

Suzanne Scourby

Subject: FW: From Beverlee McGrath - OPPOSITION, ANNUAL BEAR HUNT
Attachments: Annual bear hunt, proposed.docx; No Nevada Newspaper polls regarding Commission Decision on Bear hunt.doc; Lackey study 2008.doc

From: Beverlee McGrath [<mailto:bevddal@msn.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 2:21 PM

To: McBeath, Mike

Subject: OPPOSITION, ANNUAL BEAR HUNT

Dear Commissioner McBeath - PLEASE read the opposition letter to an annual bear hunt that is being proposed.

BEVERLEE McGRATH
Nevada Legislative Specialist
& Special Projects
(775) 815-1690
BevDDAL@msn.com

NEVADA BOARD OF WILDLIFE COMMISSION

Purpose:

Preserve, protect, manage, enhance, and restore wildlife and the habitat within the state for the aesthetic, scientific, educational, recreational, and economic benefits. The department is also charged with promoting safety for persons and property in the operation of boats on the waters of the state.

NRS 501.100 Legislative declaration regarding wildlife:

1. Wildlife in this State not domesticated and in its natural habitat is part of the natural resources **belonging to the people** of the State of Nevada.
2. The preservation, protection, management and restoration of wildlife within the State **contribute immeasurably to the aesthetic, recreational and economic aspects of these natural resources.** {Part 8:101:1947; A 1949, 292; 1943 NCL s 3035.08}---(NRS A 1969, 1347)

NRS 501.297 Duties: Evaluating local opinion and advising Commission. **The boards shall solicit and evaluate local opinion** and advise the Commission on matters relating to the management of wildlife within their respective counties. (Added to NRS by 1969, 1560; A 1985, 1351)

Dear Members of the Board of Wildlife Commission:

Since the Nevada Revised Statutes state that wildlife, as a natural resource, belongs to the PEOPLE of Nevada, I would hope that you consider the opinions and desires of the PEOPLE of Nevada and do NOT propose an annual bear hunt in an obvious attempt to appease a small contingent of trophy hunters.

The majority of the people living in Nevada are concerned about the Nevada housing market and economy. Less than 3% are hunters and trappers. Nevada real estate agents desire a focus on restoring the housing market by promoting safe neighborhoods, affordable homes, retirement and time-share opportunities. Home owners are repelled by the idea of hunting and trapping in the vicinity of where they live. People want to hike in the wild without fear. **No Bear Hunt NV.org** claims its polls show that up to 86% of Nevadans oppose the hunt, the first official season for bears in Nevada history.

Public safety is a major concern when promoting tourism in Nevada. We depend on visitors to come to NV for recreation, resorts, camping, hiking, horseback riding and other outdoor activities. Let's encourage people to come to Nevada rather than discourage them due to unregulated and unsafe hunting and trapping practices. Consider the possibility of injury to hikers, campers, pets and residents should a large bear be wounded and go on an angry rampage. Please read the attached **'Northern Nevada Newspaper polls re Commission decision on 'Bear Hunt'**.

Bears were nearly extirpated from Nevada due to habitat loss and indiscriminate killing, but slowly crept back in extremely small numbers. In NDOW's bear biologist Carl Lackey's report, **'Carnivores, urban landscapes, and longitudinal studies'**, the bear population is estimated to be 200-400. Though the commission has claimed the bear population has increased dramatically, wildlife managers have refused to provide the public with information supporting this claim.

According to the Nevada Department of Wildlife, 95 percent of complaints about bears are about garbage, (something that could be easily managed), and bear complaints decreased in 2009, for the second consecutive year. Complaints were predominantly out of Washoe County and most of these were from Incline Village. Property damage can be attributed to two or three individual bears in the Incline Village area (two of them have been removed). Carl Lackey's summary in his **'Black Bear'** report for the

NV Department of Wildlife, states: "Washoe County continues to dodge the issue" "The need for an ordinance requiring bear-proof trash containers is clearly evident".

There are **NO COMPLETE POPULATION STATISTICS** that warrant an annual bear hunt. Where is the **FULL POPULATION/POPULATION DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY?** Where is the documentation that shows there's been an **INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF BEARS?**

Mr. Lackey's report states that bears handled in the Western Region in 2003 totaled 44, 2004 – 69, 2005 – 74, 2006 – 88, 2007 – 157, 2008 – 68, and 2009 -39. Of the 39 captures, there were 36 individual bears. Of the 36, 21 were bears not previously captured, 15 were recaptures, and 6 bears were captured for research purposes. Comparatively, 18 bears were captured specifically in response to a conflict situation. Clearly, bears are not overpopulated and conflicts with them are almost entirely caused by human carelessness. Nevada's bears should NOT be punished simply because some don't store their garbage properly.

The Department of Wildlife makes population claims about Nevada's bears, despite the fact that wildlife officials refuse to release any recent population data to the public ("Bears and human conflicts climb upward," Oct. 9).

The agency has not demonstrated a science-based need re any trophy hunt (or a continual trophy hunt). Studies that purportedly show an increase in bear population have not been made available to the public. Transparency in the process leading up to initiating a season on bears is imperative.

Bears are not hunted out of concern for public safety or for food. Bear hunters are after trophies: heads and hides to display in their living rooms or trophy rooms. Most bear hunters don't even eat the meat. Often, a hunting season is inaugurated whether or not authorities actually believe bears are overpopulated or becoming a nuisance.

Commission Chairman Scott Raine has said initiating a hunt could help reduce human-bear conflicts that often lead to bears becoming a nuisance and having to be destroyed. "They get a little bit of fear of people in them (from being hunted) and hopefully they won't come in contact with people," he said earlier. "It might prevent some from being euthanized."

Critics disagree, and point to a 2004 report from biologists with the Nevada Department of Wildlife that said after a male bear is removed from urban neighborhoods, another will appear and take up residence "within days or weeks."

"A legal harvest season would then not seem to be a solution to the nuisance bear problem, although the population as a whole may absorb the harvest," the report said. Nevada's bear hunt would not reduce the number of conflicts. It would simply provide a handful of trophy hunters with bearskin rugs.

BEVERLEE McGRATH
Nevada Legislative Specialist & Special Projects
PAW PAC
NV POLITICAL ACTION FOR ANIMALS
NEVADA HUMANE SOCIETY
ACTION FOR ANIMALS
NORTHERN NV SPCA
(775) 815-1690 BevDDAL@msn.com

No Nevada Newspaper polls regarding Commission Decision on Bear hunt:

Nevada Appeal, Carson City NV: [Polls](#)

[<< back](#) Polls

[View Past Polls](#)

Poll

Should Nevada have a bear hunt?

No	62.72%
	(180)
Yes	37.28%
	(107)

287 votes

Tahoe Daily Tribune, covering Douglas County NV on East Shore:

Polls

[View Past Polls](#)

Poll

Should the Nevada Department of Wildlife have approved a bear hunt?

No, bears should not be hunted.	51.15%
	(201)
Yes, our area is overpopulated with bears.	19.85%
	(78)
Yes, hunting is a worthwhile recreational activity.	9.67%
	(38)
No, hunting bears can leave orphaned cubs.	9.16%
	(36)
Yes, it could be a deterrent to bear/human interactions.	7.89%
	(31)
Other, please write below.	2.29%
	(9)
	393 votes

North Lake Tahoe Bonanza, Incline Village NV: Polls

[View Past Polls](#)

Poll

Should bear hunting be legalized in Nevada?

B. No.	57.69%
	(30)
A. Yes.	42.31%
	(22)

52 votes

Human–Wildlife Conflicts 2(2), Fall 2008

Carnivores, urban landscapes, and longitudinal studies: a case history of black bears

JON P. BECKMANN, Wildlife Conservation Society, North America Program, 2023 Stadium Drive, Suite 1A, Bozeman, MT 59715 USA jbeckmann@wcs.org

CARL W. LACKEY, Nevada Department of Wildlife, 1100 Valley Road, Reno, NV 89512 USA

Abstract: As urban landscapes expand across the globe, it becomes imperative to understand how these landscapes affect large carnivore populations. We examined the effects of humanaltered landscapes on age-specific fecundity and life history parameters for female black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in urban and wildland regions in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of Nevada, including the Lake Tahoe Basin. We followed 12 marked female bears in an urban environment and 10 females in wildland habitats from 1997–2006. Our results show that female bears in urban areas have higher age-specific fecundity rates. Despite this difference, female bears in urban areas never realized this putative gain in fitness because they experienced higher age-specific mortality rates, leading to the creation of sinks ($\lambda = 0.749$). Urban bears of the Lake Tahoe Basin are unable to repopulate vacated wildland areas.

Key words: black bears, human–wildlife conflicts, life tables, source sink, urban interface, *Ursus americanus*

Human activities associated with urban areas impact the viability of carnivore populations. Impacts include altering (1) behavior of individuals (Mattson 1990, Baker and Timm 1998, Beckmann and Berger 2003a), (2) distributions of populations (Craighead et al. 1995, Beckmann and Berger 2003b, Prange et al. 2004), (3) movements of individuals and use of corridors or linkage areas (Torres et al. 1996, Prange et al. 2004), (4) disease ecology of populations (Frolich et al. 2005), (5) diets (Craighead et al. 1995, Burgess 2000, Beckmann and Berger 2003b), and (6) mortality (Woodroffe and Ginsberg 2000, Grinder and Krausman 2001). Most impacts of human activities on these parameters have been investigated singly in separate, independent studies that have focused mainly on behavioral or ecological changes. Hence, little is understood about the impacts of human-altered landscapes on entire life histories of individuals in a population, especially for large carnivores.

Ecologists use population-modeling tools, such as minimum viable population (MVP) analyses and island biogeography theory to predict the likelihood of populations of various sizes surviving into the future (Ferrerias et al. 2001). Many studies have focused on the theoretical basis of population viability, by

modeling differing scenarios of mortality, reproductive rates, and migration under various hypothetical environmental conditions (e.g., Tiedemann et al. 2000). Many of these models are not based on empirical data from the field because one of the most challenging tasks facing population biologists who focus on large mammals is accurately estimating the number of individuals in a population and calculating age-specific survivorship and fecundity schedules (Millar and Zammuto 1983). As humans continue to expand their distribution into regions that contain carnivores, there will be a more pressing need for temporal data sets examining changes not only in behavioral parameters of carnivores, but in life history parameters, as well. Currently, such information exists for only a handful of carnivore species and rarely in urban settings. Such broad gaps in knowledge of the temporal impacts of human perturbations on large carnivores make conservation of these species difficult. Despite the relatively simple calculations involved, life history tables potentially can be one of the most useful tools to examine the impacts of various environmental conditions and changes in land-use patterns on a species (Millar and Zammuto 1983). However, for most long-lived species with extended generation times, collecting adequate data to calculate age-specific fecundity, mortality, survivorship, and basic reproductive rates requires a data set over several years or decades. Because the vast majority of ecological field studies on mammals are only 3 to 5 years in duration, calculating life tables is rarely done (Millar and Zammuto 1983).

We summarize a 10-year data set on black bears in western Nevada to examine the impact of humans on life history traits of a large carnivore in areas where contact rates between humans and bears are high. The primary question is whether exposure to human activities and altered food resources in the form of garbage affect bear life history patterns.

We are unaware of any studies on urban carnivore populations that have estimated age-specific fecundity rates or life tables and compared them to populations existing in less human-disturbed environments. The ability to carry out this type of analysis is invaluable to understanding how individuals and, ultimately, populations respond to altered ecological regimes.

Methods

Our study was conducted in western Nevada where bears are restricted to the Carson Range of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, Sweetwater Range, Pine Nut Range, and the Wassuk Range in extreme western Nevada (Goodrich 1990; Figure 1). The current population estimate is 200-400 bears, the lowest of any western state (Beckmann and Berger 2003b). We specifically targeted 2 different types of bears: those in urban areas and those in wildland areas. From 1997 to 2006, 165 individuals were marked and released. Detailed procedures on capture, handling, and classification (urban versus wildland) for bears are found in Beckmann and Berger (2003b) and Beckmann and Lackey (2004). *A priori* individuals for which >90% of their location points were inside urban areas (defined by town and city delineation on coverage maps in ArcView 3.2) were defined as urban. Such sites in western Nevada were Carson City, Incline Village, Glenbrook, Stateline, Minden, and Gardnerville. South Lake Tahoe, California, was also considered an urban center in density calculations. Based upon our operational definition, there never was a case where it was questionable whether a bear was an urban or wildland bear. Urban bears always had >90% of their location points within urban areas, whereas wildland bears almost always had 100% of their location points outside urban areas (Beckmann and Berger 2003b). To estimate fecundity and life table parameters, we followed 12 marked females in an urban environment and 10 females in wildland

habitat from 1997–2006. These 22 bears were chosen because they were females we captured prior to their achieving reproductive maturity (<3 years of age), and collared. Thus, we could follow them throughout their entire lives. We estimated age-specific fecundity (m_x), age-specific mortality rates (q_x), and the finite rate of increase (λ) using the methods of Andrewartha and Birch (1954). Life tables were calculated

Figure 1. The region of western Nevada with mountain ranges containing black bears (*Ursus americanus*). Black bears are currently found in the Carson Range of the Sierra Nevada Mountains along the eastern shore of Lake Tahoe; the Pine Nut Range east of Carson City, Nevada; the Sweetwater Range that extends from California into Nevada; and the Wassuk Range located on the western shore of Walker Lake.

Black bear case history • Beckmann and Lackey 79


using Survival 6.0 Life Table program.

Our calculations of the finite rate of increase (λ) assumed a closed population, an assumption likely to be violated because of the close proximity of black bears in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of California. However, in the absence of genetic data from the California population, we were unable to estimate immigration rates. We note up-front several limitations to our analyses. (1) Our sample sizes are small relative to studies conducted under more controlled laboratory conditions because black bears are a long-lived, low-density species with extended generation times. However, we feel that our sample sizes for urban and wildland females are adequate to examine the impacts of human-altered landscapes on life history traits of this large carnivore. (2) We collapsed the final age-class of wildland bears into a >10-year-old group because all urban females included in this analysis were dead by age 10. This led to a conservative estimate of the finite rate of increase (λ) of wildland bears because no female cubs produced by wildland females >10 years of age are included in our calculations. (3) We have detected female bears up to 20 years of age in our study area. Therefore, the discrepancy in the finite rate of increase between the 2 populations is likely greater than what is reported here, with the actual λ for wildland bears being higher than that reported. Despite these potential limitations, our approach remains valuable.

Results

Age-specific fecundity (m_x = number of female cubs/female) of urban bears was higher during the early reproductive years (ages 4 and 5) and again in the prime reproductive years (ages 8–9) compared to wildland conspecifics (Figure 2). Urban female bears also had an earlier age of first reproduction (age 4) compared to that of wildland female bears (age 7) in this xeric environment (Figure 2). Fecundity rates generally increased for both groups as age increased, especially between ages 7 and 10. Age-specific mortality rates (q_x) were dramatically higher in the first 2 years of life for urban females ($q_x = 0.58$ and 0.20 respectively) compared to wildland conspecifics ($q_x = 0$ in both years; Figure 3). Both groups had similar age-specific mortality rates from age 2–7, although there was a lack of dispersal-related mortality in urban female bears at ages 2–3 as seen in wildland female bears (Figure 3). Urban female bear mortality surpassed that of wildland females again at age 8 (Figure 3). All 12 urban female bears were dead by age 10

Figure 2. Age-specific fecundity (m_x = female cubs/female) rate for urban and wildland American black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of western Nevada, USA. Values are based on 12 marked female bears in urban areas and ten in wildland areas from 1997–2006.



80 Human–Wildlife Conflicts 2(2), Fall 2008

due of collisions with vehicles. Our subsequent truncation of the data set at age 10 resulted in an age-specific mortality of 1.0 for wildland female bears at that age despite the fact that six were still alive.

Based on our data, higher levels of bear mortality in urban areas have led to the creation of sinks in urban centers as evidenced by the low finite rate of increase ($\lambda = 0.75$) in urban centers ($\lambda = 1$ represents a stable population). In contrast, wildland bear numbers in western Nevada are near the replacement rate ($\lambda = 1.0$). Survivorship curves demonstrate the high level of mortality among urban female bears,

Figure 3. Age-specific mortality (q_x) rate for urban and wildland American black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of western Nevada, USA. Values are based on 12 marked female bears in urban areas and ten in wildland areas from 1997–2006.





Figure 4. Age-specific survivorship curves for urban and wildland American black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of western Nevada, USA. Values are based on 12 marked females in urban areas and ten in wildland areas from 1997–2006.



Black bear case history • Beckmann and Lackey 81
 particularly during the first 2 years of life (Figure 4). The chronic high level of juvenile mortality in this urban population has led to a Type III survivorship curve that is generally seen for species that produce many offspring but provide little or no parental care. This urban bear population no longer exhibits the Type I survivorship curve generally associated with large mammals that produce few offspring. Over the 10-year study period, we handled a total of 43 female bear cubs <24 months of age. Of those, twenty-eight (65%) died before they reached 15 months of age (dispersal age); 78% of deaths were due to collisions with vehicles. During our 10-year study period, we documented 156 bear mortalities; all of the 151 bear deaths with a known cause were due to human activities, despite the continued protected status of bears in Nevada. Of the 151 human-caused bear mortalities, 89 bears were killed by vehicles, twenty-seven by agency management actions for public safety, seventeen for depredating livestock, two due to illegal killing, and sixteen

due to other causes (e.g., accidents, euthanized for poor body condition, etc.).

Discussion

Why has an increasing food supply in the form of garbage not led to more bears on the landscape and a subsequent repopulation of wildland areas? As our data make clear, bears in urban areas have experienced elevated levels of mortality that exceed reproductive rates, even though urban bears are more fecund than wildland bears.

In our study site, mortality due to anthropogenic causes have increased in the last few decades. We found that almost 9 bears have been killed annually by vehicles from 1997–2008. This represents a 17-fold increase in bear mortalities due to bear-vehicle collisions since the late 1980s (Goodrich 1993). During the late 1980s, before bears became conditioned to human food, no bears were destroyed because of safety concerns (Goodrich 1990). In contrast, 27 bears were euthanized because of safety concerns during the 10 years of our study.

We found that bear mortality in urban areas are exceeding recruitment rates. The creation of sinks in urban centers has resulted in the situation where bears are unable to repopulate vacated wildland areas following the shift to urban centers and food sources in the early to mid-1990s. In contrast to data collected on bears in the same region in the late 1980s (Goodrich 1990), we have now documented >100 urban bears, a 10-fold increase in the annual number of complaints, and a 17-fold increase in the annual bear mortality rate due to vehicles in the 1990s. In addition, densities have increased by >3-fold over baseline, historical levels (Goodrich 1990, Beckmann and Berger 2003b).

Changes have been so great that the estimated density of urban bears at our study site is the second highest density of black bears in North America (Beckmann and Berger 2003b). In contrast, the historical densities for our study population were low to intermediate relative to those elsewhere in North America, due to the xeric climate of our study site.

We believe that bears are being drawn out of wildland areas by a clumped food resource in urban areas (as evidenced by the positive

change in body mass, Beckmann and Berger 2003b) and concentrated into urban areas; stomachs of necropsied bears were filled with human garbage, and garbage was concentrated in urban areas. For example, in the Lake Tahoe Basin bears were historically found throughout the entire Carson Range (Goodrich 1990). However, due to the redistribution of bears in the landscape in the 1990s we were unable to capture any bears in the Carson Range outside of urban areas except at one small site (Little Valley, a 7-km² area). These findings reaffirm our supposition of dramatic and rapid decadal ecological shifts.

While discrepancies in age-specific fecundity, mortality, and the finite rate of increase between urban and wildland bears are striking, they are based on very conservative calculations. Because we truncated the data set at age 10 when all urban females were dead, we underestimated the true finite rate of increase for wildland bears, as six of them were still alive at age 10. None of their subsequent female cubs was included in our calculations. In reality, λ was likely even higher for wildland bears, making the difference between urban and wildland females even more extreme.

Bears in the Tahoe Basin are likely functioning in a source-sink dynamic, with urban areas acting as sinks for bears produced in both urban areas and wildland source areas. Further, **82 Human-Wildlife Conflicts 2(2)** given the near-replacement level of production in wildland areas and the sink in urban areas, the stable-sized population of bears in western Nevada over the past 15 years likely is the result of bear immigration from neighboring areas of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California.

Management and conservation implications

Without the empirical foundation that can be provided only by long-term life history studies, the permutations of assumed life history trait values in models for species such as black bears are infinite. The ability to place realistic boundaries on trait values based on field data is extremely important in cases in which management decisions may be based on projections from population modeling (Crouse

et al. 1987, Congdon and Dunham 1997). This is also true when a conflict exists between harvesting and conserving a species. High levels of bear mortality in urban areas have led to the creation of sinks in urban centers, and bears of the Lake Tahoe Basin currently are unable to repopulate vacated wildland areas following a shift to urban centers and urban food sources (Beckmann and Berger 2003b). If anthropogenic sources of mortality could be reduced in the region, it is likely that the bear population in the Lake Tahoe Basin and western Nevada would slowly start to increase due to reproductive rates in wildland source areas. At the same time, densities would likely redistribute across the landscape. Given that long-lived species such as black bears have limited ability to respond to high levels of juvenile mortality (Congdon et al. 1993), the current levels of mortality of young females in urban areas makes the long-term viability of this bear population tenuous.

Acknowledgments

We thank the University of Nevada, Nevada Agriculture Experiment Station, the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW), and the Wildlife Conservation Society for support. We also thank the numerous volunteers and NDOW personnel who assisted with data collection.

Literature cited

- Andrewartha, H. G., and L. C. Birch. 1954. The distribution and abundance of animals. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.
- Baker, R. O., and R. M. Timm. 1998. Management of conflicts between urban coyotes and humans in southern California. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference* 18:288–312.
- Beckmann, J. P., and J. Berger. 2003a. Rapid ecological and behavioural changes in carnivores: the responses of black bears (*Ursus americanus*) to altered food. *Journal of Zoology (London)* 261:207–212.
- Beckmann, J. P., and J. Berger. 2003b. Using black bears (*Ursus americanus*) to test ideal-free distribution models experimentally. *Journal of Mammalogy* 84:594–606.
- Beckmann, J. P., and C. W. Lackey. 2004. Are desert basins effective barriers to movements of relocated black bears (*Ursus americanus*)? *Western North America Naturalist* 64:269–272.
- Burgess, R. M. 2000. Arctic Fox. Pages 159–178 in J. C. Truett and S. R. Johnson, editors. *The*

- natural history of an arctic oil field: development and the biota. Academic Press, San Diego, California, USA.
- Congdon, J. D., and A. E. Dunham. 1997. Contributions of long-term life history studies to conservation biology. Pages 205–206 in G. K. Meffe and C. R. Carroll, editors. Principles of Conservation Biology. Sinauer Associates Inc., Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA.
- Congdon, J. D., A. E. Dunham, and R. C. van Loben Sels. 1993. Delayed sexual maturity and demographics of Blanding's turtles (*Emydoidea blandingi*): implications for conservation and management of long-lived organisms. Conservation Biology 7:826–833.
- Craighead, J. J., J. S. Sumner, and J. A. Mitchell. 1995. The grizzly bears of Yellowstone: their ecology in the Yellowstone ecosystem, 1959–1992. Island Press, Washington D. C., USA.
- Crouse, D. T., L. B. Crowder, and H. Caswell. 1987. A stage-based population model for loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) and implications for conservation. Ecology 68:1412–1423.
- Ferreras, P., P. Gaona, F. Palomares, and M. Delibes. 2001. Restore habitat or reduce mortality? Implications from a population viability analysis of the Iberian lynx. Animal Conservation 4:265–274.
- Frölich, K., W. Jürgen Streich, J. Fickel, S. Jung, U. Truyen, J. Hentschke, J. Dedek, D. Prager, and N. Latz. 2005. Epizootiologic investigation of parvovirus infections in free-ranging carnivores from Germany. Journal of Wildlife Disease 41:231–235.
- Goodrich, J. M. 1990. Ecology, conservation, and management of two western Great Basin black bear populations. Thesis, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.
- Goodrich, J. M. 1993. Nevada black bears: ecology, management, and conservation. Nevada Department of Wildlife. Biological Bulletin 11.
- Grinder, M., and P. R. Krausman. 2001. Morbidity—mortality factors and survival of an urban coyote population in Arizona. Journal of Wildlife Disease 37:312–317.
- Mattson, D. J. 1990. Human impacts on bear habitat use. International Conference on Bear Research and Management 8:33–56.
- Millar, J. S., and R. M. Zammuto. 1983. Life histories of mammals: an analysis of life tables. Ecology 64:631–635.
- Prange, S., S. D. Gehrt, and E. P. Wiggers. 2004. Influences of anthropogenic resources on raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) movement and spatial distribution. Journal of Mammalogy 85:483–490.
- Tiedemann, R., O. Hardy, X. Vekemans, and M. C. Milinkovitch. 2000. Higher impact of female than male migration on population structure in

large mammals. *Molecular Ecology* 9:1159–1163.

Torres, S. G., T. M. Mausfeld, J. E. Foley, T. Lupo, and A. Brinlchaus. 1996. Mountain lion and human activity in California: testing speculations. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 24:451–460.

Woodroffe, R., and J. R. Ginsberg. 2000. Ranging behavior and vulnerability to extinction in carnivores. Pages 125–140 in M. L. Gosling, and W. J. Sutherland, editors. *Behaviour and conservation*. Cambridge University Press,

Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA *Human–Wildlife Conflicts* 2(2), Fall 2008

Carnivores, urban landscapes, and longitudinal studies: a case history of black bears

JON P. BECKMANN, Wildlife Conservation Society, North America Program, 2023 Stadium Drive, Suite 1A, Bozeman, MT 59715 USA jbeckmann@wcs.org

CARL W. LACKEY, Nevada Department of Wildlife, 1100 Valley Road, Reno, NV 89512 USA

Abstract: As urban landscapes expand across the globe, it becomes imperative to understand how these landscapes affect large carnivore populations. We examined the effects of humanaltered landscapes on age-specific fecundity and life history parameters for female black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in urban and wildland regions in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of Nevada, including the Lake Tahoe Basin. We followed 12 marked female bears in an urban environment and 10 females in wildland habitats from 1997–2006. Our results show that female bears in urban areas have higher age-specific fecundity rates. Despite this difference, female bears in urban areas never realized this putative gain in fitness because they experienced higher age-specific mortality rates, leading to the creation of sinks ($\lambda = 0.749$). Urban bears of the Lake Tahoe Basin are unable to repopulate vacated wildland areas.

Key words: black bears, human–wildlife conflicts, life tables, source sink, urban interface, *Ursus americanus*

Human activities associated with urban areas impact the viability of carnivore populations. Impacts include altering (1) behavior of individuals (Mattson 1990, Baker and Timm 1998, Beckmann and Berger 2003a), (2) distributions of populations (Craighead et al. 1995, Beckmann and Berger 2003b, Prange et al. 2004), (3) movements of individuals and use of corridors or linkage areas (Torres et al. 1996, Prange et al. 2004), (4) disease ecology of populations (Frolich et al. 2005), (5) diets (Craighead et al. 1995, Burgess 2000, Beckmann and Berger 2003b), and (6) mortality (Woodroffe and Ginsberg 2000, Grindler and Krausman 2001). Most impacts of human activities on these parameters have been investigated singly in separate, independent studies that have focused mainly on behavioral or ecological changes. Hence, little is understood about the

impacts of human-altered landscapes on entire life histories of individuals in a population, especially for large carnivores. Ecologists use population-modeling tools, such as minimum viable population (MVP) analyses and island biogeography theory to predict the likelihood of populations of various sizes surviving into the future (Ferrerias et al. 2001). Many studies have focused on the theoretical basis of population viability, by modeling differing scenarios of mortality, reproductive rates, and migration under various hypothetical environmental conditions (e.g., Tiedemann et al. 2000). Many of these models are not based on empirical data from the field because one of the most challenging tasks facing population biologists who focus on large mammals is accurately estimating the number of individuals in a population and calculating age-specific survivorship and fecundity schedules (Millar and Zammuto 1983). As humans continue to expand their distribution into regions that contain carnivores, there will be a more pressing need for temporal data sets examining changes not only in behavioral parameters of carnivores, but in life history parameters, as well. Currently, such information exists for only a handful of carnivore species and rarely in urban settings. Such broad gaps in knowledge of the temporal impacts of human perturbations on large carnivores make conservation of these species difficult. Despite the relatively simple calculations involved, life history tables potentially can be one of the most useful tools to examine the impacts of various environmental conditions and changes in land-use patterns on a species (Millar and Zammuto 1983). However, for most long-lived species with extended generation times, collecting adequate data to calculate age-specific fecundity, mortality, survivorship, and basic reproductive rates requires a data set over several years or decades. Because the vast majority of ecological field studies on mammals are only 3 to 5 years in duration, calculating life tables is rarely done (Millar and Zammuto 1983).

We summarize a 10-year data

set on black bears in western Nevada to examine the impact of humans on life history traits of a large carnivore in areas where contact rates between humans and bears are high. The primary question is whether exposure to human activities and altered food resources in the form of garbage affect bear life history patterns. We are unaware of any studies on urban carnivore populations that have estimated age-specific fecundity rates or life tables and compared them to populations existing in less human-disturbed environments. The ability to carry out this type of analysis is invaluable to understanding how individuals and, ultimately, populations respond to altered ecological regimes.

Methods

Our study was conducted in western Nevada where bears are restricted to the Carson Range of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, Sweetwater Range, Pine Nut Range, and the Wassuk Range in extreme western Nevada (Goodrich 1990; Figure 1). The current population estimate is 200-400 bears, the lowest of any western state (Beckmann and Berger 2003b). We specifically targeted 2 different types of bears: those in urban areas and those in wildland areas. From 1997 to 2006, 165 individuals were marked and released. Detailed procedures on capture, handling, and classification (urban versus wildland) for bears are found in Beckmann and Berger (2003b) and Beckmann and Lackey (2004). *A priori* individuals for which >90% of their location points were inside urban areas (defined by town and city delineation on coverage maps in ArcView 3.2) were defined as urban. Such sites in western Nevada were Carson City, Incline Village, Glenbrook, Stateline, Minden, and Gardnerville. South Lake Tahoe, California, was also considered an urban center in density calculations. Based upon our operational

definition, there never was a case where it was questionable whether a bear was an urban or wildland bear. Urban bears always had >90% of their location points within urban areas, whereas wildland bears almost always had 100% of their location points outside urban areas (Beckmann and Berger 2003b).

To estimate fecundity and life table parameters, we followed 12 marked females in an urban environment and 10 females in wildland habitat from 1997–2006. These 22 bears were chosen because they were females we captured prior to their achieving reproductive maturity (<3 years of age), and collared. Thus, we could follow them throughout their entire lives. We estimated age-specific fecundity (m_x), age-specific mortality rates (q_x), and the finite rate of increase (λ) using the methods of Andrewartha and Birch (1954). Life tables were calculated

Figure 1. The region of western Nevada with mountain ranges containing black bears (*Ursus americanus*). Black bears are currently found in the Carson Range of the Sierra Nevada Mountains along the eastern shore of Lake Tahoe; the Pine Nut Range east of Carson City, Nevada; the Sweetwater Range that extends from California into Nevada; and the Wassuk Range located on the western shore of Walker Lake.

Black bear case history • Beckmann and Lackey 79
using Survival 6.0 Life Table program.


Our calculations of the finite rate of increase (λ) assumed a closed population, an assumption likely to be violated because of the close proximity of black bears in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of California. However, in the absence of genetic data from the California population, we were unable to estimate immigration rates. We note up-front several limitations to our analyses. (1) Our sample sizes are small relative to studies conducted under more controlled laboratory conditions because black bears are a long-lived, low-density species with extended generation times. However, we feel that our sample sizes for urban and wildland females are adequate to examine the impacts of human-altered landscapes on life history traits of this large carnivore. (2) We collapsed the final age-class of wildland bears into a >10-year-old group because all urban females included in this analysis were dead by age 10. This led to a conservative estimate of the finite rate of increase (λ) of wildland bears because no female cubs produced by

wildland females >10 years of age are included in our calculations. (3) We have detected female bears up to 20 years of age in our study area. Therefore, the discrepancy in the finite rate of increase between the 2 populations is likely greater than what is reported here, with the actual λ for wildland bears being higher than that reported. Despite these potential limitations, our approach remains valuable.

Results

Age-specific fecundity (m_x = number of female cubs/female) of urban bears was higher during the early reproductive years (ages 4 and 5) and again in the prime reproductive years (ages 8–9) compared to wildland conspecifics (Figure 2). Urban female bears also had an earlier age of first reproduction (age 4) compared to that of wildland female bears (age 7) in this xeric environment (Figure 2). Fecundity rates generally increased for both groups as age increased, especially between ages 7 and 10. Age-specific mortality rates (q_x) were dramatically higher in the first 2 years of life for urban females ($q_x = 0.58$ and 0.20 respectively) compared to wildland conspecifics ($q_x = 0$ in both years; Figure 3). Both groups had similar age-specific mortality rates from age 2–7, although there was a lack of dispersal-related mortality in urban female bears at ages 2–3 as seen in wildland female bears (Figure 3). Urban female bear mortality surpassed that of wildland females again at age 8 (Figure 3). All 12 urban female bears were dead by age 10

Figure 2. Age-specific fecundity (m_x = female cubs/female) rate for urban and wildland American black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of western Nevada, USA. Values are based on 12 marked female bears in urban areas and ten in wildland areas from 1997–2006.



Urban
80 *Human–Wildlife Conflicts* 2(2), Fall 2008

due of collisions with vehicles. Our subsequent truncation of the data set at age 10 resulted in an age-specific mortality of 1.0 for wildland female bears at that age despite the fact that six

were still alive.

Based on our data, higher levels of bear mortality in urban areas have led to the creation of sinks in urban centers as evidenced by the low finite rate of increase ($\lambda = 0.75$) in urban centers ($\lambda = 1$ represents a stable population).

In contrast, wildland bear numbers in western Nevada are near the replacement rate ($\lambda = 1.0$).

Survivorship curves demonstrate the high level of mortality among urban female bears,

Figure 3. Age-specific mortality (q_x) rate for urban and wildland American black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of western Nevada, USA. Values are based on 12 marked female bears in urban areas and ten in wildland areas from 1997–2006.





Figure 4. Age-specific survivorship curves for urban and wildland American black bears (*Ursus americanus*) in the northern Sierra Nevada Mountains of western Nevada, USA. Values are based on 12 marked females in urban areas and ten in wildland areas from 1997–2006.



Black bear case history • Beckmann and Lackey 81 particularly during the first 2 years of life (Figure 4). The chronic high level of juvenile mortality in this urban population has led to a Type III survivorship curve that is generally seen for species that produce many offspring but provide little or no parental care. This urban bear population no longer exhibits the Type I survivorship curve generally associated with large mammals that produce few offspring. Over the 10-year study period, we handled a total of 43 female bear cubs <24 months of age. Of those, twenty-eight (65%) died before they reached 15 months of age (dispersal age); 78% of deaths

were due to collisions with vehicles. During our 10-year study period, we documented 156 bear mortalities; all of the 151 bear deaths with a known cause were due to human activities, despite the continued protected status of bears in Nevada. Of the 151 human-caused bear mortalities, 89 bears were killed by vehicles, twenty-seven by agency management actions for public safety, seventeen for depredating livestock, two due to illegal killing, and sixteen due to other causes (e.g., accidents, euthanized for poor body condition, etc.).

Discussion

Why has an increasing food supply in the form of garbage not led to more bears on the landscape and a subsequent repopulation of wildland areas? As our data make clear, bears in urban areas have experienced elevated levels of mortality that exceed reproductive rates, even though urban bears are more fecund than wildland bears.

In our study site, mortality due to anthropogenic causes have increased in the last few decades. We found that almost 9 bears have been killed annually by vehicles from 1997–2008. This represents a 17-fold increase in bear mortalities due to bear-vehicle collisions since the late 1980s (Goodrich 1993). During the late 1980s, before bears became conditioned to human food, no bears were destroyed because of safety concerns (Goodrich 1990). In contrast, 27 bears were euthanized because of safety concerns during the 10 years of our study.

We found that bear mortality in urban areas are exceeding recruitment rates. The creation of sinks in urban centers has resulted in the situation where bears are unable to repopulate vacated wildland areas following the shift to urban centers and food sources in the early to mid-1990s. In contrast to data collected on bears in the same region in the late 1980s (Goodrich 1990), we have now documented >100 urban bears, a 10-fold increase in the annual number of complaints, and a 17-fold increase in the annual bear mortality rate due to vehicles in the 1990s. In addition, densities have increased by >3-fold over baseline, historical levels (Goodrich 1990, Beckmann and Berger 2003b). Changes have been so great that the estimated

density of urban bears at our study site is the second highest density of black bears in North America (Beckmann and Berger 2003b). In contrast, the historical densities for our study population were low to intermediate relative to those elsewhere in North America, due to the xeric climate of our study site.

We believe that bears are being drawn out of wildland areas by a clumped food resource in urban areas (as evidenced by the positive change in body mass, Beckmann and Berger 2003b) and concentrated into urban areas; stomachs of necropsied bears were filled with human garbage, and garbage was concentrated in urban areas. For example, in the Lake Tahoe Basin bears were historically found throughout the entire Carson Range (Goodrich 1990).

However, due to the redistribution of bears in the landscape in the 1990s we were unable to capture any bears in the Carson Range outside of urban areas except at one small site (Little Valley, a 7-km² area). These findings reaffirm our supposition of dramatic and rapid decadal ecological shifts.

While discrepancies in age-specific fecundity, mortality, and the finite rate of increase between urban and wildland bears are striking, they are based on very conservative calculations. Because we truncated the data set at age 10 when all urban females were dead, we underestimated the true finite rate of increase for wildland bears, as six of them were still alive at age 10. None of their subsequent female cubs was included in our calculations. In reality, λ was likely even higher for wildland bears, making the difference between urban and wildland females even more extreme.

Bears in the Tahoe Basin are likely functioning in a source-sink dynamic, with urban areas acting as sinks for bears produced in both urban areas and wildland source areas. Further,

82 Human-Wildlife Conflicts 2(2)

given the near-replacement level of production in wildland areas and the sink in urban areas, the stable-sized population of bears in western Nevada over the past 15 years likely is the result of bear immigration from neighboring areas of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California.

Management and conservation

implications

Without the empirical foundation that can be provided only by long-term life history studies, the permutations of assumed life history trait values in models for species such as black bears are infinite. The ability to place realistic boundaries on trait values based on field data is extremely important in cases in which management decisions may be based on projections from population modeling (Crouse et al. 1987, Congdon and Dunham 1997). This is also true when a conflict exists between harvesting and conserving a species.

High levels of bear mortality in urban areas have led to the creation of sinks in urban centers, and bears of the Lake Tahoe Basin currently are unable to repopulate vacated wildland areas following a shift to urban centers and urban food sources (Beckmann and Berger 2003b).

If anthropogenic sources of mortality could be reduced in the region, it is likely that the bear population in the Lake Tahoe Basin and western Nevada would slowly start to increase due to reproductive rates in wildland source areas. At the same time, densities would likely redistribute across the landscape. Given that long-lived species such as black bears have limited ability to respond to high levels of juvenile mortality (Congdon et al. 1993), the current levels of mortality of young females in urban areas makes the long-term viability of this bear population tenuous.

Acknowledgments

We thank the University of Nevada, Nevada Agriculture Experiment Station, the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW), and the Wildlife Conservation Society for support. We also thank the numerous volunteers and NDOW personnel who assisted with data collection.

Literature cited

Andrewartha, H. G., and L. C. Birch. 1954. The distribution and abundance of animals. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.
Baker, R. O., and R. M. Timm. 1998. Management of conflicts between urban coyotes and humans in southern California. Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference 18:288–312.
Beckmann, J. P., and J. Berger. 2003a. Rapid ecological and behavioural changes in carnivores: the responses of black bears (*Ursus americanus*) to altered food. Journal of Zoology (London)

261:207–212.

Beckmann, J. P., and J. Berger. 2003b. Using black bears (*Ursus americanus*) to test ideal-free distribution models experimentally. *Journal of Mammalogy* 84:594–606.

Beckmann, J. P., and C. W. Lackey. 2004. Are desert basins effective barriers to movements of relocated black bears (*Ursus americanus*)? *Western North America Naturalist* 64:269–272.

Burgess, R. M. 2000. Arctic Fox. Pages 159–178 in J. C. Truett and S. R. Johnson, editors. *The natural history of an arctic oil field: development and the biota*. Academic Press, San Diego, California, USA.

Congdon, J. D., and A. E. Dunham. 1997. Contributions of long-term life history studies to conservation biology. Pages 205–206 in G. K. Meffe and C. R. Carroll, editors. *Principles of Conservation Biology*. Sinauer Associates Inc., Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA.

Congdon, J. D., A. E. Dunham, and R. C. van Loben Sels. 1993. Delayed sexual maturity and demographics of Blanding's turtles (*Emydoidea blandingi*): implications for conservation and management of long-lived organisms. *Conservation Biology* 7:826–833.

Craighead, J. J., J. S. Sumner, and J. A. Mitchell. 1995. *The grizzly bears of Yellowstone: their ecology in the Yellowstone ecosystem, 1959–1992*. Island Press, Washington D. C., USA.

Crouse, D. T., L. B. Crowder, and H. Caswell. 1987. A stage-based population model for loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) and implications for conservation. *Ecology* 68:1412–1423.

Ferreras, P., P. Gaona, F. Palomares, and M. Delibes. 2001. Restore habitat or reduce mortality? Implications from a population viability analysis of the Iberian lynx. *Animal Conservation* 4:265–274.

Frölich, K., W. Jürgen Streich, J. Fickel, S. Jung, U. Truyen, J. Hentschke, J. Dedek, D. Prager, and N. Latz. 2005. Epizootiologic investigation of parvovirus infections in free-ranging carnivores from Germany. *Journal of Wildlife Disease* 41:231–235.

Goodrich, J. M. 1990. *Ecology, conservation, and management of two western Great Basin black bear populations*. Thesis, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.

Goodrich, J. M. 1993. *Nevada black bears: ecology, management, and conservation*. Nevada Department of Wildlife. *Biological Bulletin* 11.

Grinder, M., and P. R. Krausman. 2001. Morbidity—mortality factors and survival of an urban coyote population in Arizona. *Journal of Wildlife Disease* 37:312–317.

Mattson, D. J. 1990. Human impacts on bear habitat

- use. International Conference on Bear Research and Management 8:33–56.
- Millar, J. S., and R. M. Zammuto. 1983. Life histories of mammals: an analysis of life tables. *Ecology* 64:631–635.
- Prange, S., S. D. Gehrt, and E. P. Wiggers. 2004. Influences of anthropogenic resources on raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) movement and spatial distribution. *Journal of Mammalogy* 85:483–490.
- Tiedemann, R., O. Hardy, X. Vekemans, and M. C. Milinkovitch. 2000. Higher impact of female than male migration on population structure in large mammals. *Molecular Ecology* 9:1159–1163.
- Torres, S. G., T. M. Mausfeld, J. E. Foley, T. Lupo, and A. Brinlchaus. 1996. Mountain lion and human activity in California: testing speculations. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 24:451–460.
- Woodroffe, R., and J. R. Ginsberg. 2000. Ranging behavior and vulnerability to extinction in carnivores. Pages 125–140 in M. L. Gosling, and W. J. Sutherland, editors. *Behaviour and conservation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA