational and commercial harvest. (For more information on Council, see APPENDIX 1, Role of the Fish and Game Council.) The Mission of

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

DFW is to protect and manage the [state's] State's fish and wildlife to maximize their long-term biological, recreational and economic values for all New Jerseyans. The Goals of DFW are:

To maintain NJ's rich variety of fish and wildlife species at stable, healthy levels and to protect and enhance the many habitats on which they depend;

To educate New Jerseyans on the values and needs of our fish and wildlife and to foster a positive human/wildlife co-existence;

To maximize the recreational and commercial use of NJ's fish and wildlife for both present and future generations.

Based upon scientific evidence presented to it by DFW, Council opens and closes seasons and sets season lengths, bag limits and manner of take to ensure long-term stable populations and to maximize and equitably distribute recreational opportunity to user groups. Additionally, with some species such as black bear, white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*) and beaver (*Castor canadensis*), hunting and trapping can be used to control populations. Historically, Council has adjusted hunting and trapping seasons to control these species in order to minimize agricultural, residential or environmental damage. The Council recognizes that the most cost effective method of population control for these species is provided through regulated hunting and trapping seasons.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council has directed that DFW manage black bears to assure their continued survival in NJ, while addressing the property damage and safety concerns of residents and farmers. In addition, Council recognizes that[,] although instances of black bears injuring or killing humans are rare [and no person in NJ has been killed by a black bear since 1852], human safety concerns must be considered as part of black bear management decisions. **In 2014, the first documented human fatality from a black bear attack occurred in New Jersey and reinforces the human safety concern associated with managing this species.** With careful management, **however,** the black bear [can be a] **provides an overall** benefit [for] **to** the citizens of NJ in the form of wildlife appreciation, observation and hunting.

Council notes that it is generally recognized that responsible management, not passive preservation, is necessary when managing agricultural and natural resources, or protecting property and human health and safety (USDA WS WI 2002). Council also notes that DFW uses Integrated Wildlife Damage Management (IWDM), which seeks to prevent, reduce or stop wildlife damage by integrating a combination of methods sequentially or concurrently (USDA WS WI 2002).

II. DECISION MAKING

Council's current and future management decisions regarding black bears have been and will continue to be based upon the best available scientific data. Based upon scientific evidence presented to it by DFW, Council opens and closes seasons, and sets season lengths, bag limits and manner of take to ensure long-term stable populations and to maximize and equitably distribute recreational

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

opportunity to user groups. In addition, the Council, subject to the approval of the [commissioner]

Commissioner of Environmental Protection (Commissioner), formulates comprehensive policies for the protection and propagation of fish, birds and game animals (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-28). It is this statutory framework that provides the basis for the CBBMP.

New Jersey Court Order and Decision on Bear Management

On February 28, 2005, the NJ Supreme Court held that a black bear hunt must conform to a comprehensive black bear management policy developed by the Council and approved by the DEP Commissioner (U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance **Found.** [vs.] **v.** [NJ Dept. of Env. Protect.] **N.J.D.E.P.,** [182 NJ.] **182 N.J.** 461, **867 A.2d 1147** (2005)). The opinion indicated that comprehensive policies should include: 1) black bear management objectives, 2) a detailed outline for meeting those objectives, 3) the tools at the Council's disposal, and 4) the criteria used to determine which tools are selected.

Fish and Game Council Black Bear Management Objectives

Council has set the following objectives for management of the NJ black bear population:

- Sustain a robust black bear population as part of NJ's natural resource base.
- Advance the scientific understanding of black bears.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

- Educate the public about common-sense practices that reduce the risk of negative black bear behavior on humans, their homes, their property and their communities.
- Enforce the law on bear feeding and garbage containment.
- Use lethal control on high-risk, dangerous bears.
- Utilize non-lethal aversive conditioning techniques on nuisance bears.
- Reduce and stabilize the population at a level commensurate with available habitat and consistent with reducing risk to public safety and property.
- Ensure that regulated hunting remains a safe and effective management tool to provide recreation and control NJ's black bear population.

Council recognizes that management of NJ's expanding black bear population to meet these objectives requires a variety of measures. Council reiterates the conclusion of the 1997 Black Bear Management Plan (BBMP) (McConnell et al. 1997) that the New Jersey bear population is large enough to support a regulated recreational hunting season and that [the] regulated hunting [seasons of 2003 and 2005 resulted] **can result** in a subsequent reduction in nuisance bear incidents, providing relief to people living **in or** near black bear habitat. This policy endorses education for people living and recreating in [bear country] **New Jersey**, garbage management to reduce bear access to non-natural food, lethal control for dangerous bears, non-lethal control methods for nuisance bears and a hunting season to provide recreation and control the black bear population.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council desires to reduce high-risk bear incidences that are a threat to public safety and property damage, and so has selected a range of management tools according to criteria [of consistency] **consistent** with current law, practicability in light of current resource constraints and demonstrated efficacy. A well-managed black bear population will require public education, proper waste management, enforcement, bear control, aversive conditioning, population control and other measures to reduce risk to people living close to black bears.

III. HISTORY

The black bear occurred [statewide] **Statewide** in NJ through the 1800's, however, by the mid-1900's [less] **fewer** than 100 existed and these were restricted to the northern portion of the [state] **State** (Lund 1980, McConnell et al. 1997). In 1953, Council classified black bears as a game animal, thereby protecting bears from indiscriminate killing. This protection stabilized the population. DFW wildlife control agents (later wildlife technicians) responded to citizen complaints to alleviate black bear damage. Limited **archery and firearm** hunting was legal in 10 seasons from 1958-1970 and resulted in a harvest of 46 black bears. Based upon data gathered through [the] **these** regulated hunting seasons, DFW assessed the bear population status and Council closed the black bear hunting season in 1971 (Lund 1980). Council reinstated a limited hunting season, resulting in a harvest of [328] **2,497** bears in [2003 and 298 bears in 2005] **the seven seasons held in 2003, 2005, and 2010 through 2014.**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Historically, management of black bears has been funded through the Hunters and Anglers Fund, which comes from the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. Additional funding is obtained from Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration (Pittman–Robertson) grants. Funding for these grants is derived from a federal excise tax placed on hunting related equipment and ammunition that is passed on to State wildlife agencies for research, education and management activities. Bear management activities conducted by DFW [have been] were supplemented with General Treasury monies [in five of the last ten fiscal years] **from 2001 to 2008.**

Since the 1980's the black bear population has increased[,] and its range has expanded (Figure 1) due **in part** to the protection afforded it by game animal status. Also contributing to this population increase were black bear population increases in Pennsylvania and New York and improved habitat in NJ, provided by the maturation of forested areas (McConnell et al. 1997). **Using data collected from 1988 to 1992, DFW estimated a 1992 population of between 450 and 550 black bears in the 681 square mile Kittatinny (Western) and Bearfort (Eastern) study areas.** Because of agricultural damage attributed to black bears, DFW and Council recognized that the level of human/bear conflict had become untenable in northern NJ and the black bear population was large enough to sustain a limited, regulated hunting season (McConnell et al. 1997).

The 1997 Black Bear Management Plan (BBMP) recommended that DFW stabilize NJ's black bear population using regulated hunting seasons in bear management zones (BMZs), institute a statewide ban on feeding black bears, install bear-proof (bear-resistant) dumpsters at public campgrounds within black bear range, educate beekeepers on the use of electric fences to deter black bear

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

depredation, institute a black bear depredation permit for landowners suffering damage to property, agricultural crops or livestock, continue to analyze NJ black bear data as new technology and data becomes available, protect critical habitat and reduce illegal killing of bears (McConnell et al. 1997). [Since] **After** the release of the 1997 BBMP, DFW [has] instituted these recommendations with some limitations. Council [believes that], **in developing the 2010 CBBMP, charged the** DFW [should] **to** fully implement those recommendations and advance additional non-lethal control methodologies.

In 2000, DFW biologists estimated a bear population of 1,056 in the Kittatinny and Bearfort study areas, and in 2001, estimated 1,146 bears in the primary bear range of Sussex, Warren, Passaic and Morris counties. Since 2003, bear population modeling has been performed by Pennsylvania State University (PSU) as well as DFW biologists. The PSU model estimates the size of the bear population north of I-78 and west of I-287 using a modified Horvitz-Thompson estimator (Diefenbach et al. 2006). The DFW estimated the bear population within the same area using a Lincoln-Petersen Index, which is a method of mark-recapture population estimation. The main assumption behind the Lincoln-Petersen Index is that after a sample of the population is marked initially, the proportion of marked individuals recaptured in the second sample represents the proportion of marked individuals in the population as a whole. Together, these two approaches of estimating the black bear population within this area provide a basis for looking at population trends over time.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Through its partnership with PSU, and by using the Lincoln-Petersen Index, DFW estimated a 2003 population of 1,150 to 3,200 bears in the area north of Interstate 80 and west of Interstate 287 (NJDEP 2003). The 2005 PSU population estimate was 1,269 bears (range 700 to 2,306) in the Kitatinny and Bearfort study areas and 2,397 bears (range 1,328 to 4,329) in the areas north of I-80 and west of I-287 (Diefenbach 2006). The bear population north of I-78 and west of I-287 was estimated to be 3,531 in 2010 and decreased in 2012 to a population estimate of 1,911. The data indicates that this decrease in population size is largely attributable to regulated hunting seasons with high harvest rates during 2010 and 2011. Since the 2012 bear season, harvest rates during the December season have decreased, leading to an increase in the population in 2013 and 2014 (Figure 2).

DFW continues to use the most advanced scientific knowledge and modeling available, in concert with its science and education partners, to provide the most accurate population count possible. In addition to the analysis performed by PSU, DFW has used the Lincoln-Petersen Index and a linear regression model to estimate the black bear population in BMZ 1-4. DFW has gathered extensive data through research over the past several years and has used this data to produce more informed population estimates. Using the midrange estimate (Lincoln Peterson) , DFW estimated that in 2014 the black bear population has returned to at least the 2010 level (approximately 3,500 bears).

IV. INTEGRATED BLACK BEAR MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

DFW utilizes an integrated approach to managing black bears; this integrated black bear management strategy includes educating people about black bear ecology, recommending human behavioral adjustments while in bear range, enforcing laws that minimize human-bear conflicts, taking action against dangerous and nuisance bears, monitoring the bear population and implementing population control. Since 1980, the DFW has been conducting research on NJ black bears and has utilized an array of tools for managing black bears. This multi-prong approach is necessary because the bear population is increasing and expanding while the human population is also expanding through residential and commercial development. Council believes that it is imperative to have a broad, comprehensive approach in place to address the growing potential for human/bear conflicts. In November 2000, DFW instituted a more aggressive integrated black bear management strategy, implementing an enhanced educational effort, more aggressive control measures and increased research and monitoring activities. From FY01 through [FY10] **FY15**, DFW has devoted more than [\$9 million] **\$12 million** to black bear management, including [\$2 million] **\$2.3 million** to education[al], [\$2 million] **\$2.3 million** to law enforcement, and [\$5 million] **\$7.5 million** to control, research and monitoring activities. These funds have come from the general treasury subsidy (\$5.5 million), the Hunters' and Anglers' Fund ([\$2.5 million] **\$3.7 million**) and the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund ([\$1 million] **\$3 million**).

A. Education

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Policy:

Council believes there is a continued need to educate **all** people living and recreating in [bear habitat] **New Jersey** about methods to minimize negative interactions with black bears. Residents, campers and outdoor enthusiasts within bear country can reduce or eliminate negative interactions with black bears by simply adjusting their activities. There is general support from the public, DEP, DFW and Council for [increasing] **continuing** education efforts about bears.

Discussion:

Council recognizes that it is important to make the educational message available to as many citizens as possible. **The majority of New Jersey residents do not live in black bear habitat; however, they do frequent areas of the State where black bears are prevalent and could encounter bears when they hike, camp, or become involved in other outdoor activities. Those residents who live in urban areas are in need of education just as much as those who live in prime bear habitat.** While education alone will not solve all the problems associated with bears, those who adjust their activities to take into account bear activity will be less likely to have problems. Council recognizes that DFW has created and participated in “Bear Aware” programs like nearly all other states and provinces with bear populations. These programs have resulted in declines in certain nuisance complaints over time, especially in such simple actions as reducing bear damage to bird feeders and using electric fencing to protect beehives [(Table 1, Figure 2)].

DFW has conducted an extensive educational campaign to provide NJ residents and visitors with techniques and methods for minimizing negative interactions in areas where black bears exist [(APPENDIX 2)] **and**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

has distributed over 369,500 copies of various educational materials to residents and visitors of New Jersey between 2010 and 2014 (Table 1). Council notes that this educational campaign is having a positive effect. The DFW campaign emphasizes the importance of never feeding bears, either intentionally or unintentionally. Some of DFW's **educational** efforts include: (1) developing and distributing educational materials for homeowners and campers to reduce negative encounters with bears; (2) producing brochures, bookmarks, bumper stickers, coloring books and book covers for distribution to schools, municipalities, libraries, parks and environmental education centers; (3) conducting public presentations about living with black bears for schools, service organizations, township meetings, parks, camps and clubs; (4) producing and distributing radio[, TV and cinema] **and TV** public service announcements (PSAs) and issuing [statewide] **Statewide** news releases providing bear information and bear-proofing techniques; (5) addressing media inquiries and providing interviews regarding bears; (6) providing bear information and bear-proofing techniques to all persons who contact DFW regarding bears [and]; (7) producing a Spanish version of the “Know the Bear Facts” brochure; **and (8) providing self-help manuals, PSAs and other bear related information on its webpage.**

DFW provides NJ residents and visitors with techniques and methods for reducing negative interactions while spending time in areas where black bears exist. The primary message is “Do Not Feed Bears,” either intentionally or unintentionally. DEP developed and continues to issue news releases during the peak spring and fall activity periods, alerting the public to increased bear activity and reminding them with tips to minimize conflicts. [Television, radio and cinema] PSAs are aired for the bear activity seasons in spring, summer and fall. DFW’s Web Page (www.njfishandwildlife.com) provides additional black bear biology,

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

natural history and bear-proofing information, including a black bear slide show and sources for bear-resistant garbage containers. Council recognizes that DFW has also produced two educational videos.

Education programs designed to reduce human-black bear conflict have been instituted by [NJDFW] **DFW** and other states, entities and institutions. These programs seek to reduce the magnitude or frequency of human-black bear conflict and/or increase the awareness of human actions that result in conflict **and have been well attended by New Jerseyans (Table 2)**. Council concurs with the recommendations of Gore et al. (2006) that emphasis should be placed on evaluating the efficacy of education programs to identify improvements or inform decisions about the allocation of scarce resources.

[The need to educate New Jersey's citizenry will increase as bears expand their range throughout the state.] **There is a need to increase educational efforts in southern New Jersey.** Bear education efforts have been concentrated in northern and central New Jersey counties[. However, it is now necessary to begin], **but it has become necessary for the DFW to increase its** education efforts in the southern counties [since there are confirmed bear sightings in all New Jersey counties] **as bear sightings and incidents have increased in these areas.**

[There are data indicating] **Data indicates** that intense education of campers and visitors to several national parks (for example, Yellowstone, Yosemite and Great Smoky Mountains) has resulted in a reduction in bear nuisance complaints. Council agrees that educating campers and visitors to parks is a valid and successful way to minimize negative human-bear interactions in the campsite/park situation.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council recognizes that the internet is a powerful tool increasingly utilized for information and education by New Jersey residents, with visits to DFW's main bear webpage exceeding 220,000 from 2010 through 2014. Residents now look to social media such as Facebook for information about many subjects. The DFW should expand use of this medium to increase public awareness about bears. Council recognizes that increased use of the internet by DFW will reduce the funding needed for printing and distribution of materials and reduce the amount of time DFW personnel spend on the telephone educating the public.

[New York tested the outreach intervention program designed to modify bear-related human behavior, NeighBEARhood Watch (NYNW), and found the impact was varied (Gore and Knuth 2006). Council notes that the direct associated costs for the NYNW program for 2 treatment towns were approximately \$27,000, not including staff/researcher time and that respondents' knowledge scores did not change after the NYNW program in both treatment and reference towns. In 2004, reference and treatment town respondents did not differ in their knowledge of how to keep black bears away from their home; one year later, neither group demonstrated a change in this knowledge. Neither treatment nor reference towns indicated a change in their willingness to adopt desired behaviors after the NYNW (Gore and Knuth 2006).]

Recommendations:

1. DFW should continue educational efforts [in northern and central counties] **throughout the State.**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

2. DFW should [broaden] **expand** educational efforts to include **urban areas, and should increase educational efforts in** the southern counties.
3. DFW should evaluate the effectiveness of its educational campaign for residents and visitors.
4. DFW should evaluate the effectiveness of an educational campaign for residents and visitors to use bear resistant garbage cans.
5. [The General Treasury should continue funding bear education at the FY08 level.] **DFW should develop educational products in the Spanish language, in addition to the educational material and public service announcements (PSAs) produced in English.**
6. **DFW should move to a more web-based approach for its educational programs (including social media) so that residents and visitors to the State can view, download and print items as needed.**
7. **DFW should increase the amount of information provided on the DFW website in the form of self-help guides that are directed at educating younger residents and visitors since it is this demographic that will be utilizing bear inhabited areas most frequently in the future.**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

- 8. DFW should include a self-help guide on its website that provides detailed guidance on protecting livestock and beehives from black bears and on the proper use and placement of birdfeeders.**
- 9. DFW should provide detailed information on its website concerning bear encounters and the proper actions to take if a bear approaches a human or becomes aggressive.**
- 10. DFW should encourage managers of State, federal, county, municipal and private properties to post bear-related signage at trailheads and on kiosks with information on bears and Q-R code links to the Division's website.**
- 11. DEP should continue to explore additional sources of funding for DFW's educational programs in an effort to restore funding to no less than the FY05 level.**

B. Control of Human-Derived Food

Policy:

Council believes that legislation and enforcement initiatives are necessary to ensure that human-related food sources and garbage do not unintentionally become a source of food for bears.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Discussion:

Council recognizes that in [2003] **2002** NJ enacted legislation that banned the intentional feeding of bears (N.J.S.A. 23:2A-14) because bears habituated to human food sources through intentional feeding can cause problems for entire communities. However, experience has shown that the ambiguous definition of unintentional feeding as contained in the statute has made effective enforcement difficult. **DFW's Bureau of Law Enforcement continues to support policies and proposed legislation that uphold and enhance the current feeding ban statute.** DEP and DFW law enforcement officers **have** inspected [over 4,600] **thousands of** residential properties in high bear incident areas and found [98% were in] **near complete** compliance with black bear garbage management guidelines[. This suggests], **suggesting** the black bear education effort has been effective **in obtaining such compliance.**

[DFW conservation] **DEP environmental** officers have canvassed scores of homes and businesses and have worked with additional [state] **State** and local law enforcement officials to enforce the law. **The result of this effort has shown that over 90% of homeowners are complying with the law's requirements.** Inspections of commercial establishments indicate[s] that it is difficult to acquire bear-resistant dumpsters from garbage haulers and bear proofing dumpsters continues to be a problem.

DEP has a trash policy of "Carry In – Carry Out" that reduces the garbage at DEP-managed parks and forests. Council recognizes that DEP has installed bear resistant garbage dumpsters **and bear**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

proof food storage boxes in North Jersey and [DEP] has begun placing bear resistant dumpsters in [Central Jersey] park and forest locations **in central New Jersey**.

DFW has installed bear resistant garbage dumpsters on North Jersey Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs).

DFW has identified closed or limited access communities in bear habitat where implementation of a bear resistant community dumpster would enhance efforts to limit access of bears to residential garbage. DFW telemetry studies and observations have determined that bears will alter their movements to access household garbage left on the street for hauler pick-up. Installation of a community bear-resistant dumpster would further limit access to garbage by these bears.

Council recognizes that DFW provides information and resources to municipalities to educate residents on proper garbage management techniques and ways to avoid attracting bears.

Municipal officials are encouraged to work with local waste haulers to make certified bear-resistant garbage containers available to residents and businesses and to consider passing local waste disposal ordinances or resolutions encouraging the use of bear-resistant garbage containers. Council notes that it does not have the authority to mandate the use of bear-resistant cans, but that DFW has been successful at aiding municipalities and other entities in implementing important controls into their waste management programs (Table 3).

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

[Council recognizes that great strides have been made in educating citizens about the value of garbage management, but the expense of bear-resistant garbage cans and commercial containers has hampered their wide spread use. Council notes that no municipalities have mandated bear-resistant garbage cans, so use is strictly voluntary. Additionally, Council notes that it does not have the authority to mandate the use of bear- resistant cans or to regulate municipal garbage containment.

DEP provided a Community Grant to West Milford Township, Passaic County to purchase and deploy 3,000 bear-resistant garbage cans in selected neighborhoods. Council notes that DFW personnel continue to monitor bear activity in those neighborhoods with the bear-resistant garbage cans against those neighborhoods without the bear-resistant cans to evaluate the effectiveness of bear-resistant cans for reducing human/bear interactions and nuisance calls.]

Council recognizes that no data exist[s] that demonstrates that **the** reduction of provisioning from garbage sources would result in a decrease in fecundity within the NJ bear population. However, eliminating bear access to human provided food should result in decreased habituation and [should] decrease nuisance and public safety related complaints.

Recommendations:

1. DEP should [work with legislators to amend the] **support legislation that strengthens the current** feeding ban statute [to clarify] **by tightening enforcement provisions and**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

clarifying that **both** intentional and unintentional feeding of bears is prohibited [and to tighten the enforcement provision].

2. DEP should seek legislation to require public and private campgrounds in habitat occupied by bears to install bear-resistant dumpsters and food boxes.
3. DEP should seek legislation that would require closed communities to make a bear-resistant community dumpster facility available to residents.
4. Local authorities should mandate the use of bear-resistant garbage containers in entire communities with the coordination and cooperation of local garbage haulers. Regulations, funding and coordination with local garbage contractors is necessary in order to implement a successful program.
5. DEP should identify funding and grant sources and/or incentive programs to assist public and private entities to purchase bear-resistant garbage systems.

C. Research

Policy:

Council believes that using the best available scientific data is crucial for making management decisions regarding black bears, as it does for all wildlife **and fish** species under its jurisdiction.

Council believes that DFW personnel **and its cooperating partners** are qualified and highly trained professionals who provide the data and analysis to ensure that black bears remain a viable component of New Jersey's landscape **without exceeding cultural carrying capacity**.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Discussion:

DFW has conducted intensive and extensive research on bears throughout NJ and more specifically in the Kittatinny (Western) and Bearfort (Eastern) regions of northern NJ [(Figures 3 and 4)] since 1980, and the data represent a solid, long term and extremely valuable database upon which to make management decisions.

Since 1981 DFW personnel have handled over [3,600] 7,200 individual black bears; DFW staff have tagged and released alive over [2,400] 3,700 bears, including [750] 1,016 young-of-the-year at dens.

During this same period, DFW personnel have collected data from [nearly 1,950 bears killed as a result of] 4,386 bears that died for various reasons, including vehicle strikes [(730)] (1,238), control actions [(236)] (413), **and** hunting seasons in NJ, PA and NY [(805) and other types of mortality] (2,735). [Recent tagging and bear information is contained in Table 2.] **A summary of DFW's tagging effort and the total number of bears handled since 2001 is summarized in Table 4.**

DFW continues to radio-collar and monitor bears using radio telemetry to acquire information on reproduction, survival, mortality, home range size and habitat use. DFW currently has [40] over 20 female bears fitted with radio collars to monitor reproduction and survival. DFW has determined that the average litter size is 2.7 cubs per litter. The most common litter size is 3 (43%), followed by

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

litters of 4 (23%) and 2 (22%), which has not changed over the [thirty] **35** years that DFW has conducted research. **Litters of 5 and 6 have been documented either through den site visits or staff observation of bears outside dens. Litters of this size are rarely seen throughout the Country and are a measure of New Jersey's excellent bear habitat.**

DFW has updated its Bear Management Zone (BMZ) designations from the 2010 CBBMP (Figure 3A) and now divides the State into 7 BMZs (Figure 3B). DFW has [been conducting] **conducted extensive** research in **BMZs 1 through 4** (the long-term established study area[s]) and has begun research in [the area between I-80 and I-78] **BMZs 5 through 7** to gain bear population parameters (density, birth rates and survivability) in an area occupied by bears but which exhibits different habitat characteristics and human development pressures compared to the [two] study areas already established and studied for the past [thirty] **35** years. [Council recognizes that the information should enable biologists to extrapolate the population level and growth rate in this area of the State and enhance bear management decisions.]

DFW has employed population monitoring by determining individual identity using DNA analysis. DFW personnel continue to monitor bears using radio telemetry to acquire information on reproduction, survival, mortality, home range size and habitat use. Council also recognizes that DFW uses cooperating university statisticians to generate population size estimates.

Council recognizes that the current bear population in southern NJ is small. Although there is sufficient habitat for black bears to survive in the Pinelands, productivity and survival in this area

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

will be different than in northern NJ, as is the case for white-tailed deer and wild turkey (Burke and Predl 1990, McBride 2003). Council recognizes that undertaking a trap and tagging operation for bears at the current low density [would not be] **is not** cost effective [at this time], so DFW [has limited research opportunities in this region] **should attempt to collect as much data as possible when other research opportunities present themselves in central and southern NJ. Any data collected will be valuable in formulating management strategies for this region.**

Based on the intensive population monitoring that DFW has conducted over the past [30] **35** years, Council concludes that the NJ bear population is [a] robust and viable [population that has maintained], **which maintains** a high reproductive and survival rate. This finding is in concert with population parameters reported for other viable populations in the mid-Atlantic region. In fact, NJ's bear population, like all other mid-Atlantic populations are larger, denser and exhibit a higher rate of fecundity compared to other, less productive habitat areas of the country.

Recommendations:

1. DFW should continue to conduct research and analyze NJ's database on the black bear population [within the long term study areas in the Kittatinny (Western) and Bearfort (Eastern) regions, which can be used as an index to the population within prime black bear range, and the study area in the lower bear density area between I-80 and I-78] **in BMZs 1 through 4.**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

2. DFW should continue using sophisticated statistical analysis as new data and data analysis tools become available to obtain the most accurate density and population estimates.
3. DFW should continue to develop the simulation model of NJ's black bear populations in [the Kittatinny and Bearfort regions] **BMZs 1 through 4** to evaluate the effect of various recruitment and mortality factors and other factors contributing to bear population dynamics as new data is added to the existing database.
4. DFW should, as limited resources allow, conduct research in southern NJ **and further develop an approach to estimating the population in BMZs 5, 6 and 7 in order to obtain a better understanding of the population of black bears Statewide.**
5. [The General Treasury should, at a minimum, fund research at the FY08 level.] **DEP should continue to explore additional sources of funding for DFW's bear research program in an effort to restore funding to no less than the FY05 level.**

D. Bear Habitat Analysis for NJ's Bear Management Zones

Policy:

Council believes that NJ contains suitable habitat to support a viable, robust black bear population and that habitat analysis is necessary to properly manage this renewable and valuable resource.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council believes that the designation **and use** of Bear Management Zones is the most effective manner in which to make decisions concerning bears.

Discussion:

DFW developed a ranking of bear habitat throughout NJ [(Figure 5)] based on bear use of varying landscapes as defined by Land Use / Land Cover data for NJ (McLaughlin et al. 1987, Rogers and Allen 1987, MacKenzie 2003, Niles et al. 2004). DFW biologists and technicians overlaid the **grid of Deer Management Units (DMUs)**, **each DMU with** an area of approximately 14 square miles, with the 2002 Land Use/Land Cover data, then used an Arcview GIS computer system to standardize the habitat evaluation. DFW determined the percentage of forested, wetland, agriculture, urban land, barren land and water in each DMU.

DFW designated the term Bear Management Zone (BMZ) to describe areas for bear management. BMZs [defines] **delineate** the boundaries for all areas of the [state] **State** and are designated as zones where bears should be managed at various densities consistent with land use, **and biological and cultural carrying capacities (Figure 3)**. Individual BMZs may or may not be open to regulated bear hunting.

DFW determined that [excellent] **optimal** bear habitat consists of $\geq 51\%$ forest land and $\leq 33\%$ urban land and $\leq 26\%$ agricultural land **(Table 5)**. BMZs 1 and 3, which contain the black bear research study areas, have an average forest cover of [68%] **76%** and are designated as excellent

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

bear habitat **(Figure 4)**. [Mark-recapture studies have shown that the bear density in BMZs 1 and 3 was about 2.6 bears per square mile in 2003 (Carr and Burgess 2004).]

BMZs 2 and 4 have an average forest cover of [43%] **50%**, and are designated as [good] **moderate** bear habitat **(Figure 4)**. Council recognizes that the bear population **in these BMZs** is likely to exist at a lower density than BMZs 1 and 3 [and, based on percentages of forested habitat, would probably be about 1.6 bears per square mile].

BMZ 5 contains an average forest cover of [approximately 32%] **>30%** with a mosaic of forest, farmland, wetlands and urban land, which makes it [fair] **low quality** bear habitat **(Figure 4)**.

Council recognizes that the bear population **in this BMZ** is likely to exist at a lower density than BMZs 2 and 4 [and, based on percentages of forested habitat, would probably be about 1.2 bears per square mile].

BMZ 6 is the second largest zone (663 mi²), but contains only 13% forest cover, which is the lowest forest cover of any of the 7 bear management zones. The Council recognizes that this zone is unlikely to hold bears in high densities since 79% of the zone is considered to be low quality bear habitat (Figure 4).

Bear habitat in southern NJ has been designated as BMZ [6] **7 (Figure 4)**. Although there is sufficient habitat for black bears to survive in the Pinelands, Council recognizes that productivity and survival in this area will be different than in northern NJ, as is the case for white-tailed deer and

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

wild turkey (Burke and Predl 1990, McBride 2003). Currently the bear population in southern New Jersey is small and undetermined.

[DFW has classified BMZ 7 as unsuitable bear habitat. Council recognizes that the lack of suitable bear habitat in BMZ 7 makes it unlikely that a viable population could be established. Although small areas of forested habitat remain, they are isolated and cannot sustain a viable bear population. Additionally, Council recognizes that the preponderance of suburban and urban land in BMZ 7 would result in almost certain bear-human conflicts.]

Recommendations:

1. DFW should continue to update the habitat analysis as new data becomes available.
2. [The General Treasury should, at a minimum, maintain the FY08 appropriation level for the continued bear habitat analysis research efforts.] **DEP should continue to explore additional sources of funding for DFW's bear habitat analysis in an effort to restore funding to no less than the FY05 level.**

E. Cooperative Research

Policy:

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council believes that cooperative research is the most efficient and cost effective manner for DFW to conduct research on wildlife species, including bears. This model has proven effective[,] for waterfowl, bobwhite quail, wild turkey and bear. DFW should continue to partner with research institutions, federal and state agencies, which have the expertise, staff and economic resources to enhance the knowledge base on the NJ black bear population.

Discussion:

Council recognizes that DFW [has participated] **continues to participate** in a number of cooperative studies with such institutions as Rutgers University, [Montclair State University, Tufts University (MA),] East Stroudsburg State University (PA), **Cornell University (NY), Penn State University, West Virginia University, Utah State University, Stockton University (NJ)**, and the adjacent states of Pennsylvania and New York (**Appendix II**). [These studies are] **This research is** intended to expand knowledge about NJ black bears and to collect scientific information on which to base management decisions. These projects have included research on home range and habitat use, food habits, reproduction, diseases (West Nile Virus and Toxoplasmosis) and parasites (*Trichinella*), aversive conditioning, **taste aversion**, use of contraceptive techniques for population management, genetic relatedness using DNA and developing habitat suitability models.

DFW is cooperating with East Stroudsburg University's Applied DNA Sciences Center, Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory (NEWDL) and Fish & Wildlife Microbiology Laboratory (FWML) to **generate a black bear population estimate using microsatellite analysis, to** build a black bear

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

DNA database [to be used] for **determining** genetic **identity and** diversity [determination] and for forensic **DNA** investigation[. DFW continues to provide blood samples for determining the overall], **to determine the** population health of NJ black bears, and [building] **to build** a serum database that provides information [on the extent that wild bears] **for managing wildlife health, including revealing where and to what extent wild animals** carry disease that may affect human or domestic animal health.

DFW has partnered with PSU for estimating New Jersey's black bear population. For many years the Pennsylvania Game Commission (PGC) has had a successful cooperative agreement with PSU for population analysis. DFW formed a similar cooperative agreement to analyze New Jersey's black bear population. DFW also uses two other models for estimating the black bear population: the Lincoln-Petersen Index and a linear regression model. All models show identical trends (Figure 2).

DFW biologists meet with biologists and administrators from NY, PA, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area and the U.S. Forest Service to discuss research, population monitoring, aversive conditioning and population control.

Council recognizes the importance of DFW biologists' attending annual and semi-annual bear conferences such as the International Bear Association (IBA), Eastern Black Bear Workshop (EBBW), and North East Black Bear Technical Committee (NEBBTC) to further their understanding of management issues and learn new management strategies that can be

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

implemented in New Jersey. Council also recognizes that DFW biologists have valuable information to provide to other agency biologists that attend these events.

[DFW is cooperating with several northeastern states to evaluate non-lethal management techniques to determine their effectiveness. The research results will benefit not only management decisions in New Jersey but will also provide valuable information to assist other states which are dealing with similar black bear issues.]

Recommendations:

1. DFW should continue to cooperate in research projects with other State and Federal agencies, universities and entities.
2. DFW should continue to participate in the bear summits with the bear biologists from the neighboring states of New York and Pennsylvania at regular intervals to continue to coordinate black bear management strategies and to ensure the success of black bear management efforts for this tri-state regional population.
3. DFW biologists should continue to meet regularly with bear biologists from the region[, eastern seaboard] and **throughout** North America to stay abreast of up-to-date research and management tools and techniques.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

4. [The General Treasury should, at a minimum, maintain the FY08 appropriation level for the continued bear research efforts that benefit all residents.] **DEP should continue to explore additional sources of funding for cooperative bear research in an effort to restore funding to no less than the FY05 level.**

F. Bear Control: Lethal and Non-Lethal

Policy:

Council believes the DFW Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria (BBRRC) (NJDFW BWM 2000) is the most effective operating policy for response to bears that are a threat to human safety, agricultural crops, and[/or] property, or are a nuisance. Council supports that the policy errs on the side of human safety. Council believes that despite educational efforts, situations will arise that will require private citizens, farmers, local police officers or DEP personnel to take action against problem bears.

Council supports DFW's policy, which allows farmers, via special permit, to destroy black bears depredating crops and livestock (N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.32) **and recognizes that these permits provide valuable relief to farmers experiencing such damage from bears (Figure 5).**

Council believes that continued cooperation between [state] **State** and local law enforcement agencies and DFW is necessary to properly manage bears.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

DFW should continue to use non-lethal control techniques such as aversive conditioning, to modify the behavior of nuisance bears. Council also believes that as interactions between humans and bears increase, additional non-lethal control techniques should be investigated, and if effective, be implemented.

Discussion:

Council recognizes that [the increase of] **increases in** human development in NJ, [the] concurrent bear population increases, and the expansion of bear range southerly and easterly [has] **can** result[ed] in an increase in human-bear conflicts. Council recognizes that incidents involving bear damage to property [and] **including** livestock remain high in frequency and severity (Table [1] **6**), **and that** DFW's Wildlife Control Unit (WCU) and DEP's WARNDP Hotline receive complaint calls and the DFW WCU provides response and control using the BBRRC.

DFW has had a policy of responding to problem black bears since the 1980's and a more aggressive black bear operating policy, **the BBRRC**, was instituted on November 16, 2000. **The BBRRC was developed by the DFW and approved by the** Council [and DEP approved this policy]. The BBRRC defines three categories of black bear behavior and dictates how DEP and other governmental agency personnel should respond. **Generally, in years following hunting seasons, the number of incidents in each of these categories is reduced (Figure 6).**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

DFW has determined that Category I black bears are those bears exhibiting behavior that is an immediate threat to human safety or which cause agricultural damage to farmland as defined pursuant to the Farmland Assessment Act (N.J.S.A. 54:4-23.1 et seq.) or significant damage (\geq [\$500]**\$1000**) to property. Examples of Category I behavior are human attacks, home entries, attempted home entries, agricultural crop damage, [and] killing or injuring **protected** livestock, **and killing or injuring** [or] pets. **“Protected” means completely enclosed by properly installed and active electrified fencing, or otherwise enclosed in such a manner that reasonably prevents access by bears.** Category I black bears are euthanized as soon as is possible in order to protect the public or eliminate further damage to agricultural crops or **other** property.

DFW has determined that Category II black bears are nuisance bears that are not a threat to life and property. Examples of Category II behavior are habitual [visitors] **visits** to dumpsters or birdfeeders or [cause] property damage less than \$[500]**1000 and bears that kill or injure unprotected livestock.** Category II black bears are aversively conditioned [using rubber buckshot, pyrotechnic charges and/ or bear dogs (Yellow Blackmouth Cur)] so they receive a negative experience associated with the nuisance location and people. If trapped, nuisance bears are released on site and aversively conditioned, or if conditions are unsuitable, taken to the nearest [state] **State** land where they are released and aversively conditioned.

DFW has determined that Category III bears are bears that are exhibiting normal behavior and are not creating a threat to the safety of the public or a nuisance. In general, these are animals observed and reported to DFW’s WCU by the public or local authorities. Such animals may be considered by

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

the caller to be a danger or a nuisance because the caller has not had the experience of interacting with bears. Category III black bears include dispersing animals that wander into densely populated areas, black bears passing through rural and suburban neighborhoods and black bears observed by hunters, hikers, campers and others using facilities in black bear habitat. Category III bears may occasionally utilize birdfeeders and trash containers as supplemental food sources in the course of their activities. Until a Category III black bear returns to a particular site and repeats utilization of these food sources, it is not considered to be a nuisance or problem animal (Category II). The WCU offers assistance in the form of technical advice on bear-proofing surroundings to callers reporting Category III encounters. No attempt is made to capture a Category III bear unless it is confined in a fenced area or treed in an urban area during daylight and any further movement will result in a threat to safety of the public or the animal due to potential vehicle collision.

The DFW BBRRC dictates that Category III bears from urban or [suburbia] **suburban** settings that must be extracted will be released on the nearest State-owned property with suitable bear habitat. Although municipal officials in the towns where the bear are released have criticized relocation, Council recognizes that it represents the most acceptable public policy at this current time.

Council recognizes that the cooperation of all law enforcement personnel from all levels of governmental agencies within black bear range is essential to the implementation of the bear response policy. Council notes that since January 2001, DFW has trained over [950] **1,380** municipal, county and [state] **State** law enforcement officers from [123] **130** municipalities, 14 counties and 33 [state] **State**, county and federal parks to assist DFW in black bear control. Council

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

notes that DFW has spent [nearly] over \$100,000 for this task. Council recognizes that there will continue to be a need to respond to bear complaints. [As bears expand their range in NJ] **Since bears have expanded their range throughout NJ (Figure 1)**, such response will increasingly become the responsibility of local law enforcement agencies. The Council notes that some local enforcement agencies that have received bear response training from DFW have not filed annual reports on bear incidents as agreed upon when training was received and that this lack of information has the potential to negatively impact bear management decisions made by the DFW and Council.

Council recognizes that DFW and local law enforcement officers cannot always respond immediately to situations involving depredating black bears and that farmers can alleviate damage caused by black bears if allowed the opportunity. Allowing farmers to act quickly to protect their crops, livestock and/or property constitutes responsible action by DFW to manage the growing black bear resource while minimizing negative impacts to humans, agricultural crops, livestock and property.

Council recognizes that depredation permits are invaluable for alleviating agricultural damage, especially when issued as soon as damage occurs. A telephone survey was conducted by DFW in 2014 to measure farmer satisfaction related to obtaining depredation permits. All twenty farmers that received a depredation permit in 2014 were contacted and asked questions pertaining to responsiveness of DFW technicians. All farmers surveyed reported they were satisfied with DFW's response time in delivering depredation permits. Many of the farmers further commended DFW personnel for their dedication and professionalism.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council recognizes that [some problem bears will] **nuisance bears can** be eliminated through regulated hunting seasons. In [the 2003 and 2005] **each** NJ hunting [seasons, some problem bears were harvested] **season since 2003, approximately 20% of the tagged bears harvested were known nuisance bears or bears captured at nuisance locations (Figure 7)**, thereby reducing bear related problems without cost to the taxpayer. Council recognizes that without some method of population control to reduce and then maintain a viable bear population in NJ at densities compatible with the human population, human-bear conflicts may [continue to] increase.

Council [considers] **recognizes that the number of** serious bear complaints (Category I) reported to DFW and law enforcement agencies [to be high (Table 1)] **has decreased since 2010 but should be reduced further (Figure 6)**. Many factors contribute to bear related incidences including individual bear and human behavior. Small year-to-year fluctuations may be attributed to environmental factors. For example, natural food scarcity, such as mast failures, may cause bears to seek alternate food supplies resulting in more negative human-bear incidents. It is clear, however, that over time, **the number of** serious incidences [have] **has** increased with the increase in the bear population. Of particular concern to the Council are increases in **the number of** Category I incidents **in parts of the State without open black bear hunting seasons** [as the bear population has expanded] **(Figure 8A), especially within BMZ 5 (Figure 8B)**. Although the number of overall complaints has varied since 1999 [(Table 1)], **the number of** Category I complaints remains unacceptably high.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

The newly delineated BMZ 5 (see 5 above) is proposed to be opened for bear hunting.

Proposed BMZ 5 incorporates areas south of Interstate 78 and east of Interstate 287 not

previously open to bear hunting. As bears have spread into areas south of Interstate 78 and east of Interstate 287, bear damage and nuisance complaints in these areas have increased.

From 2010 to 2014 in the proposed BMZ 5, Category I incidents increased 35%, Category II incidents increased 46%, and Category III incidents increased 19% (Figure 8b). New Jersey's

bear population is highly correlated to the number of bear incidents reported each year

(Figure 12), and this correlation can be used as a predictor of bear population changes. In the

proposed BMZ 5, there was a 29% increase in bear incidents (all categories combined) since

2010, which corresponds to an increase in the bear population in this zone of 39% during the

same period. Opening the proposed BMZ 5 to bear hunting is expected to provide relief from

bear damage and nuisance to residents of Hunterdon, Somerset, eastern Morris and southern

Passaic Counties. Hunting in this area is also expected to lessen the number of bears that

disperse into urban areas and then require capture and removal at a significant cost to State

and municipal agencies.

DFW personnel, law enforcement personnel, [state] **State** park police and landowners and farmers have killed [nearly 250] **424** dangerous Category I bears since 1993.

Council recognizes that **when** annual reductions in bear complaints reported to DFW from 1999 to

[2009 is] **2013 occurred (Figure 9), the available data suggest that these reductions were**

attributed to the following: (1) residents calling local police who have been trained by DFW for bear

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

response; (2) euthanizing Category I bears thereby eliminating further negative behaviors by those animals; (3) DFW's education program successfully reaching residents who **subsequently** bear-proof their yards including proper garbage management; (4) an increased tolerance of bears by the public due to DFW's policy of destroying Category I bears; and (5) the short term population reduction achieved by the 2003 [and 2005], **2005, 2010, and 2011** black bear hunting seasons which included the harvest of nuisance bears by hunters.

DFW uses the non-lethal technique of aversive conditioning to deal with nuisance bears. Council recognizes that DFW determined [that], as have other state and federal agencies and institutions, **that** aversive conditioning can deter a bear from returning to the treatment location, but treated bears continue nuisance activity at other, different locations (**Madonia 2011**).

Council cites particular studies where aversive conditioning reduced but did not eliminate the occurrence of bears entering developed areas to forage on human food and trash in Sequoia National Park (Mazur 2010), Lake Tahoe Basin (Beckmann et al. 2004) and southern Louisiana (Leigh and Chamberlain 2008, **Madonia 2011**).

DFW continues to explore non-lethal methods to deal with nuisance bears. Council recognizes that DFW acquired specially trained [Yellow Blackmouth] **Black Mouth Yellow** Cur dogs to harass bears as part of the aversive conditioning technique.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

[Most recently] **In 2010**, DFW and East Stroudsburg University conducted an evaluation of aversive conditioning techniques and found that rubber buckshot and dogs used to deter bears from returning to the spot of nuisance activity have limited short-term effectiveness. All bears, regardless of being unconditioned or conditioned, returned to urban settings within 17 days of capture and/or treatment. Overall, habitat use and availability of natural food in home ranges did not differ significantly [among] **between** aversively conditioned and control group bears. Both conditioned and control bears were involved in subsequent nuisance behavior. The study concluded that the aversive conditioning protocol did not eliminate nuisance behavior in adult female black bears in NJ (Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory 2010). **The results of this research continue to inform DFW's decision making when it comes to managing bears exhibiting nuisance behavior.**

Council recognizes that when a Category I bear must be [destroyed] **euthanized**, DFW and local law enforcement follow euthanasia procedures recommended by the American Veterinary Medical Association (Beaver et al. 2001). DFW and local law enforcement personnel follow procedures for animal welfare and care with respect to humaneness, pain and suffering as addressed in USDA WS WI (2002) and CA FED (2000).

Recommendations:

1. DFW should continue to operate under the BBRRC, an operating policy to respond to bear calls.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

2. DFW personnel, law enforcement officers, State Park Police officers and park rangers trained by DFW should continue to [destroy Category I bears immediately] **follow and abide by the BBRRC.**
3. DFW should continue to refer Category II complaints to **those** local law enforcement agencies[, which] **that employ professionals with relevant training to address these complaints who** can more quickly respond.
4. DFW should continue to train State and local police officers and State Park Police officers so that they can respond to problem black bears.
5. DFW should coordinate with universities on research to describe the distribution of [black-bear] **black bear** - human conflicts in NJ as they relate to spatial and temporal variables including anthropogenic development, habitat features and the demographic makeup of the human and nuisance bear populations.
6. DFW should continue to scientifically evaluate non-lethal control measures to determine their effect on bear behavior and bear related problems[;].
7. DFW should continue to develop aversive conditioning techniques for Category II bears for reducing conflict by altering bear behavior and movement.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

8. DFW should open a dialogue with representatives of those municipalities [which] **and agencies that** have failed to file the agreed-upon annual reports on their bear response activities. **Those municipalities and agencies should be encouraged to submit these surveys so an accurate assessment of the bear activity within each region can be made.** A letter stressing the importance of reporting should be sent to all participating agencies.
9. [DFW personnel should not actively remove bears in BMZ 7, however, Category III bears that must be removed from urban areas within BMZ 7 should be released on the nearest State owned land with suitable habitat.] **DFW should encourage farmers experiencing bear damage to allow bear hunting on their property.**
10. DFW should continue issuing depredation permits to farmers [because the circumstances and permit criteria regulating the taking of black bear and other wildlife under the special depredation permit has been addressed] **experiencing crop damage.**
11. [The General Treasury should, at a minimum, maintain FY 08 funding for DFW bear training and response and non-lethal control research because these activities benefit all NJ residents.] **DEP should continue to explore additional sources of funding for non-lethal and lethal bear control by DFW in an effort to restore funding to no less than the FY05 level.**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

G. Habitat Protection

Policy:

Council believes that DEP's open space acquisition program has been instrumental in protecting valuable bear habitat; Council supports habitat acquisition and improvement programs.

Discussion:

DFW has undertaken an effort to identify and protect critical black bear habitat. Council also recognizes that DEP, through its Green Acres Program and State Park and Wildlife Management Area systems, has acquired a significant amount of habitat which is important to black bears. Council recognizes that the Pinelands and Highlands Protection Acts will ensure that bears remain part of NJ's landscape. Council supports the monumental effort by the DEP to preserve wildlife habitat through its aggressive Green Acres Program and Pinelands and Highlands legislation.

Council realizes that black bear populations must be managed at a landscape level and therefore it is not appropriate to develop management plans on a parcel-by-parcel basis because of the size of bear home ranges.

Recommendations:

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

1. DEP should continue to protect black bear habitat as it becomes available through the State's open space acquisition programs.
- [2. DFW should create a wildlife management plan for all new lands purchased by or deeded to the DEP that addresses the management and control of bears and other wildlife.]
- [3.] **2.** DFW should continue to use GIS technology to identify and rank black bear habitat and travel corridors.
- [4.] **3.** The State Legislature should continue to allocate funding to purchase wildlife habitat as it becomes available.

H. Bear Population Management

Policy:

Council believes that DFW should stabilize the bear population, then evaluate and eventually maintain the population at a density that minimizes human/bear conflicts, provides for a sustainable population within suitable bear habitat and minimizes emigration of bears to unsuitable habitat in suburban and urban areas. **Council's management goal is to decrease and stabilize the black bear population at a level consistent with the available habitat and cultural carrying capacity.**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Discussion:

Council recognizes that DFW has conducted NJ bear⁹² population monitoring which has shown bear population growth and range expansion. Council notes that the bear population has [been] spread[ing] south and east, impacting people in areas of NJ that have not had bears for more than a century.

[Using data collected from 1988 to 1992, DFW estimated a 1992 population of between 450-550 black bears in the 681 square mile Kittatinny (Western) and Bearfort (Eastern) study areas (Figure 3) (McConnell et al. 1997).

In 2000, DFW biologists estimated a bear population of 1,056 in the Kittatinny and Bearfort study areas. The population estimate for the prime bear area of northern New Jersey north of Route I-80 and west of Route I-287 in 2001 was estimated at 1777 adult bears using DNA and mark-recapture data. DFW estimated a 2003 population of between 1,600-3,200 bears in an area north of Route I-80 and west of Route I-287 (NJDEP 2003); in the research study areas (Figure 4), the population was estimated at 1,490. The 2005 population estimate was 1,269 bears (range 700 to 2,306) in the study areas and 2,397 bears (range 1,328 to 4,329) in the areas north of Route I-80 and west of Route I-287 (Diefenbach 2006).

Most recently, genetic data was used to estimate the 2009 population size of black bears in New

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Jersey and to evaluate population structure, and landscape-genetic relationships. Black bear DNA was provided by the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife (NJDFW) from tissue samples collected from hunter harvested bears and research trapped bears from bear management zones (BMZs) 1-4 in NJ. The 2009 bear population was estimated at 3,438 in the areas north of Route I-80 and west of Route I-287. The genetic structure indicates there is no evidence of increasing genetic isolation with geographic distance in New Jersey. The bears are not restricted in their movements. Highways and other land use features are not a barrier to movement among BMZs. Data indicates the maturing NJ bear population is developing its own genetic character. Results of this study confirm inter-breeding with Pennsylvania bears, however more data is needed to confirm inter-breeding with NY bears, however, this is likely. Additional sampling is recommended to confirm the tri-state nature of our bear population (Huffman et al. 2010).]

Council also recognizes that emigration of NJ bears into neighboring Pennsylvania and New York has impacted these states. The concurrent expanding human population and bear population in this region of NJ, PA and NY provides potential for conflict. The 1997 BBMP recommended managing NJ bears at the same density (1 bear / 2½ square miles) as our neighboring states since bears living along our respective borders are essentially one regional population. Council notes that DFW research has found that in some areas in northwestern New Jersey black bear densities are as high as 2 – 3 bears / square mile, which is 5 to 7 times higher than the density recommended by the 1997 BBMP.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council recognizes that Pennsylvania increased its bear hunting season in counties adjacent to New Jersey in 2002 due to an increase in the bear population and human/ bear conflict problems in this region and that New York increased its bear hunting season length in the **neighboring** Catskill region. Council recognizes that to properly manage this tri-state bear population, density goals must be similar.

The **data indicates that the** population reductions achieved by the 2003 [and 2005], **2005, 2010, and 2011** bear hunting seasons [resulted in short-term] **correlated with** reductions in bear related complaints received by DFW and cooperating law enforcement agencies **(Figure 10)**. Council also notes that bear calls and complaints[, in total, remain high, particularly the Category I complaints (Table 1)] **began to rise after the 2013 hunting season, which had a less than optimal harvest rate (Figure 11)**. Council also recognizes that [these] negative interactions **between humans and bears** not only result in economic loss to individual citizens, but also have created a severe budgetary burden on responding agencies, particularly DFW. Council notes that maintaining [a high] **an adequate** level of bear response by DFW [will require continued funding from the General Treasury] **is not sustainable at current funding levels without new sources of funding to cover the increasing costs of this work.**

The tools available for population reduction are few. Council notes that the NJ Supreme Court [ruled] **instructed** that Council [must consider] **may include consideration of** the absolute size of the bear population, the number of harmful bear-human interactions and the fiscal and human

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

resources available to carry out its goals. Council recognizes that DFW must consider the proven efficacy of the tools and the experience of other states and the cost of using the tools.

Council recognizes that wildlife managers, confronted with conflicting public perceptions of bears as both a nuisance and a valued game animal, are faced with a dilemma: how to maintain healthy populations of black bears while minimizing conflicts between bears and humans (USDA WS WI 2002). Council also recognizes that people in NJ express opinions on both sides of the hunting issue.

Council [has] recognized the concerns of citizens and[, therefore,] adopted a conservative approach to population reduction by regulated hunting in order to [ensure] assure the public that the long-term viability of the bear population [is] would be maintained. [Council notes that the 2003 and 2005 bear hunting seasons clearly demonstrated that the outcome of the bear hunting season could be predicted based upon previously collected data on the New Jersey bear population and the results of similar hunting seasons in adjacent states.] However, with recent increases in the bear population and bear related incidents following bear seasons with reduced harvest rates, the Council believes that a more liberal bear season is necessary in order to achieve the desired level of population control. Therefore, the addition of an archery and muzzleloader fall season, and the ability to extend the season when specified objective harvest goals are not met, are necessary. DFW examined bear population and bear complaint data and found they were positively correlated. This suggests that reductions in population size should contribute to reductions in bear complaints (Figure 11).

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Various methods to stabilize or reduce the increasing bear population have been suggested to the Council, DEP and DFW by NJ citizens. The following is a discussion of these proposed methods.

1. Relocation:

Although relocation can be used to establish or reestablish bear populations, no state has successfully used relocation as a means of population control. Council recognizes that southern NJ contains quality long-term habitat for black bears. Over 1.1 million acres is contained in the Pinelands National Reserve, of which one third is publicly owned. Council also recognizes that in the early 1980's DFW conducted an Environmental Assessment of a plan to relocate black bears to the Pinelands (Lund et al. 1981). At that time, local opposition to the relocation of bears to southern NJ put a halt to this option. However, as a result of the population pressures created by an expanding northern NJ bear population, bears [now occupy all NJ] **have been sighted in all 21** counties (Figure 1).

Council also believes that the bear population that is reestablished in southern NJ will grow. Once all available bear habitat is occupied, there will be no additional space for relocation in NJ. Council has determined that no other state or provincial agency in North America would accept excess bears from NJ.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Additionally, relocation of nuisance and/or problem bears to unoccupied range comes with a level of risk. Dedication of the necessary staff and funding to subsequently handle the resultant nuisance complaints from citizens in southern NJ will place additional burden on already strained budgets.

Council believes that even if relocation of excess and/or problem bears to unoccupied range in southern NJ was acceptable to local residents, the cost of such a program would be prohibitive. DFW estimates that the cost to capture a bear during their research efforts is over [\$1,000] **\$1,500**.

Transporting **and removing** bears out of [the woods] **their established home range** would significantly increase labor and equipment costs. Due to lower success, costs for trapping nuisance bears [approaches \$2,000] **are over \$2,500**. Relocating 1000-2000 bears from northern NJ to southern NJ would be cost prohibitive and likely a multi-year task. Council believes that DFW does not have the necessary staff and funding to make such a program practical. To the Council's knowledge, no state has successfully used relocation as a means of population control. Based upon the cost and opposition to relocating bears, particularly nuisance bears, Council does not consider this a viable option for population control. Therefore, Council concludes that relocation is not a suitable tool for bear population control.

2. Alternative Methods of Population Control:

DEP's Division of Science and Research commissioned a literature review of fertility control on bears and other wildlife, which concluded that fertility control is very unlikely to be a feasible means of managing the black bear population in New Jersey due to the costs involved with field capture

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

and the inability to capture enough bears to effect population control, even if a licensed fertility agent existed for bears (Frakker et al. 2006).

Council's position on bear fertility control was presented in the 2005 CBBMP (Wolgast et al. 2005), which stated that Council has encouraged DFW and independent researchers to explore alternative population control techniques to determine if these techniques are viable for control of wild populations of bears. [Council has adopted criteria that will allow DFW, with Council approval, to issue permits for legitimate research on fertility control when captive studies indicate that there is potential for controlling wild populations (N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.37).] **The Northeast Black Bear Technical Committee (NEBBTC) has reviewed this topic and determined that it is not a viable option for management of free ranging populations (NEBBTC, 2012).**

In November 2002, the DEP entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) to investigate the feasibility of fertility control as a means of controlling the black bear population and DEP authorized a study investigating using sterilization as a means of controlling the black bear population. Both studies utilized captive bears at Six Flags Safari Park in Jackson, Ocean County, NJ. As of the publication date of this CBBMP, no results of these studies have become available. **To the Council's knowledge, results of these studies have not been published.**

Alternative non-lethal population control methods are still in the experimental phase and have yet to be tried on free roaming populations of bears. Current contraceptive techniques have been

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

uneconomical or infeasible for practical implementation even in small localized populations of game species. The species for which contraceptives have been primarily tested (long-lived species such as deer and horses) are least suited for population reduction through use of fertility control (Fagerstone et al. 2002). In New Jersey, fertility control on a suburban deer population cost over \$ 714 per deer (DeNicola 2004). Although fertility control in field situations has not been attempted on bears, the cost of capturing bears during research or nuisance control activities in New Jersey, reported above, are applicable and might double since it is likely that as in the case of deer, multiple captures and injections would be required.

In 2006, federal authority to regulate fertility control agents on wildlife was transferred from the US FDA to US EPA. Neither FDA nor EPA has approved any chemical fertility control on an experimental basis for any wild population of bears. Although physical sterilization does not require FDA approval, the costs of trapping bears for such purposes would be prohibitive. Council notes that since New Jersey bears have a very high annual survival rate and are known to live over twenty years, population reduction, if any, through sterilization or fertility control would be slow.

Even though fertility control may not affect survival of individual bears, it can easily be lethal to populations (Hobbs et al. 2000). Animals with good immune systems will be most likely to mount a strong immune response when given an immunocontraceptive agent and so would be [least likely] **unlikely** to reproduce. Animals with a poor immune system, either due to genetics, injury or disease, would be affected less[,] **and** therefore be most likely to reproduce. The long-term implications of immunocontraceptives in wildlife populations would be that immunocontraception

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

could artificially select for those individuals that are immunodeficient and produce populations of animals with weak immune systems and high susceptibility to disease and population fluctuations (Muller et al. 1997).

Council [reiterates its] supports [for] continued testing of fertility control by credible scientists [on enclosed populations despite DEP's finding that fertility control is unlikely to be a feasible means of managing the black bear population in New Jersey (Frakker et al. 2006) and the conclusion that fertility control will not limit the growth of long-lived game species like wild black bear populations (Fagerstone et al. 2002)] **and has adopted criteria that will allow DFW, with Council approval, to issue permits for legitimate research on fertility control when captive studies indicate that there is potential for controlling wild populations (N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.37).**

Based upon the lack of success with current research and logistical problems discussed in the above cited literature review, Council concludes that fertility control, either chemical or physical, is not **currently** a viable tool for bear population control.

3. Regulated Hunting:

Hunting is a safe, legal, responsible use of the wildlife resource and a legitimate and effective means to control over-abundant game species in a cost-effective manner. Council notes that, as with other species such as waterfowl and deer, bear hunting relies on the principle of adaptive management as described by Walters (1986). This approach relies on managing wildlife populations through

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

experience and monitoring which allows the management agency to make necessary changes to maintain the natural resource (bear population) in the desired condition. Council further notes that because DFW has ongoing monitoring, any changes needed can be made by annually reviewing hunting regulations [(the current Game Code process)].

Black bear populations can withstand regulated hunting on an annual basis (CA FED 2000, Williamson 2002, Ternent 2006, NEBBTC 2012). [and historically] Historically, managed hunting has been an effective system for protecting bear populations because it has enlisted a clientele interested in the continued abundance of the resource [and it transfers] while transferring the killing of a species [which] whose members can become a public nuisance or threat from the general public to a smaller group of people (hunters) (Garshelis 2002). Council notes that regulated hunting engenders a conservation minded constituency group, hunters, who ensure the [continued abundance] appropriate population density of the species of interest, and who support and are willing to pay for research, habitat protection and conservation measures necessary to meet that end. Council recognizes that hunters provide an important service to the public [while decreasing] without increasing the general tax burden.

Although the activity of regulated hunting of black bears results in the death of individual bears, specific safeguards, including an in-season closure mechanism and bag limit, will assure that bear harvests are below the population's sustained-yield capabilities. Council agrees with the finding that no significant negative effects, individually or cumulatively, on bears as a species are expected to result from hunting (CA FED 2000).

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Council notes that hunting is the primary means of managing and regulating black bear populations in 29 states. Many of these states charge an additional permit fee for bear hunting that is used to support bear research and management. [All] **With the exception of New Jersey, all** states with bear hunting seasons allow archery[, shotgun and muzzleloaders to be used] **(Table 7)**. Firearms and archery equipment [have been shown to be] **are** effective **in hunting bears** (CA FED 2000, Kurzejeski et al. 1999) and [that] both shotguns and archery equipment were allowed in past bear hunting seasons in New Jersey **(archery 1958-1970)**. **Council believes archery should once again be integrated into DFW’s regulated hunting season as a method of controlling the black bear population.**

Council recognizes that the 1997 BBMP stated that “continual fragmentation of habitat and the projected growth of the human population has made it untenable to continue maintaining a black bear population at its present level and density” (McConnell et al. 1997, p. 76) and that the black bear population could sustain a limited, regulated hunting season (McConnell et al. 1997, p. 78).

No other method of black bear population control has been identified and implemented in states with resident bear populations. Hunting is considered one element of an integrated approach to manage bear populations. [The purpose of the 2003 and 2005] **Bear** hunting seasons [was to] provide [recreation] **recreational opportunities**, [gather] **provide** data on hunter participation and success rates, and [begin to] reduce the black bear population density in order to reduce the associated human/bear conflicts, including property damage caused by bears.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

[The 2003 and 2005 black bear hunting season were successful because these hunting seasons met the objectives established: 1) the target harvests were obtained; 2) the seasons were conducted safely with no hunter accidents and without incident of trespassing or other complaints; and 3) biological data on bears, hunter success and hunter participation was collected. The results (APPENDIX 3, Wolgast et al. 2005) followed the predictions of DFW biologists based on the conservative format. The 2003 harvest was 328 bears and the 2005 harvest was 298 bears. These] **The 2003, 2005, and 2010 through 2014** hunting seasons established that hunters could safely harvest black bears in a controlled manner **(Figure 13). During these seasons, DFW collected biological data on the bears and demographic data on hunter success and participation, which DFW uses to design future management actions.**

[DFW collected biological data on the bears and demographic data on hunter success and participation, which DFW uses to design future management actions. Using surveys of successful hunters, DFW estimated that hunters spent approximately \$1 million in each of the 2003 and 2005 hunting seasons for equipment, supplies, gas, food and lodging in pursuit of black bears. If a bear permit fee had been in effect, similar to deer and turkey hunting permits, DFW would have collected about \$283,000 in permit fees from bear hunters. Bear hunting, like other recreational hunting seasons, has a demonstrated positive economic benefit.]

Bear hunting seasons can alleviate damage and nuisance incidents caused by problem bears.

[Twenty percent] **Approximately 20%** of the tagged bears [in the 2003 and 2005 harvests] **that**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

were harvested during the past seven seasons were bears tagged at nuisance sites or in urban situations **(Figure 7)**. [Damage and nuisance calls to DFW decreased by 40% and Category I reports to DFW decreased by 37% in 2004, after the 2003 season. Damage and nuisance calls to DFW increased by 37% and Category I reports to DFW increased by 35% in 2005; damage and nuisance calls to DFW decreased by 13% and Category I reports to DFW decreased by 7% in 2006, after the 2005 season.] The data suggests that as a result of the 2010 through 2012 hunting seasons, nuisance calls between 2011 and 2013 dropped 40% (Figure 6). In 2014, DFW measured an increase in the number of nuisance incidents which, the data suggests, is the result of an increase in the bear population due to a low harvest rate during the 2013 season (Figure 10).

The hunting season structure of 2003, 2005, and 2010 through 2014 was timed to be conservative, restricting harvest to bears that had not yet entered winter dens. This conservative structure allowed important data to be collected on New Jersey bear harvest rates without negatively impacting the population. However, employing this conservative, late season structure during the past several years has likely allowed harvest rates to fall (Figure 11), which in turn, has likely led to an increase in estimated bear population numbers from 1,911 in 2012 to 3,500 in 2014 (Figure 2); factors contributing to this decrease in harvest rate are discussed below.

The Council recognizes that bear harvest rates can be used as a guide to prevent overharvest of bears or to inform decisions to expand hunting seasons in order to achieve desired levels of

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

population control. Research suggests that black bear populations can sustain annual harvest rates of 15-20% with little or no decline in population size (Miller 1989). Conversely, in order to protect populations from overharvest there are upper limits to the sustainable harvest rates. In certain counties in Pennsylvania harvest rates exceeded 30-35 percent (Ternent 2001). These rates are higher than desired by most states including PA, however, in order to sustain a population over the long term. Therefore, the Council believes that a harvest rate between 20-30% for black bears is appropriate for New Jersey.

Three different models indicate that the black bear population has returned to at least the 2010 level (approximately 3,500 bears, Figure 2). Although the point estimates for each model differ, the predicted population trends over time are similar. Additionally, the bear population has expanded beyond the northwest portion of New Jersey (Figure 1) and bear/human interactions have increased greatly outside BMZs 1-4 over the past 5 years (Figure 8A). Municipalities that are completely or partially contained within BMZ 5 showed high numbers of both Category I and Category II incidents from 2010 through 2014 (Figure 8A and 8B).

The DFW has identified four factors that have contributed to diminishing bear season harvest rates: 1) season timing, 2) bear behavior, 3) hunter behavior, and 4) hunter participation (Geist 2003). The following is a discussion of all four of these factors, including recommendations to offset their effects.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

1. Season Timing:

The current hunting season occurs late in the fall and is affected by weather conditions both before and during the season. Early occurrence of cold weather and/or snow-cover forces bears into their winter dens early, making them unavailable for harvest. Severe winter weather occurring during the season induces denning activity as well, and also reduces hunter numbers, which exacerbates the low harvest potential. In addition, the current season takes place after most pregnant female bears have denned, rendering them unavailable for harvest and increasing production potential the following year. Therefore, with a season timed in December alone, consistent appropriate harvest rates cannot be achieved. New Jersey bear seasons should include dates early in the fall, when weather is unlikely to have a large impact on harvest rates.

2. Bear Behavior:

Bears have a natural fear of humans that is reinforced by hunting activity. Bears that survive a hunting season learn from the experience and become more wary. Where bears are hunted consistently, their increased wariness makes it more difficult for hunters to be successful. A longer hunting season will help increase the harvest since there will be greater opportunity for wary bears to be harvested through the increased probability of hunters encountering a bear during a longer season. Furthermore, utilizing different hunting techniques, such as archery,

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

will also increase the harvest of wary bears because archery is a stealthy method of hunting, which does not create the gun shot sounds that firearm hunting creates in the woods.

3. Hunter Behavior:

Since 2003, many sportsmen and women in New Jersey have been successful in harvesting a black bear. Many of these hunters continue to hunt bears, but have become more selective as to the specific bear taken. An increase in season length will help offset the negative effects on harvest rate due to selectivity amongst hunters. Hunters will be able to spend a greater amount of time hunting, and thus have a greater chance of harvesting a bear that they select for.

4. Hunter Participation:

Some successful New Jersey bear hunters have chosen to abstain from bear hunting in subsequent seasons. The great amount of effort required to extract such a large animal from the field and properly prepare the hide and meat are the main reasons for this. New Jersey is not a state with a strong bear hunting tradition, which would help counter reduced participation; however, additional hunting opportunities such as earlier season timing and additional weapon choices can also stimulate interest among these hunters. Additionally, earlier season and weapon choice opportunities will also stimulate interest among hunters who have never tried bear hunting before.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Hunting has been used as a tool to reinforce the aversive conditioning methods employed by DFW and trained law enforcement officers. Council refers to the review of the scientific literature conducted by Conover (2001), who determined that hunting reduces wildlife damage by reinforcing an animal's fear of humans and causing animals to avoid areas where they might come into contact with humans. Conover (2001) also stated that hunting should increase the effectiveness of non-lethal techniques because the animals learn to associate humans with negative consequences. Although some nuisance bears are eliminated during hunting seasons, others are pursued but not harvested, thereby imparting a negative experience on the bear. This negative interaction for the bear [contrasts] **counters** the positive food reward in other human/bear interactions.

Council recognizes there is a significant amount of land, both public and private, that is closed to bear hunting. Bears that inhabit these locations are not subjected to hunting pressure, and the data indicates that bear-human interactions remain high in those and adjacent communities. On many of these parcels, hunting of other species is allowed but bear hunting is restricted. In order for bear management in New Jersey to be most successful, the owners/managers of these properties should be encouraged to allow bear hunting.

The adaptive management process will guide the future structure of bear population management. This dynamic process is already in place as the Game Code[,], where DFW biologists evaluate the results of the bear hunting season on the bear population and bear related conflicts.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

[As is the case with other polygamous species such as deer, management of the bear population is affected by management of the female segment of the population. Population benchmarks will provide a quantitative assessment of the effect of hunting on the bear population and guide future hunting season structure. For example, a deterministic model using productivity, survival and mortality of the New Jersey research study population yields population stabilization at a hunting harvest rate of 0.2 females per square mile and 8% reduction at 0.3 females per square mile.

The proposed conservative bear hunting seasons allows data to be collected without negatively impacting the black bear population. The December season reduces the possibility of overharvest because most pregnant females would be denned and not available for harvest. The current Game Code contains language that has authorized the Director of the DFW, after consultation with the Chairman of the Council, to close the bear season with 24 hours notice, if warranted, after DFW biologists review data from the harvest. Based upon data from the 2003 and 2005 NJ bear hunting seasons and harvest rates in adjacent states with similar seasons, DFW estimates that a harvest rate of more than 25% of the current year's tagged bears would call for consideration of an in-season closure.]

Council will continue to rely on the expertise of DFW biologists, who through data collection and analysis provide recommendations regarding the structure and timing of future seasons which will ensure black bear populations are maintained in appropriate habitat at desired densities compatible with existing land use.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

In reviewing the tools available for population control and the costs associated with each, the

Council concludes that relocation will never be a viable tool for bear population control.

Additionally, non-lethal tools such as sterilization and chemical fertility control [are unproven] **have been shown to be ineffective** at this time. However, research in this area should continue **as new methodologies arise**. In contrast, Council concurs with the experience of all states which manage viable bear populations [that] **through the** regulated sport hunting of bears **that this** is the most cost effective and practical tool to control bear populations.

Recommendations:

1. [DFW should reestablish a regulated black bear hunting season which is similar to the 2003 hunting season and which includes BMZs to direct hunting pressure as appropriate. Council believes the purpose of this season is to collect additional information on hunter participation and success rates and bear harvest rates and to begin to reduce the bear population in the most efficient, cost-effective manner and to provide recreational opportunity to New Jersey sportsmen and women.] **DFW should continue to allow an annual regulated black bear hunting season in BMZs 1, 2, 3, and 4, and should expand the season into BMZ 5. DFW should adopt an appropriate structure for bear hunting seasons that reduces and then stabilizes the bear population at a level compatible with the availability and quality of habitat, which is consistent with public safety and residential and agricultural concerns. Future season structures should be based on data collected from the regulated bear hunting seasons and population monitoring. Permit quotas and season length should be**

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

adjusted as necessary to regulate hunting pressure in BMZs. Season formats should use all hunting implements legally available such as archery and muzzleloaders, should incorporate a fall season as seen in other states (Table 7), and should mandate season closure if harvest rates reach 30% or season extension if harvest rates fall short of 20%.

2. DFW should not use relocation as a means of population control.
3. DFW should continue to [investigate] **review current research on** alternative population control techniques, such as fertility control.
- [4. DFW should develop a long-term structure for bear hunting seasons to reduce and then stabilize the bear population at a level compatible with the availability and quality of habitat, which is consistent with public safety and residential and agricultural concerns. Future season structures should be based on data collected from the regulated bear hunting seasons and population monitoring. Permit quotas and season length should be adjusted as necessary to regulate hunting pressure in BMZs. Season formats should use all hunting implements legally available including archery and muzzleloaders.]
- [5.] **4.** DFW should use harvest parameters, including [female] harvest rates, as a benchmark to gauge the progress of the population reduction and stabilization, and **to** trigger adjustments to future season structures.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

[6. DFW should include BMZ 7 in future Game Code proposals to legally harvest bears by properly licensed hunters with bear permits during the established deer hunting seasons.]

[7.] **5.** Council supports legislation that would establish a fee of \$28 for a bear permit. Hunters will pay for the privilege to participate in a regulated hunting season with the fees used to cover the costs of administering the hunt. A bear permit fee comparable to the deer permit (\$28) has the potential to generate [\$280,000] **\$308,000**.

6. In the future, DFW should consider including BMZs 6 and 7 in regulated seasons and modifying existing zones as needed.

V. CONCLUSION

Council supports active, integrated bear management and DFW's population goal of maintaining bears at a density that provides for a sustainable population within suitable bear habitat, minimizes human-bear conflicts and reduces emigration of bears to unsuitable habitat in suburban and urban areas.

Council recognizes that bears are causing considerable damage to personal property and that the amount of damage and threats to public safety have increased commensurate with the bear population. Home entries and attempted home entries increased significantly in the late 1990s and remain unacceptably high despite intensive efforts to eliminate problem bears and despite intensive

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

education efforts. Even though DFW has been proactive in response to high risk bear incidents that are a threat to public safety and property damage, Council is not willing to continually subject the citizens of New Jersey to this level of risk to public safety and property damage from black bears and so must take the responsible action of reducing the bear population.

Council recommends that DFW continue its integrated strategy for black bear management that includes continuing the educational campaign, pursuing legislative initiatives, conducting research and population monitoring, continuing appropriate control measures, investigating all population control methods and implementing population reduction through a regulated hunting season. Bear population management through regulated hunting will satisfy the Council's legislative mandate of conserving the bear resource and providing recreational opportunity. Additionally, the use of regulated hunting as a tool for population control satisfies the NJ Supreme Court mandate to consider the most appropriate tools available.

Council supports the need for additional funding for DFW to continue its research, education, and nuisance control activities throughout New Jersey. Adequate funding [from the General Treasury, combined with Hunters and Anglers and federal funds, must continue to maintain an adequate] **for** black bear management [program] **at the 2014 population level is estimated to be \$1.25 million annually. This amount combined with the Hunters and Anglers funds and federal funds must continue in order for the State to maintain an adequate black bear management program.** It is unrealistic to believe that NJ's sportsmen and women share the sole responsibility for paying for this cost. Since responsible bear management benefits all citizens of NJ, it is appropriate

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

that it continue to be funded through [an appropriation from the General Treasury] **other sources**.

Over time, a reduction in the bear population should reduce the associated management costs as well as reduce the economic losses incurred by citizens of New Jersey resulting from bear related property damage.

Council realizes that the desirable bear population level will be influenced over time by many dynamic factors such as the amount of available bear habitat, human population growth and resulting development, and changes in human tolerance for bears brought about by education, **possible changes in bear behavior**, and the willingness to change lifestyles to adapt to living in bear country. Council is confident that with careful management of this species, black bears will be able to thrive in suitable habitat in NJ where they can more safely coexist with NJ residents.

VI. LITERATURE CITED

Beaver, B.V., W. Reed, S. Leary, et. al. 2001. Report of the AVMA Panel on Euthanasia. J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc. 218 (5):669-696.

Beckmann, J. P., C. W. Lackey, and J. Berger. 2004. Evaluation of deterrent techniques and dogs to alter behavior of “nuisance” black bears. Wildlife Society Bulletin 32:1141–1146.

Burke, D. and S. Predl. 1990. An assessment of deer hunting in New Jersey. NJ DEP, DFW. 150 pp. Trenton, NJ.

California Final Environmental Document, Section 265, 365, 367, 367.5, Title 14, California Code of Regulations Regarding Bear Hunting. April 27, 2000. CA Department of Fish and Game, 188 pp. + Appendices.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

[Carr, P.C. and K. Burgess. 2004. New Jersey status report. NJ DEP, DFW. 25 pp. Trenton, NJ.]

Conover, M.R. 2001. Effect of hunting and trapping on wildlife damage. Wildlife Society Bulletin 29(2):521-532.

DeNicola, A. 2004. Experimental control of a suburban population of white-tailed deer using immunocontraception. Interim Summary Report for Princeton Township, NJ, Year 2. 8 pp.

Diefenbach, D.R. 2006. Black Bear Population Estimates for New Jersey, 2003 and 2005. PA Coop. Fish and Wildl. Res. Unit, Pennsylvania State Univ., Univ. Park, PA. 5 pp.

Fagerstone, K.A., M.A. Coffey, P.D. Curtis, R.A. Dolbeer, G.J. Killian, L.A. Miller, and L.M. Wilmot. 2002. Wildlife Fertility Control. Wildl. Soc. Tech. Rev. 02-2. 29 pp.

Frakker, M.A., P.D. Curtis, and M. Mansour 2006. An Analysis of the Feasibility of Using Fertility Control to Manage New Jersey Black Bear Populations. 44 pages.:
<http://www.state.nj.us/dep/dsr/bear/bearreport.pdf>

Garshelis, D.L. 2002. Misconceptions, ironies, and uncertainties regarding trends in bear populations. Ursus 13:321-334.

Geist, V. 2003. Hunters, ‘freedom of the woods ‘ and dispersal phenotype : carnivore management for public safety. Paper presented at 17th Eastern Black Bear Workshop, March 2-5, 2003, Mt. Olive, New Jersey.

[Gore, M.L. and B.A. Knuth. 2006. Attitude and Behavior Change Associated With the New York NeighBEARhood Watch Program. Cornell University Human Dimensions Research Unit (06-14).]

Gore, M.L., B.A. Knuth, P.D. Curtis and J.E. Shanahan. 2006. Education programs for reducing American black bear-human conflict: indicators of success? Ursus 17(1):75-80

Hobbs, N.T., D.C. Bowden, and D.L. Baker. 2000. Effects of fertility control on populations of ungulates: general, stage-structured models. Journ. Wildl. Manage. 64(2):473-491.

Huffman, J.E., T. Ombrello and D. Zellner. 2010. Evaluation of genetic structure and population estimate in New Jersey black bears (*Ursus americanus*). Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory, East Stroudsburg, PA. 28 pp.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Kurzejeski, E.W., J.L. Byford, K. Causey, J.W. Enck, L.P. Hansen, W. Krueger, K. Mayer, and K. McCaffery. 1999. The Role of Bowhunting in Wildlife Management. Wildl. Soc. Tech. Rev. 99-1, 15 pp.

Leigh, J. and M.J. Chamberlain. 2008. Effects of aversive conditioning on behavior of nuisance Louisiana black bears. Human–Wildlife Conflicts 2(2):175-182.

Lund, R.C. 1980. New Jersey status report. Proc. East. Black Bear Workshop. 5:6-7.

Lund, R.C., P. McConnell and S. Smyser. 1981. Restoration of the Black Bear to the New Jersey Pine Barrens-A discussion of the Proposal and Assessment of Impacts. NJ DEP, DFGW, BWM. 27 pp. Trenton, NJ.

MacKenzie, K.G. 2003. Nuisance vs. non-nuisance bears: Seasonal movement and home range utilization of female New Jersey black bears (*Ursus americanus*). M.S. Thesis. East Stroudsburg State University, East Stroudsburg, PA. 108 pp.

Madonia, M. J. 2011. Evaluation of Aversive Conditioning Using Satellite Collars on Black Bears in New Jersey. M.S. Thesis. East Stroudsburg State University, East Stroudsburg, PA. 125 pp.

Mazur, R. L. 2010. Does Aversive Conditioning Reduce Human–Black Bear Conflict? Journal of Wildlife Management 74(1):48–54.

McBride, A.E. 2003. Wild Turkey Research Project Report. NJ DEP, DFW. 64 pp. Trenton, NJ.

McConnell, P.A., J.R. Garriss, E. Pehek and J.L. Powers. 1997. Black Bear Management Plan. NJ Div. of Fish, Game & Wildl. 115 pp. Trenton, NJ.

McLaughlin, C.R., G.J. Matula, and J.H. Hunt. 1987. A draft habitat suitability index model for black bears in the conifer-deciduous forests of New England: its application in Maine. Maine Dept. Inland Fish. & Wildl. Augusta, ME. 44 pp.

Miller, S. 1989. Population management of bears in North America. International Conference on Bear Research and Management. 8:357-373.

Muller, L.I., R.J. Warren, and D.L. Evans. 1997. Theory and practice of immunocontraception in wild mammals. Wildlife Society Bulletin 25(2):504-514.

NEBBTC. 2012. An Evaluation of Black Bear Management Options. Report of the Northeast Black Bear Technical Committee. 42 pp.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Niles, L.J., M. Valent, P. Winkler and P. Woerner. 2004. New Jersey's Landscape Project, Version 2.0. NJ DEP, DFW, ENSP. 56 pp. Trenton, NJ.

NJDFW BWM 2000. Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria. NJDEP DFW. Trenton, NJ 4 pp.

NJDEP. 2003. New Jersey Independent Bear Panel Report. NJ DEP. Trenton, NJ. 17 pp.

Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory. 2010. New Jersey black bear aversive conditioning report. East Stroudsburg University, East Stroudsburg, PA. 68 pp.

Rogers, L.L. and A.W. Allen. 1987. Habitat suitability index models: Black Bear, Upper Great Lakes Region. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 82 (10.144). 54 pp.

Ternent, M. A., T. Conway, R.M. Hough, G. Feaser, R.D. Buss, S.E. Harshaw and M.S. Rutkowski. 2001. Recommendations for Reducing Nuisance Black Bear Conflicts in Pennsylvania. PA Game Commission, Harrisburg, PA. 24 pp.

Ternent, M. A. 2006. Management Plan for Black Bear in Pennsylvania (2006-2015). PA Game Commission, Harrisburg, PA. 72 pp.

USDA WS WI 2002. Environmental Assessment: Black bear nuisance and damage management in Wisconsin. Decision and Finding of No Significant Impact. U.S. Department of Agriculture-APHIS-Wildlife Services. May 10, 2002. 60 pp.

Walters, C. 1986. Adaptive management. MacMillan Publishing Co. NY. 374 pp.


Williamson, D.F. 2002. In the Black: Status, Management, and Trade of the American black bear (*Ursus americanus*) in North America. TRAFFIC North America. Washington, DC: World Wildlife Fund. 161 pp.

Wolgast, L.J., W.S. Ellis and J. Vreeland. 2005: Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy: <http://www.njfishandwildlife.com/bearpolicy05.htm> and <http://www.njfishandwildlife.com/pdf/2005/bearpolicy05.pdf> and DEP letters: http://www.njfishandwildlife.com/pdf/2005/bearpolicy05_letter.pdf and http://www.njfishandwildlife.com/pdf/2006/letter_to_council.pdf

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.


[Figure 1. Black Bear Distribution 1995-2000

Black Bear Distribution 1995-2009




NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Figure 2. Bear Complaint Calls by Year




NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Figure 3. 1997 BBMP Study Areas



NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Figure 4. 2003 Study Areas




NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Figure 5. Black Bear Habitat

Black Bear Habitat

Based on 2002
Land Use /
Land Cover



February 2010

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 1. Bear Calls Received by NJDFW by Type

TYPE	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
CAT I	199	242	209	125	154	130	112	276	255
CAT II	754	1025	1015	562	832	625	732	1499	1477
CAT III	783	806	851	489	775	556	573	1045	1274
TOTAL	1736	2073	2075	1196	1761	1311	1417	2820	3006

Category I

TYPE	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
AD	5	9	5	10	8	9	12	29	29
AHE	5	25	23	10	23	17	16	32	36
DA	6	15	11	5	8	2	9	1	2
HA	1	1	2	1	1	1		1	1
HE	29	55	53	24	29	40	32	69	34
LS	36	27	17	24	24	13	13	49	57
PD+	6	11	16	2	7	8	6	10	3
PH		2	3	5	2	6	3	6	9
RA	57	34	38	27	15	7	2	24	29
TA	37	28	19	7	21	13	10	28	35
TE	2	5	4	2	3		1	2	
UH	13	24	9	5	9	10	5	16	13
VE	2	6	9	3	4	4	3	9	7
TOTAL	199	242	209	125	154	130	112	276	255

KEY:		
AD= Agricultural Damage	HE= Home Entry	RA= Rabbit Attack
AHE= Attempted Home Entry	LS= Livestock Attack	TA= Aggressive Bear
DA= Dog Attack (Unprovoked)	PD+= Property Damage > \$500	TE= Tent Entry
HA= Human Attack	PH= Protected Beehives	UH= Unprotected Beehives
		VE= Vehicle Entry

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Category II

TYPE	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
CS	5	10	1	3	0	2	4	2	0
GA	269	379	503	282	358	288	319	632	504
NU	357	525	357	229	387	271	331	692	833
PD-	123	111	132	44	83	61	75	160	131
PDA	**	**	22	4	4	3	3	13	9
TOTAL	754	1025	1015	562	832	625	732	1499	1477

KEY:		
CS= Campsite	GA= Garbage	PD-= Property Damage <\$500
	NU= Nuisance	PDA= Provoked Dog Attack
		**= new category in 2003

Category III

TYPE	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
BF	137	137	89	59	87	71	45	77	68
FD	3	3	5	1	1	4	4	14	9
IB	50	65	69	35	58	43	49	58	130
IK	5	6			1	1	4	3	3
OT	13	34	11	7		2		45	80
ST	502	479	610	322	507	345	375	678	833
UB	12	19	11	12	38	15	17	27	6
VS	61	63	56	53	83	75	79	143	145
TOTAL	783	806	851	489	775	556	573	1045	1274

KEY:		
BF= Birdfeeder	IB= Injured Bear	ST= Sighting
FD= Found Dead	IK= Illegal Kill	UB= Urban Bear
	OT= Other	VS= Vehicle Struck Bear

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 2. NJDFW Black Bear Tagging Effort

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	TOTAL
Tagged & Released, including recaptures	215	312	291	247	286	263	233	364	286	2497
Individual Bears Handled	202	291	270	230	274	246	223	337	262	2335
Cubs of Year (denwork)	14	89	60	50	44	38	42	69	53	459

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

APPENDIX 1. Role of the Fish and Game Council

Council has historically worked closely with DFW, utilizing the scientific expertise of its biologists to regulate the taking of wildlife in order to ensure its abundance and minimize wildlife related damage. Council's ability to manage is primarily through its rule-making authority to regulate hunting and trapping (Game Code) and fishing (Fish Code). The ability to implement various Council policies is constrained by the fiscal and human resources of governmental agencies, particularly DEP and DFW, as well as those of interested non-governmental organizations. Therefore, with regard to the Supreme Court opinion concerning the ability to determine the absolute population size of New Jersey black bears, the Council recognizes that the ability to measure wildlife populations is subject to the scientific tools available and that the population status is most often measured through the use of population indices and estimates, as opposed to absolute counts. Except for highly visible small populations such as bald eagles, it is impossible to obtain absolute counts on wildlife species. The CBBMP relies on estimates of abundance within the bear study areas as well as the changes in human-bear related incidences when considering bear management decisions.

Council was established by the legislature in 1945; Council's current makeup of 11 members was established in 1979. The makeup and authority of Council was upheld by the NJ Supreme Court in 1976 (*Humane Society of the U.S. vs. NJ State Fish and Game Council*, 70 N.J. 565 (1976), appeal dismissed 429 U.S. 1032, 50 L.Ed. 2d 744.) and more recently the Superior Court in 2002 (*Mercer Cty. Deer Alliance vs. NJDEP*, 349 NJ Super. 440). The Governor, with advice and consent of the Senate, appoints each member. Three members of the Council are farmers,

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

recommended by the Agricultural Convention; six members are sportsmen, recommended by the State Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs; one member is a public member knowledgeable in land use management and soil conservation practices, and the final member is the Chairperson of the Endangered and Nongame Advisory Committee (N.J.S.A 13:1B-24).

Council is mandated with the responsibility of protecting and conserving game birds, mammals and fish and providing an adequate supply for recreational and commercial harvest. This mandate is carried out through Council's adoption of the Fish and Game Codes, which determine "under what circumstances, when and in what localities, by what means and in what amounts and numbers [fish and game species] may be pursued, taken, killed, or had in possession so as to maintain an adequate and proper supply thereof..." (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-30, 13:1B-32).

"In addition to its powers and duties otherwise hereinafter provided, the Fish and Game Council shall, subject to the approval of the commissioner, formulate comprehensive policies for the protection and propagation of fish, birds and game animals ..." (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-28). It is this statutory authority that provides the basis for the CBBMP.

APPENDIX 2. NJDFW Educational Effort

DFW has been providing information to the New Jersey public about black bears and precautions necessary to avoid attracting bears for the last 30 years. The bear education program was formalized in 1998 and intensified in 2001 through the addition of general treasury funding.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

The bear education program received a national education award in 2000 from the Association of Conservation Information and has since won several other awards for bear education publications. The ½ hour television video “ Bear Country NJ” produced by DFW and NJN received an Emmy, and more recently, the “Welcome to Bear Country” camping video won a “Telly” award for educational video.

Over the last 10 years, bear education has been provided directly to over 100,000 people through presentations and manned exhibits in every New Jersey county. A variety of audiences were reached including school children of all ages, scout troops, rotary clubs, senior groups, nature clubs, outdoor enthusiasts at public and private campgrounds, civic groups, personnel at various professional organizations and members of the general public. During the same period, over 3 million pieces of bear education material have been produced and distributed to the general public. A long standing education partnership between DFW and the Division of Parks and Forestry has provided bear information to hundreds of thousands of park visitors and minimized park user conflicts with bears.

The educational material produced and distributed includes:

295,000	Park, campground and outdoor recreation brochures
566,000	Residential household brochures
400,000	Residential/Outdoor recreation brochures
26,000	Residential/Outdoor recreation brochures – Spanish version

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

50,000	Signs for use in parks and campgrounds
350,000	Camper behavior in bear country cards
206,000	Garbage can fliers for residential households
35,000	Waste hauler bill inserts
500,000	Educational brochures for children
40,000	Educational coloring books for children
125,000	Educational activity book for children
350,000	Educational bookmarks
110,000	Educational bookcovers
45,000	'Do Not Feed the Bears' bumper stickers
1,500	Magnets

Annual letters to Municipality leaders on bear response, which have included requests to distribute bear education information to resident households have significantly added to the number of people receiving bear education information. In one year alone, more than 75,000 households received bear education information through the Municipal partnership.

In 2008 and 2009, black bear education public service announcements were aired on 30 New Jersey radio stations during the peak bear activity months of April, May, June, September, October and November. The 30 and 60 second PSAs aired thousands of times each year on these radio stations.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

DFW' s Website (www.njfishandwildlife.com) provides electronic versions of bear education literature and bear-proofing information including sources for bear-proof garbage containers. There is also information on black bear biology, natural history and black bear research and management.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

APPENDIX 3. Results of 2003 and 2005 NJ Black Bear Hunting Seasons

The 2003 and 2005 black bear hunting seasons met the objectives established for the hunt: 1) the target harvest was obtained; 2) the hunt was conducted safely with no hunter accidents and without incident of trespassing or other complaints; and 3) biological data on bears, hunter success and hunter participation was collected. The results followed the predictions of DFW biologists based upon the conservative format. As predicted, the sex and age structure of the harvest matched that of bears captured during research and control activities. Seventy percent of the harvested bears were untagged, similar to the numbers that Division personnel handle in research activities.

The data from the 2003 and 2005 hunting seasons has proven that hunting can alleviate damage and nuisance incidents caused by problem bears. Ten percent of the tagged bears in the 2003 and 2005 harvests were known nuisance bears; an additional 10 percent were bears tagged at nuisance sites or in urban situations. GIS analysis of harvest location has shown that in Vernon township, Sussex county, 38 bears were harvested an average of 309 yards from a road; subsequently Category I and II bear complaint calls to DFW from Vernon township were reduced more than 67% (from 174 in 2003 to 58 in 2004).

Township officials have reported that their level of bear complaints dropped significantly in 2004 and 2006, a year after a hunting season, but have since increased. Damage and nuisance calls were reduced by 37.5% and Category I reports to DFW were reduced by 37% after the 2003 season; damage and nuisance calls were reduced by 24.5% and Category I reports to DFW were reduced by 13.6% after the 2005 season.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Harvest		Township	Complaints				
2003	2005		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
38	33	Vernon	263	72	160	124	167
24	31	West Milford	256	99	207	204	209
14	13	Stillwater	88	42	37	29	29
10	10	Rockaway	87	10	29	13	29
25	14	Montague	31	12	32	6	13
328	298	STATEWIDE	1308	756	1104	833	900

Harvest		Township	Cat I & II Complaints				
2003	2005		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
38	33	Vernon	174	58	128	102	133
24	31	West Milford	159	51	99	88	127
14	13	Stillwater	57	26	25	25	18
10	10	Rockaway	5	5	17	8	10
25	14	Montague	23	7	11	5	6
328	298	STATEWIDE	1046	629	863	746	838

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Hunting Season Results	2003	2005
Harvest	328	298
Harvest Rate	22.2%	19.8%
Hunter Success Rate	6.0%	7.0%

2003 SEX AND AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HARVEST

Age	Male	Female	Total (%)
Young of year	47	38	85 (26%)
Yearling	36	43	79 (24%)
Adult	36	128	164 (50%)
Total (%)	119 (36%)	209 (64%)	328

2005 SEX AND AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HARVEST

Age	Male	Female	Total (%)
Young of year	23	23	46 (15%)
Yearling	42	66	108 (36%)
Adult	59	85	144 (48%)
Total (%)	124 (42%)	174 (58%)	298

2003 BY COUNTY

County	Total Harvest	Percentage of Harvest	Area mi ²	Percentage of Hunt Area	Harvest/mi ²
Sussex	233	71 %	537	34 %	0.43 / mi ²
Warren	48	15 %	363	23 %	0.13 / mi ²
Passaic	26	8 %	126	8 %	0.21 / mi ²
Morris	20	6 %	429	28 %	0.05 / mi ²
Bergen	1	0.3 %	35	2 %	0.03 / mi ²
Hunterdon	0	0	219	13 %	0 / mi ²
Somerset	0	0	74	4 %	0 / mi ²
Total	328		1558		0.21 / mi ²

2005 BY COUNTY

County	Total Harvest	Percentage of Harvest	Area mi ²	Percentage of Hunt Area	Harvest/mi ²
Sussex	196	66 %	537	34 %	0.36 / mi ²
Warren	43	14 %	363	23 %	0.12 / mi ²
Passaic	32	11 %	126	8 %	0.25 / mi ²
Morris	26	9 %	429	28 %	0.06 / mi ²
Bergen	1	0.3 %	35	2 %	0.03 / mi ²
Hunterdon	0	0	219	13 %	0 / mi ²

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Somerset	0	0	74	4 %	0 / mi ²
Total	298		1558		0.19 / mi ²

NJ bear harvest predictions by Division of Fish and Wildlife biologists:

Prediction: <10% of 79,000 firearms hunters would participate:

5,665 permits issued in 2003

4,434 permits issued in 2005

Prediction: Bear hunters would hunt bears where they traditionally hunt deer:

86% of bear permit holders said they would hunt bear where they hunt deer (based upon application question)

Prediction: This hunting season would not draw excessive numbers of non-resident hunters:

Only 4.3% of bear permit holders were non-residents. This is similar to other seasons.

Prediction: About half of the NJ bear hunters would have experience hunting bears:

47% of permit applicants had hunted bears previously, either in NJ before the season was suspended in 1971 or in other states or provinces

Prediction: Harvest rate would be less than 25% of available bears:

2003: 22.2% harvest rate

2005: 19.8% harvest rate

Prediction: Hunter success rate would be between 5% and 7.5%:

6.0% of 2003 hunters were successful

7.0% of 2005 hunters were successful

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Prediction: Harvest would be between 272 and 408 bears:

328 bears were harvested in 2003
298 bears were harvested in 2005]

(**Agency Note:** To improve readability, proposed new Figures 1 through 13 and Tables 1 through 7 are published below in final form, without added underlined boldface symbolism as proposed new text.)

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 1. Extent of known black bear distribution (mapped by municipality) in New Jersey in 1995-2014. Dark shading represents the previously known distribution and light shading represents those municipalities where black bear occurrences were documented between previous years. Occurrence data is based on reports that were

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

received by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and are maintained within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's NJEMS (NJ Environmental Management System) database.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 2. Estimated black bear population size within New Jersey's Black Bear Management Zones 1-4 for 2010 through 2014. Population estimates were calculated by researchers at Pennsylvania State University using a modified Horvitz-Thompson estimator (■), by NJDFW staff using a Lincoln-Petersen Index (▲), and by NJDFW staff using the linear regression model (*) created by correlating Lincoln-Petersen Index estimates model with the incidents per year

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

(w/in BMZs 1-4; from 2003-2013) to generate a 2014 estimate (Figure 12). Estimates represent the black bear population on the day before the hunting season of the year estimated.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 3. (A) Zone boundaries designated in the 2012 Game Code. (B) Current boundaries of the 7 Black Bear Management Zones (BMZ) in New Jersey. Boundaries of BMZs 1 through 4 have remained unchanged. BMZs 1 and 3 are heavily forested and have the highest bear densities, while BMZs 2, 4 and 5 have lower bear densities due to a higher component of open space and

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

agriculture. BMZs 6 and 7 have the lowest bear densities in the State, but are experiencing an increase in bear activity as the population expands into these areas.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 4. Ranking of black bear habitat based on 4 parameters using 2011 Land Use/ Land cover data. Land considered to be OPTIMAL/HIGH bear habitat will have greater than or equal to 51% forest cover, less than or equal to 26% agricultural land, less than or equal to 33% urban cover and greater than or equal to 2% but less than or equal to 42% wetlands. Habitat considered to be MODERATE will consist of forest cover greater than or equal to 31% but less than or equal to 50%, agricultural land will cover no more than 50% of the area, urban land will be no greater than 59%, and wetlands will comprise greater than 1% but less than or equal to 52% of the area. LOW bear habitat will be comprised of less than 30% forest cover, 0% agricultural lands, greater

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

than 60% of the area will be considered urban, and there will be less than 30% of the area considered to be wetlands.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 5. Total number of depredation permits issued (●) from 2010 through 2014 and the number of different farmers receiving depredation permits (▲) during this same timeframe (farmers must obtain

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

separate permits for disjunct farm parcels). The total number of black bears killed under the authority of depredation permits (■) is also depicted.




Figure 6. Reports received by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for black bears exhibiting Category I (■), Category II (●), and Category III (▲) behaviors (as defined by the Division of Fish and Wildlife's Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria) throughout New Jersey from 2001 through 2014. These reports are maintained within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's NJEMS (NJ Environmental Management System) database and are obtained from residents, law enforcement agencies, and municipalities reporting bear activity. Vertical dashed lines indicate years with a regulated black bear hunt.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.





Figure 7. The percent (%) of harvested bears during each hunting season from 2003 through 2014 that were known to be involved in nuisance behavior. These bears were previously trapped and tagged by New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife staff, at nuisance locations, for exhibiting nuisance behavior or damage behavior. Because there was no controlled hunt during

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

2004 or 2006-2009 no nuisance bears were removed from the New Jersey population by means of legal hunting during these years.



NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Figure 8A. Reports received by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for black bears exhibiting Category I (A) , Category II (B), and Category III (C) behaviors (as defined by the Division of Fish and Wildlife’s Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria) in the portion of New Jersey without an open black bear hunting season from 2008 through 2014. Incidents are reported by municipality and for the purposes of this figure black bear incident numbers for municipalities that were partially outside and partially within the huntable area were adjusted proportionally to the percentage of the municipality that fell outside the huntable area. For example, a municipality that was 50% outside, and 50% inside, the huntable area would only have half of its total incidents included in this summary. These reports are maintained within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection’s NJEMS (NJ Environmental Management System) database and are obtained from residents, law enforcement agencies, and municipalities reporting bear activity.




Figure 8B. Reports received by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for black bears exhibiting Category I (B) , Category II (C), and Category III (D) behaviors (as

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

defined by the Division of Fish and Wildlife's Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria) in municipalities that are completely, or partially, within the newly proposed BMZ 5 from 2010 through 2014; total incidents are also reported (A). These reports are maintained within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's NJEMS (NJ Environmental Management System) database and are obtained from residents, law enforcement agencies, and municipalities reporting bear activity.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 9. Total statewide nuisance and damage reports for black bear in New Jersey from 2003 through 2014. These reports are held within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's NJEMS (NJ Environmental Management System) database and are obtained from residents, law enforcement agencies, and municipalities reporting bear activity. Downward arrows (↓) indicate years with a regulated black bear hunt.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 10. Estimated black bear population and number of black bear nuisance and damage reports (excluding sightings) in BMZs 1-4. Population estimates were calculated using a Lincoln-Petersen Index and represent the black bear population on the day before the hunting season of the year estimated. Nuisance and damage reports are held within the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's NJEMS (NJ Environmental Management System) database and are obtained from residents, law enforcement agencies and local municipalities reporting bear activity.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.




Figure 11. Black bear harvest rates during New Jersey’s black bear hunting seasons from 2010 through 2014. Harvest rates are calculated as the percentage of bears tagged in a given year that are harvest during the hunting season of the same year. A harvest rate of 15% (indicated by the dashed line above) is often used as a minimum threshold for population stability. Harvest rates below 15% are believed to result in subsequent years of population increase.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.





Figure 12. Correlation between black bear population size and black bear nuisance and damage reports in New Jersey. Black bear population estimates were calculated using a Lincoln-Petersen Index and represent the black bear population on the day before the hunting season of the year estimated. Data are from 2003, 2005, and 2010 through 2014.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.



NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Figure 13. Number of black bears harvested in New Jersey (BMZ 1-4) during each of the regulated hunting seasons from 2010 through 2014.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 1: Summary of bear related educational materials distributed by the DFW from 2010 through 2014.

Description	Number Distributed to Public
Know The Bear Facts Brochure (English)	200,000
Camper Cards	90,000
Know The Bear Facts Activity Guide	60,000
Know The Bear Facts Brochure (Spanish)	15,000
Living With NJ Black Bears Documentary	4,500 Copies Of The DVD
Understanding Black Bears Curriculum Kit	190 Hard Copies Also On Division Website

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 2: Summary of attendance numbers at bear education programs by county from 2010 through 2014.

County	Bear Education Presentation or Exhibit Attendance
Atlantic	530
Bergen	2,334
Burlington	2,074
Camden	390
Cape May	150
Cumberland	0
Essex	2,278
Gloucester	95
Hudson	25
Hunterdon	831
Mercer	2,828
Middlesex	1,291
Monmouth	542
Morris	9,651
Ocean	6,384
Passaic	3,422
Salem	0
Somerset	3,965
Sussex	6,123
Union	1,526
Warren	9,536

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 3. Summary of successful and ongoing waste management programs implemented in partnership with DFW. These programs were implemented in an effort to reduce human-derived food sources for black bear in New Jersey.

Municipality/ Agency	Description	Year Implemented
National Park Service (DWGNRA)	Installation of bear resistant garbage containers at all camping locations.	2005
Great Gorge Village, Vernon NJ	Installation of bear resistant retro fitted dumpster lids.	2008
Denville Township	Implementation of a community wide bear resistant garbage container program (funding needed). Bear resistant dumpsters have been installed at the local schools.	Started in 2011 and is ongoing
Mountain Lakes Borough	Implementation of a community wide bear resistant garbage container program (pursuing funding).	Starting in 2011 and is ongoing
New Jersey State Parks	Installation of bear resistant dumpsters at all Parks north of I-80. Installation of bear resistant food storage lockers at remote camping locations and along the Appalachian Trail (AT) in Northern New Jersey.	2005
New Jersey DFW Field Offices	Installation of bear resistant dumpsters at field offices in northern New Jersey.	2008
West Milford Twp	DEP provision of a community grant to purchase 3,000 bear resistant cans.	2008
Beaver Lake Community	Transition to centralized bear resistant dumpsters and garbage pick-up twice per day.	2009

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 4. The DFW has handled more than 200 individual bears annually since 2001 through 2014. The animals were tagged, tattooed, and analyzed for research and control purposes. Data collected from tagged bears enables DFW to perform mark and recapture studies for population estimates, determine reproductive and recruitment rates, make health assessments of the population, and determine movement and expansion of the population throughout the State. The average cost of handling a bear exceeds \$2,000.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	1012	2013	2014	Total
Tagged & Released Including Recaptures	215	312	291	247	286	263	233	364	286	336	284	325	281	314	4,037
Individual Bears Handled	202	291	270	230	274	246	223	337	262	320	262	287	262	292	3,758

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 5. Ranking of black bear habitat based on 4 parameters using 2011 Land Use/ Land cover data. Land considered to be OPTIMAL/ HIGH bear habitat will have greater than or equal to 51% forest cover, less than or equal to 26% agricultural land, less than or equal to 33% urban cover and greater than or equal to 2% but less than or equal to 42% wetlands. Habitat considered to be MODERATE will consist of forest cover greater than or equal to 31% but less than or equal to 50%, agricultural land will cover no more than 50% of the area, urban land will be no greater than 59%, and wetlands will comprise greater than 1% but less than or equal to 52% of the area. LOW bear habitat will be comprised of less than 30% forest cover, 0% agricultural lands, greater than 60% of the area will be considered urban, and there will be less than 30% of the area considered to be wetlands.

Rank	Forest	Ag	Urban	Wetlands
OPTIMAL /HIGH	$\geq 51\%$	$\leq 26\%$	$\leq 33\%$	$\geq 2\%$ and $\leq 42\%$
MODERATE	$\geq 31\%$ and $\leq 50\%$	$\leq 55\%$	$\leq 59\%$	$\geq 1\%$ and $\leq 52\%$
LOW	$\leq 30\%$		$> 60\%$	$< 30\%$

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 6. Bear-related Category I calls (by incident type) received by NJDEP from 2001 through 2014. Incident types are based on the Black Bear Rating and Response Criteria (BBRRC).

TYPE	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
AD	5	9	5	10	8	9	12	29	29	13	14	17	19	49
AHE	5	25	23	10	23	17	16	32	36	43	29	12	10	10
DA	6	15	11	5	8	2	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
HA	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	1
HE	29	55	53	24	29	40	32	69	34	47	47	25	23	34
LS	36	27	17	24	24	13	13	49	57	68	56	20	35	61
PD+	6	11	16	2	7	8	6	10	3	8	6	4	0	7
PH	0	2	3	5	2	6	3	6	9	2	8	7	4	4
RA	57	34	38	27	15	7	2	24	29	9	7	7	13	6
TA	37	28	19	7	21	13	10	28	35	20	9	9	2	6
TE	2	5	4	2	3	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	3
UH	13	24	9	5	9	10	5	16	13	8	15	16	19	12
VE	2	6	9	3	4	4	3	9	7	11	2	3	2	0
TOTAL	199	242	209	125	154	130	112	276	255	235	201	120	129	194

AD= Agricultural Damage	HE= Home Entry	RA= Rabbit Attack
AHE= Attempted Home Entry	LS= Livestock Attack	TA= Aggressive Bear
DA= Dog Attack (Unprovoked)	PD+= Property Damage > \$500	TE= Tent Entry
HA= Human Attack	PH= Protected Beehives	UH= Unprotected Beehives
		VE= Vehicle Entry

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Table 7. Summary of bear hunting seasons in North America. Weapon type allowed and inclusion of a fall season (anytime from August through November) are indicated for each state or Canadian Province.

State/Province	Rifle/Shotgun	Muzzleloader	Archery	Fall Season
Alaska	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arizona	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
California	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	No	No
New Mexico	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nevada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oklahoma	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tennessee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Utah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wyoming	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alberta	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
British Columbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manitoba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
New Brunswick	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Newfoundland/Labrador	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northwest Territories	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northwest Territories	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nova Scotia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Ontario	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Quebec	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Saskatchewan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yukon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Appendix I. Role of the Fish and Game Council

Council has historically worked closely with DFW, utilizing the scientific expertise of its biologists to regulate the taking of wildlife in order to ensure its abundance and minimize wildlife related damage. Council's ability to manage is primarily through its rule-making authority to regulate hunting and trapping (Game Code) and fishing (Fish Code). The ability to implement various Council policies is constrained by the fiscal and human resources of governmental agencies, particularly DEP and DFW, as well as those of interested non-governmental organizations. Therefore, with regard to the Supreme Court opinion suggesting that absolute size of the black bear population may be an important factor in determining which tools will be utilized to accomplish the DEP's broad preservation goals (U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance Found. v. N.J.D.E.P., 182 N.J. 461, 867 A.2d 1147 (2005)), the Council recognizes that the ability to measure wildlife populations is subject to the scientific tools available and that the population status is most often measured through the use of population indices and estimates, as opposed to absolute counts. Except for highly visible small populations such as bald eagles, it is impossible to obtain absolute counts on wildlife species. The CBBMP relies on estimates of abundance within the bear study areas as well as the changes in human-bear related incidences when considering bear management decisions.

Council was established by the legislature in 1945; Council's current makeup of 11 members was established in 1979. The makeup and authority of Council was upheld by the NJ Supreme Court in 1976 (Humane Society of the U.S. vs. NJ State Fish and Game Council, 70 N.J. 565 (1976), appeal dismissed 429 U.S. 1032, 50 L.Ed. 2d 744) and more recently the Superior Court in 2002 (Mercer Cty. Deer Alliance vs. NJDEP, 349 N.J. Super. 440 (App. Div. 2002)). The Governor, with advice and consent of the Senate, appoints each member. Three members of the Council are farmers, recommended by the Agricultural Convention; six members are sportsmen, recommended by the State Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs; one member is a public member knowledgeable in land use management and soil conservation practices, and the final member is the Chairperson of the Endangered and Nongame Advisory Committee (N.J.S.A 13:1B-24).

Council is mandated with the responsibility of protecting and conserving game birds, mammals and fish and providing an adequate supply for recreational and commercial harvest. This mandate is carried out through Council's adoption of the Fish and Game Codes, which determine "under what circumstances, when and in what localities, by what means and in what amounts and numbers [fish and game species] may be pursued, taken, killed, or had in possession so as to maintain an adequate and proper supply thereof" (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-30, 13:1B-32).

"In addition to its powers and duties otherwise hereinafter provided, the Fish and Game Council shall, subject to the approval of the commissioner, formulate comprehensive

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

policies for the protection and propagation of fish, birds and game animals” (N.J.S.A. 13:1B-28). It is this statutory authority that provides the basis for the CBBMP.

Appendix II:

A. Summary of Cooperative Black Bear Research Efforts from 2008 through 2014.

1. Project: Temporal, Spatial, and Environmental Influences on the Demographics and Harvest Vulnerability of American Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) in Urban Habitats in New Jersey, Pennsylvania and West Virginia

Partners: West Virginia University; NJ, PA, and WV Cooperators

Major Findings: Bears captured at urban nuisance and damage locations and released on site can be harvested by hunters.

2. Project: Retrofitting Dumpsters with Bear Resistant Lids to Reduce Negative Human-Bear Interactions in New Jersey

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: Bears that were unable to obtain food from retrofitted dumpsters moved to other unsecure dumpsters within the community.

3. Project: Evaluation of Aversive Conditioning Using Satellite Collars on Black Bears in New Jersey

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: Both aversively conditioned bears and non-aversively conditioned bears returned to an urban setting after being released. Bears that were aversively conditioned displayed a temporary avoidance of the site where conditioning occurred but eventually returned to this site. Aversive conditioning may provide a temporary, short term avoidance of the conditioning site, and nuisance behavior could shift to other locations.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

4. Project: Genetic Diversity and Multiple Paternities of American Black Bears in New Jersey

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: No significant difference was found between the genetic diversity in New Jersey and northeastern Pennsylvania black bears. No evidence was found of a geographic barrier preventing gene flow between New Jersey and Pennsylvania, indicating that the movement of black bears from northeastern Pennsylvania likely made a contribution to the repopulation of New Jersey. Data from eight microsatellite loci permitted assigning of paternity for cubs in four out of 15 (26.7%) litters.

5. Project: The Occurrence of Tick-Borne Pathogens in Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) in New Jersey

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* and *Babesia* spp. were detected in 0.01% and 39.8%, respectively, of the 317 blood samples taken from New Jersey black bears. *Rickettsia rickettsii* and *Babesia* spp. were detected in 5.2% and 94.5%, respectively, of 634 adult engorged *Ixodes scapularis* and *Dermacentor variabilis* attached to black bears. *Francisella tularensis* was not present in any of the blood samples or tick pools screened.

6. Project: Seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii*, *Trichinella spiralis*, and *Borrelia burgdorferi* in Northern New Jersey Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*)

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: Of the 240 serum samples collected from black bears located in northern New Jersey, antibody prevalence to *Toxoplasma gondii* was 73.7%, to *Trichinella spiralis* was 0%, and to *Borrelia burgdorferi* was 87.0%. People living in New Jersey must protect themselves from ticks and cook wild game meat properly to prevent infection by these particular parasites.

7. Project: Genetic Structure of American Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*)

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Major Findings: Aspects of genetic diversity and gene flow for 4 management zones in NJ using genotypic data from 9 microsatellite loci were evaluated.

Measures of genetic diversity were estimated at the individual level, as well as within and between management areas. A total of 84 alleles were observed at the 9 microsatellite loci amplified in a multiplex reaction. The degree of variation ranged from 6 to 12 alleles per locus, with an average of 9.33 alleles per population at each locus. Results indicated that genetic diversity was high in the black bears. Results from STRUCTURE 2.3.4 suggest that NJ black bears represent a panmictic population.

8. Project: Case-Control of Study of NJ Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) Infected with *Babesia* spp.

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: Blood samples were taken from 65 black bears. Of the 25 bears that tested positive for *Babesia* initially, 52% of them cleared the infection and 48% had a persistent infection. Of the remaining 38 bears that tested negative for *Babesia* at baseline, 71% of them remained free of infection and 29% acquired infections at follow-up.

9. Project: *Babesia* sp. in Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) in New Jersey

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: The tick-borne zoonosis, *Babesia*, was detected in 84 of 201 (41.8%) black bear blood samples collected from five counties in northwestern New Jersey. Sequence analysis confirmed the presence of *Babesia* spp. in all of the PCR positive samples. This data represents the first report of *Babesia* spp. in American black bears.

10. Project: Aerobic Oral and Nasal Bacteria in New Jersey Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) with Antibiotic Susceptibility of *Escherichia coli*

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: Twelve aerobic bacterial species, representing 9 genera, were identified from the oral swabs from the buccal and lingual supragingival tooth surfaces and nasal swab samples obtained from 22 research trapped bears in Warren County, New Jersey during June 2014. The most frequently isolated bacteria were *Bacillus* sp., *Klebsiella* sp., *Micrococcus luteus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Staphylococcus*

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

epidermidis. The diversity in the aerobic oral and nasal flora of black bears in New Jersey suggests the importance of including these organisms in basic health risk assessment protocols and suggests a potential tool for assessment of bear/habitat interactions. To evaluate the role of black bears in the spread of antibiotic resistant *E.coli*, oral and nasal samples were collected from 8 black bears (two sows and six cubs). Antibiotic resistance was measured for tetracycline and streptomycin. There were a total of 21.7% *E.coli* resistance for tetracycline (7.69%) and streptomycin (14%) and a total of 65.4% intermediate resistance for tetracycline (15.4%) and streptomycin (50%).

11. Project: Case Report: Fatal Disseminated Toxoplasmosis in a Black Bear Cub

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: At necropsy, the lungs were reddened and noncollapsed and had multiple pale round foci. Foci of necrosis were associated with *Toxoplasma gondii* cysts and tachyzoites in several organs. Rabies antigen was not detected.

12. Project: Case Report: *Staphylococcus intermedius* Dermatitis in Denning New Jersey Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*)

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: In March 2006, a 5-yr-old female and three yearling black bears with severe dermatitis were examined. The female and three yearlings all exhibited weight loss. Deep skin scrapings were taken and examined. No mites were found in the skin scrapings. *Staphylococcus intermedius* was the only bacterial species isolated from the four bears. To our knowledge this is the first report of non-mange related dermatitis caused by *s. intermedius* in black bears.

13. Project: Food Habits and Blood Chemistry of New Jersey Black Bears

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW

Major Findings: Ninety-one black bear stomachs were examined for food contents in the fall, summer and spring. Vegetation (63%) and grasses (70.3%), fruit, seeds and berries (52.4%), and acorns and beechnuts (42.7%) occurred most often in the black bear stomachs. In spring, New Jersey black bears consumed new vegetative growth, human food, animal tissue and refuse. During summer, herbaceous material, nuts and

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

fruits were the primary food items. During fall, bears fed mostly on plants, mast, and animal tissue. Complete blood chemistry was analyzed for 16 adult bears during the fall trapping season. Blood chemistry revealed triglyceride concentrations $175.9 \text{ mg/dL} \pm 53.7$ and cholesterol levels of $354.1 \pm 73.2 \text{ mg/dL}$. Glucose concentrations were obtained for 129 bears in the field during the fall, spring and summer. Glucose concentrations averaged 121.8 mg/dL for males and 124.2 mg/dL for females during autumn months and 102.8 mg/dL for males and 116.7 mg/dL for females during summer months.

B. Summary of Published Literature and Reports

2014. Shaw, M., N. Kolba, and J.E. Huffman. *BABESIA* SP. IN BLACK BEARS (*URSUS AMERICANUS*) IN NEW JERSEY. Northeastern Naturalist - Submitted
Partners: East Stroudsburg University, NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: *Babesia* is emerging as a cause of tick-borne zoonosis worldwide and various wildlife species animals are the principal reservoir hosts for zoonotic *Babesia* species. The primary vectors of *Babesia* are Ixodid ticks, with the majority of zoonotic species being transmitted by species in the genus *Ixodes*. The protozoan infects and lyse red blood cells. The tick-borne zoonosis, *Babesia*, was detected in 84 of 201 (41.8%) samples. Sequence analysis confirmed the presence of *Babesia* spp. in all of the PCR positive samples. This data represents the first report of *Babesia* spp. in American black bears (*Ursus americanus*).

2014. Lisowski, S., N. Chinnici and J.E. Huffman AEROBIC ORAL AND NASAL BACTERIA IN NEW JERSEY BLACK BEARS (*URSUS AMERICANUS*) WITH ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY OF *ESCHERICHIA COLI*. Journal of the Pennsylvania Academy of Science 88(2): 95-100, 2014- Submitted

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings:- The microbiology of animal bite wound infections is often polymicrobial. Black bear attacks have been a rare occurrence in the past, and with few published studies on their oral flora, the bacteria present in black bear bite wounds is largely unknown. This study examines the oral and nasal aerobic bacteria from research trapped bears in Warren County, New Jersey during June 2014. Twelve aerobic bacterial species, representing nine genera were identified from the oral and nasal samples. The most frequently isolated bacteria were *Bacillus* sp., *Klebsiella* sp., *Micrococcus luteus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

Staphylococcus epidermidis. The diversity in the aerobic oral and nasal flora of black bears in New Jersey suggests the importance of including these organisms in basic health risk assessment protocols and suggests a potential tool for assessment of bear/habitat interactions. To evaluate the role of black bears in the spread of antibiotic resistant *E.coli*, oral and nasal samples were collected from eight black bears (two sows and six cubs). Antibiotic resistance was measured for tetracycline and streptomycin. There were a total of 21.7 percent *E.coli* resistance for tetracycline (7.69%) and streptomycin (14%) and a total of 65.4 % intermediate resistance for tetracycline (15.4%) and streptomycin (50%).

2014. Huffman, J.E., and D.E. Roscoe. CASE REPORT: FATAL DISSEMINATED TOXOPLASMOSIS IN A BLACK BEAR CUB. Journal of the Pennsylvania Academy of Science 88(2): 101-106, 2014- Submitted

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: A black bear (*Ursus americanus*) cub with signs of neurological disease was captured in West Milford, NJ. The animal died in captivity and was examined because of suspected rabies. At necropsy, the lungs were reddened and noncollapsed and had multiple pale round foci. Foci of necrosis were associated with *Toxoplasma gondii* cysts and tachyzoites in several organs. Rabies antigen was not detected.

2012. Keeler, P. Shamus, K.I. Burgess, H. Lemasters, , and J.E. Huffman. CASE REPORT: *STAPHYLOCOCCUS INTERMEDIUS* DERMATITIS IN DENNING NEW JERSEY BLACK BEARS (*URSUS AMERICANUS*) Journal of the Pennsylvania Academy of Science 86(1): 75-78, 2012- Submitted

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: On 18 March 2006, during annual den research, personnel from the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife Black Bear Project examined a 5-yr-old female and three yearling black bears (*Ursus americanus*) with severe dermatitis. The female and three yearlings all exhibited weight loss. Deep skin scrapings were taken and examined under a stereomicroscope. *Staphylococcus intermedius* was the only bacterial species isolated from the four bears. To our knowledge this is the first report of non- mange related dermatitis caused by *s. intermedius* in black bears.

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

2010. Huffman, J.E., C.L. Heidelberger, K.I. Burgess. FOOD HABITS AND BLOOD CHEMISTRY OF NEW JERSEY BLACK BEARS. Journal of the Pennsylvania Academy of Sciences 85: 76-80. Submitted

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: We investigated the seasonal feeding habits, and blood chemistry of black bears (*Ursus americanus*) across their geographic range in New Jersey. We also evaluated glucose concentrations in trapped bears in the field. Ninety-one black bear stomachs were examined for food contents in the fall, summer and spring. Complete blood chemistry was analyzed for 16 adult bears during the fall trapping season. Glucose concentrations were obtained for 129 bears in the field during the fall, spring and summer. Vegetation (63%) and grasses (70.3%), fruit, seeds and berries (52.4%), and acorns and beechnuts (42.7%) occurred most often in the black bear stomachs. In spring, New Jersey black bears consumed new vegetative growth, human food, animal tissue and refuse. During summer, herbaceous material, nuts and fruits were the primary food items. During fall, bears fed mostly on plants, mast, and animal tissue. Blood chemistry revealed triglyceride concentrations $175.9 \text{ mg/dL} \pm 53.7$ and cholesterol levels of $354.1 \pm 73.2 \text{ mg/dL}$. Glucose concentrations averaged 121.8 mg/dL for males 124.2 mg/dL for females during autumn months and 102.8 mg/dL males 116.7 mg/dL for females during summer months in 2003 and 2004.

2010. Skirta, E.A., J.E. Huffman, A. Zeller, K.I. Burgess, M. Madonia, T. Ombrello. SATELLITE MONITORING OF SPATIAL AND SEASONAL LANDSCAPE USE BY BLACK BEARS IN NEW JERSEY BEARFORT MOUNTAINS Technical Commission VII Symposium 2010 (2010-06-29 14:28:16)- Submitted

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: This paper reports the results of a collaborative research project integrating the efforts of the New Jersey Fish and Wildlife Commission, ESU and the Northeast DNA Laboratory to advance understanding of landscape patterns of black bear distribution, environmental relationships, and population monitoring tools by using satellite monitoring of a group of female black bears. The experiment was implemented in 2008-2009 in the Bearfort Mountains region in New Jersey. Our goal is to model ecological inferences from statistical analyses of bear movements and environmental conditions based on Geographic Information System (GIS)-collected

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

data. Multivariate regression analysis and compositional analysis along with canonical correspondence analysis (CCA) were used to analyze variation in bear home range selection and distance analysis. Spatial and seasonal home range variations based on parametric and non-parametric statistical methods and current spatial applications of CCA are presented, and methods for integrating CCA with GIS coverage of the environment as a bear habitat use are examined.

2010. Huffman, J.E., E. Skirta, A.S. Zellner, NEW JERSEY BLACK BEAR AVERSIVE CONDITIONING REPORT. Submitted to the New Jersey Division of Fish and Wildlife.

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: Bears aversively conditioned using Def tech 12 gauge rubber buckshot pellets, pyrotechnics and specially trained black mouth yellow curs dogs stayed away from the location they were caught and conditioned an average of 19 days. Bears did resume the same Category II activity for which they had been originally captured for. Bears also remained in the same area where they were captured and conditioned.

2012. Daniel, B.J., J.E. Huffman, T.A. Ombrello, GENETIC ANALYSES OF AMERICAN BLACK BEARS (*URSUS AMERICANUS*) IN NEW JERSEY AND NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA

Partners: East Stroudsburg University and NJDFW and the Northeast Wildlife DNA Laboratory

Major Findings: Samples taken legally harvested black bears or bears captured for research purposes were analyzed to determine the level of genetic diversity there is between the two states. Bears located in western New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania was found to genetically related more so than bears located in eastern New Jersey. Bears located in New Jersey and Pennsylvania have a high degree of genetic diversity and are considered to be healthy.

7:25-5.24 Bow and arrow, general provisions

(a) – (b) (No change.)

NOTE: THIS IS A COURTESY COPY OF THIS RULE PROPOSAL. THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MAY 18, 2015 NEW JERSEY REGISTER. SHOULD THERE BE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THIS TEXT AND THE OFFICIAL VERSION OF THE PROPOSAL, THE OFFICIAL VERSION WILL GOVERN.

(c) During the seasons for taking deer, **bear**, coyote, fox, woodchuck or turkey with bow and arrow (as listed elsewhere in this subchapter), all arrows used for taking deer, **bear**, coyote, fox, woodchuck or turkey must be fitted with an edged head of the following specifications:

1.– 5. (No change.)

(d) No person shall hunt deer with the aid of a deer decoy except during the fall bow, winter bow, and special bow seasons. No person shall hunt for deer with an electronic calling device, or any other device which projects a beam of light upon the target. A bowhunter [hunting for deer and] utilizing a ground blind during a time period when the bowhunting season is concurrent with a deer **or bear** firearm season, must display 200 square inches of hunter orange atop the blind and visible from all sides, or within five feet outside of the blind and higher than the blind or at least three feet off the ground, whichever is higher. A “ground blind” is defined as a temporary man-made structure used for the purpose of concealing from sight a person who is hunting. A ground blind is not a naturally occurring feature that a hunter merely uses for concealment.

(e) – (f) (No change.)