

GRIZZLY BEAR

Ursus arctos

*Original prepared by Les Gyug,
Tony Hamilton, and Matt Austin*

Species Information

Taxonomy

The Grizzly Bear, *Ursus arctos*, is one of eight species of the bear family, Ursidae. There are currently two recognized North American subspecies: *U. arctos horribilis*, the common subspecies, and *U. arctos middendorffi*, the Kodiak bear, found on a few Alaskan coastal islands.

Description

Bears are different from other carnivores by their greatly enlarged molar teeth with surfaces that have lost their shearing function and are adapted to crushing, in keeping with their omnivorous diets. The forelimbs are strongly built and the feet are plantigrade and have five toes. Forefeet have long, non-retractile claws. The ears are small and the tail is extremely short.

The Grizzly Bear is the second largest member of the bear family next only to the polar bear (*U. maritimus*). Grizzlies are large, heavy-bodied bears that can attain weights of up to 500 kg (average range 270–360 kg). Exceptionally large bears have been recorded at 680 kg. Adult grizzlies reach nose-to-tail lengths of 1.8 m on average but have been recorded as long as 2.7 m. The long, outer guard hairs of the Grizzly Bear are often tipped with white, silver, or cream giving the bear a grizzled appearance. Coat colour is quite variable, usually brown but ranging from black to almost white. Coat colour is not a good characteristic for distinguishing between Grizzly Bears and Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*). Grizzly Bear facial profiles are usually “dished-in” and a hump of muscle is normally present on the shoulders. The front claws on a

Grizzly Bear are longer than on Black Bears, being as long as 10 cm. The long front claws and hump of muscle on the shoulders are adaptations for digging.

Distribution

Global

The Grizzly Bear has a circumpolar distribution once covering most of North America, Europe, and the northern part of Asia. In many of these areas it has been exterminated or its numbers have been greatly reduced. Most of the world’s Grizzly Bears now occur in northwestern North America and Russia.

In North America, Grizzly Bears once ranged over most of the west, from Alaska south to Mexico, and from the Pacific coast east to Manitoba, and the Missouri River (Banci 1991). In the wake of westward development and settlement, especially in the plains, the range of the grizzly shrank to its present distribution of Alaska, the Yukon Territory, and British Columbia, with small populations in Alberta, the Northwest Territories, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

British Columbia

Grizzly Bears historically occurred throughout British Columbia, with the exception of some coastal islands (e.g., Vancouver Island, Queen Charlotte Islands, and others). Populations are considered extirpated from much of south and southcentral British Columbia (e.g., lower elevations of the Okanagan, the Lower Mainland, and parts of the Cariboo). However, Grizzly Bear are occasionally sighted in the southern interior plateaus and other areas from which their populations are considered effectively extirpated.

Forest regions and districts

Grizzly Bears occur in all forest regions and almost all forest districts **except** South Island, and Queen Charlotte Islands, and only in the mainland portions of the Campbell River and North Island forest districts.

Ecoprovinces and ecosections

Grizzly Bears occur in most ecoprovinces and ecosections in mainland British Columbia but are absent from Vancouver Island and Queen Charlotte Islands. The following are mainland ecosections within which Grizzly Bear populations are considered **extirpated**:

BOP: PEL, and parts of CLH, HAP, KIP

CEI: CAB, FRB, and parts of CAP, CHP, NAU, QUL

COM: NWC, and parts of EPR, SPR

GED: GEL, FRL

SOI: SOB, SOH, NOB, THB and parts of NOH, NTU, OKR, PAR, STU

Biogeoclimatic units

Grizzly Bears occur in all biogeoclimatic units except BG and CDF.

Broad ecosystem units

Grizzly Bears are wide ranging, and can occur in most broad ecosystem units.

Elevation

All elevations from sea level estuaries to high alpine meadows and talus slopes.

Life History

Diet and foraging behaviour

In British Columbia, Grizzly Bears are efficient predators and scavengers but rely more on a vegetative diet. Grizzly Bears consume a wide variety of foods, including roots and green vegetation, small and large mammals, fish, and insects. A huge variety of plant, animal, fish, and insect food sources are regionally important. Grizzly Bears are omnivorous and opportunistic in their feeding habitats. Habitat

selection is governed by forage availability during the growing season. Grizzly Bear diet also changes with the seasons to make use of the most digestible foods. For example, Grizzly Bears will take advantage of palatable early spring forage. Feeding on ungulates is important during early spring, and for many bears, salmon comprises a significant fall diet item.

In general, the largest differences in the feeding patterns are between coastal and interior Grizzly Bears. On the coast (MacHutchon et al. 1993; Hamilton 1987), beginning in the spring, Grizzly Bears feed on early green vegetation such as skunk cabbage (*Lysichiton americanus*) and sedges located in the estuaries and seepage sites that become snow-free first. As the season advances, the bears follow the receding snow up the avalanche chutes feeding on emerging vegetation and roots. Ripe berries attract the grizzlies down onto the floodplain and lower slopes where they eat devil's-club (*Oplopanax horridus*), salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), raspberry (*Rubus* spp.), black twinberry (*Lonicera involucrata*), elderberry (*Sambucus* spp.), and a variety of blueberries (*Vaccinium* spp.). They begin to feed on salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) as they become available in the spawning channels and continue to do so until late fall, feeding on live and eventually dead salmon. Once salmon supplies dwindle, grizzlies return to feeding on skunk cabbage and other vegetation. Grizzlies will feed on insects and grubs when the opportunity arises, as well as molluscs and other animals of the intertidal zone.

In the interior (Simpson 1987; McLellan and Hovey 1995; Ciarniello et al. 2001) beginning in the spring, grizzlies feed mainly on the roots of *Hedysarum* spp., spring beauty (*Claytonia lacneolata*), and/or avalanche lily (*Erythronium grandiflorum*) depending on local abundance, and on carrion. They may also opportunistically prey on winter-weakened ungulates. As the green vegetation emerges the bears begin to graze on grasses, horsetails, rushes, and sedges. During this time, they also prey on ungulates on their calving grounds. In summer, bears follow the green-up to obtain nutritious young spring growth including locally important food sources such as cow-parsnip (*Heracleum* spp.). They also

obtain early ripening fruits beginning in mid-July mainly in riparian forests and productive low elevation seral forests, such as pine-soopolallie terraces. In late-summer and fall (August–October) high elevation berries become the major food source, mainly soopolallie (*Shepherdia canadensis*), blueberries, and huckleberries. Late fall feeding focuses mainly on harder berries such as mountain ash (*Sorbus* spp.) or kinnickinnick (*Arctostaphylos uva-ursi*) that persist past the *Vaccinium* fruiting season, and on the roots of *Hedysarum* in areas where it occurs. Throughout the active season, interior grizzlies will prey on small mammals, especially ground squirrels (*Spermophilus* spp.) Fish, roots, pine nuts, or bulbs, and insects are important whenever they are available and sufficiently abundant. Army cutworm moths (Noctuidae) in high elevation alpine talus slopes and boulder fields may be locally important (White et al. 1998a).

Reproduction

Breeding occurs between the end of April and end of June. Cubs are born in the den between January and March. The average age of first reproduction for females in southeastern British Columbia is 6 years, the time period between litters is 2.7 years, and the mean number of cubs per litter is 2.3 (McLellan 1989a). In southern grizzly populations, cubs tend to stay with the mother for approximately 2.5 years. Females remain in estrus throughout the breeding season until mating occurs and do not ovulate again for at least 2 (usually 3 or 4) years after giving birth. Two offspring are generally born per litter, and young are born blind and without fur. They are weaned at 5 months of age but remain with the mother until at least their second spring (and usually until the third or fourth).

Site fidelity

Many telemetry studies have shown that Grizzly Bears are creatures of habit and will usually return to the same seasonal food sources and areas throughout their lifetimes. Foraging strategies are somewhat flexible; individuals adapt to annual variation in food supply and can learn to exploit newly available food sources. However, many of a

Grizzly Bear's movements, habitat selection, and foraging patterns are learned as a cub and are reinforced throughout their lives (20–30 yr). Home range fidelity may be strong as a result, especially for females.

Home range

Home range sizes are proportionate to food quality, quantity, and distribution. Generally Grizzly Bear home ranges in productive coastal habitats near salmon stream are smaller than ranges in interior mountains, which are again smaller than ranges in interior plateau habitats. For coastal British Columbia, average minimum single year home range size was 137 km² for males, and 52 km² for females (Khutzeymateen: MacHutchon et al. 1993). For wet interior mountains, average home range size was 187 km² for males and 103 km² for females (Parsnip: Ciarniello et al. 2001; Revelstoke: Simpson 1987). For drier interior mountains or plateau areas, average home range size was 804 km² for males and 222 km² for females (Parsnip: Ciarniello et al. 2001; Flathead: McLellan 1981; Jasper: Russell et al. 1979; Kananaskis: Wielgus 1986).

Grizzly Bears, except females with cubs, and sibling groups, are solitary for most of the year except during the mating season. Mothers, daughters, and even granddaughters tend to have overlapping home ranges, while male home ranges are large and overlap with several adult females (Bunnell and McCann 1993). Habitat use and food habits studies have shown that the areas occupied by male grizzlies (200–300 km²) are much larger than what would be required simply to obtain food. The smaller range sizes of females with young (100 km²), which have greater energy needs than males, may provide the best estimate of the minimum feeding habitat requirements of individual bears. The large range sizes of male Grizzly Bears are probably related more to breeding than to food availability, while females may use small ranges where they can improve security of the young while still obtaining adequate food. Social intolerance and security needs of young bears probably act to distribute grizzlies widely over the available range. In many areas, adult females may inhabit marginal ranges or disturbed areas, such as

road margins, where human activities exclude most larger males (McLellan and Shackleton 1988). The size of individual home ranges varies annually in response to variation in quality and abundance of food (Picton et al. 1985). Grizzly Bear habitat use is strongly influenced by intraspecific social interactions (e.g., male predation on cubs) and the presence and activities of people.

Movements and dispersal

Grizzly Bears have low dispersal capabilities relative to other carnivores (Weaver et al. 1996). This is especially true for subadult female Grizzly Bears, which usually establish their home range within or adjacent to the maternal range (e.g., McLellan and Hovey 2001). On average, male Grizzly Bears only dispersed 30 km from the ranges used as cubs with their mothers, and female Grizzly Bears only 10 km (McLellan and Hovey 2001). This inherent fidelity, particularly of female Grizzly Bears, to their maternal home ranges may reduce the rate of recolonization of areas where breeding populations have been depleted.

Habitat

Structural stage

In general terms, Grizzly Bear forage tends to be more abundant in non-forested sites, or sites with partial forest, or sites with many tree gaps in older forest. However, security habitat and day bedding areas (for heat relief, rain interception, or warmth) tend to be closed forest sites near higher quality foraging sites. Some types of forage (e.g., salmon in streams, ants in logs, ungulates) can be found within many structural stages and the forage is not necessarily tied to any particular structural stage. (Refer to Table 1 on following page.)

Important habitats and habitat elements

Denning

Denning sites are generally used from November through March and usually to mid-April in the northern areas of British Columbia. Hibernating habitats tend to be high elevation areas that are sloped, and have dry, stable soil conditions that remain

frozen during the winter (Bunnell and McCann 1993). Dens are usually on steep north-facing slopes, with soils suitable for digging and where vegetation will stabilize the roof of the den and snow will accumulate for insulation (Vroom et al. 1977). Wet or seepage areas and areas with shallow soils or many boulders are avoided. Bears seldom reuse an excavated den but will often come back to the same vicinity to dig their new den (Ciarniello et al. 2001).

On the coast, dens are often dug under large old trees. The tree's root mass creates a stable roof for the den. Coastal grizzlies may also use very large tree cavities much like coastal Black Bears.

Foraging

Grizzly Bears in British Columbia have such an enormous range of learned behavioural adaptations to diverse regional ecosystems that generalization about habitat requirements is difficult. Even within a region, individual bears may have vastly different approaches to meeting their requirements. Some bears, particularly males, adopt a highly mobile, seasonally "transient" strategy, whereas other bears are more "resident." Some bears rely more heavily on predation than others, and some use higher elevation annual home ranges as opposed to migrating to lower elevations on a seasonal basis.

Although meeting nutritional requirements is the primary factor in habitat choice, selection is also based on thermal cover (e.g., dens/bedding sites), security (e.g., females protecting cubs), or access to potential mates during the breeding season. Habitat selection is also strongly influenced by intra-specific (social) interactions and the presence and activities of people.

Grizzly Bear habitat requirements must be viewed at several spatial scales. Transients deliberately travel to specific landscapes in a sub-region on a seasonal basis. Both residents and transients select specific patches of habitat or complexes of habitats within landscapes. Within patches, they may only require specific food-producing microsites. Habitat requirements must also be viewed at various temporal scales; continually shifting seasonal food supplies, annual food variance (e.g., berry crop failure), and

Table 1. Forage values by structural stage

Stage	Value
1a	Forage value for army cutworm moths in alpine rockfields or intertidal marine molluscs in estuaries. Otherwise generally nil forage value except in the presence of human foods or garbage. Seasonal use of small mammals (marmots and ground squirrels).
1b	Forage value for army cutworm moths in alpine rockfields. Forage value for intertidal marine molluscs in estuaries. Otherwise generally nil forage value except in the presence of human foods or garbage.
2	Forage value can be very high on bulbs, corms, grasses, horsetails, and other herbs. These values can be found variously in wet meadows, marshes, avalanche slopes, or alpine/subalpine meadows.
3a	Forage value can be very high, particularly in recovering burned or clearcut sites where <i>Vaccinium</i> berries are abundant.
3b	Forage value can be very high, particularly in recovering burned or clearcut sites where <i>Vaccinium</i> berries are abundant. Forage value can be high in skunk cabbage swamps, which are usually a mixture of structural stages because the typical skunk cabbage swamp is often partially treed, and contains tall alder or willow shrubs as well. Similarly typical avalanche slopes are mixtures of herb, low shrub, and tall shrub stages, all of which can provide high forage values for Grizzly Bears.
4	Typical value of densely forested sites, which preclude most herb or shrub forage values, are as day bedding sites for security and heat relief in areas near other types of foraging sites. Forests that are not as densely forested may continue to support berry patches (soopolallie or <i>Vaccinium</i>) in forests beyond the open shrub stage.
5	Typical value of densely forested sites, which preclude most herb or shrub forage values, are as day bedding sites for security and heat relief in areas near other types of foraging sites. Forests that are not as densely forested may continue to support berry patches (soopolallie or <i>Vaccinium</i>) in forests beyond the open shrub stage.
6	Typical value of densely forested sites, which preclude most herb or shrub forage values, are as day bedding sites for security and heat relief in areas near other types of foraging sites. Forests that are not as densely forested may continue to support berry patches (soopolallie or <i>Vaccinium</i>) in forests beyond the open shrub stage.
7	Value of forest (beyond security and heat relief) will depend on amount of openings in forest. Forests that remain dense in stage 7 will have little value beyond that found in stages 4, 5, and 6. Forests that become patchy with numerous gaps or dying canopies may support various amounts of berries or herbs for foraging in the canopy gaps.

long-term influences on habitat quality such as fire suppression must all be considered. Concurrent attention must be given to meeting the spatial requirements of individuals within and across landscapes and examining population level habitat supply.

Conservation and Management

Status

Grizzly Bears are on the provincial *Blue List* in British Columbia. In Canada, Grizzly Bears are considered of *Special Concern* in British Columbia and *Extirpated* in part of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba (COSEWIC 2002). (See Summary of ABI status in BC and adjacent jurisdictions at bottom of page.)

Trends

Population trends

The provincial population estimate from the B.C. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection for Grizzly Bears is estimated at a minimum of 13 800, which is ~50% of the Canadian Grizzly Bear population. Overall, the population in British Columbia currently appears stable, but local population declines have occurred in the past in many areas of the province. Grizzly Bears are considered threatened in 8% of their historic range in British Columbia and effectively extirpated in ~10% (Figure 1). Grizzly bear populations are believed to be increasing in some areas of the province.

Habitat trends

Habitat effectiveness for Grizzly Bears has decreased in British Columbia and can be expected to continue to decrease in British Columbia (MELP 1995b). Habitat effectiveness considers the habitat suitability of the area and further accounts for impacts such as habitat displacement and fragmentation that reduce the ability or willingness of Grizzly Bears to use the habitat. While some of this is due to direct loss to agriculture and settlement, increasing road access is now more important. Road access leads to direct mortality through increased human–bear conflicts, hunting, and poaching, and an avoidance of habitats near roads and areas heavily used by people for recreation, resource extraction, or other reasons.

Threats


Population threats

Historic reductions in Grizzly Bear populations were a result of extensive agricultural land conversion, extermination campaigns often related to livestock protection, and unrestricted killing (IGBC 1987). Today, the primary limiting factors for Grizzly Bears in the Canadian portion of their range appear to be human-caused mortality from a variety of factors, and habitat loss, alienation, and fragmentation (McLellan et al. 2000; Kansas 2002).

Currently, throughout the Grizzly Bear’s range in North America, sources of area-concentrated mortality include hunting, poaching, and control kills associated with inadequate garbage management or other types of human–bear encounters including protection of livestock or perceived threats to human safety (IGBC 1987). In southern British Columbia,

Summary of ABI status in BC and adjacent jurisdictions (NatureServe Explorer 2002)

AB	AK	BC	ID	MT	YK	NWT	WA	Canada	Global
S3	S?	S3	S1	S1S2	S?	S?	S1	N3	G4T3T4



and adjacent areas of the interior mountains, people killed 77–85% of 99 radio-collared bears known or suspected to have died during 13 radio-collaring studies in a 22-year period (McLellan et al. 2000). In British Columbia where Grizzly Bear hunting was permitted, legal harvest accounted for 39–44% of the mortality. The next leading cause of grizzly mortality was killing by people in self-defence or in defence of property or livestock. Similar extensive data to estimate mortality rates is not available for northern British Columbia where fewer radio-collaring studies have been undertaken.

Increased direct Grizzly Bear mortalities are often associated with increased road access (McLellan 1990). Roads result in Grizzly Bear mortalities both directly and indirectly (as well as habitat loss; see “Habitat threats”). The mechanisms in which mortality is increased include direct mortality both through collisions on major roads, and through hunting and poaching; habituation of bears to people when they come in close contact, and the eventual loss of some of these bears involved in human-bear conflicts; and social disruption of bears with other bears when bears start avoiding habitat near newly created roads (McLellan 1990). Most of the new road building in British Columbia stems from forestry, mining, and oil and gas development. Direct human-caused mortality represents a particularly significant threat when adult females are killed in small and localized populations that may have low immigration rates.

Isolation is a significant factor in long-term (100+ yr) viability of small isolated Grizzly Bear populations such as in the Yellowstone area in the northwestern United States (Mattson and Reid 1991). The low population numbers in some areas of British Columbia are so low as to make natural recovery almost impossible given that these areas can be fairly isolated from the other Grizzly Bear population and natural immigration is likely very low. The low population numbers and isolation of localized populations such as in the North Cascades (e.g., estimate of <20; Gyug 1998) may also be creating local inbreeding that may limit any population recovery in these areas in the absence of increased Grizzly Bear immigration.

By comparison to human-caused mortality, natural mortality factors seem to be relatively minor in Grizzly Bear populations (McLellan et al. 2000). There are no known diseases or parasites that appear to have impacts on natural populations of Grizzly Bears (IGBC 1987). Predation/cannibalism, particularly of young bears by older dominant male bears, appears to play a role in population regulation, but its extent is not well known. Malnutrition is a factor in cub mortality, often within the first 1–4 weeks of emergence from the den, indicating that the nutritional state of the pregnant female entering the den is important (IGBC 1987).

Habitat threats

Habitat loss, alienation (the displacement from otherwise suitable habitat), and fragmentation (the separation of previously continuous habitat into one or more disconnected pieces) occur on a broad scale as a result of expanding human settlement, increased access for forestry and other extraction industries, and forestry and fire suppression.

Human settlement

Urban and agricultural developments are concentrated in valley bottoms formerly used as spring habitats and as movement corridors between mountain ranges. These developments cause direct habitat loss as well as habitat fragmentation by isolating major protected areas, sometimes making them inadequate to maintain viable populations. The settlement patterns along major roads or highways also tend to cause habitat fragmentation. The increasing settlement patterns along the Highway 3 corridor through the Rocky Mountains in southern British Columbia is seen as one of the major population fragmentation causes preventing extensive Grizzly Bear population recovery in the northern Rocky Mountains of the United States.

Because Grizzly Bear populations are naturally found at low densities, large areas of occupied and connected habitat are required to ensure their long term viability. To sustain habitat supply for populations, individuals must be able to move freely among valued habitats, without being restricted by human-caused blockages or being attracted to mortality

sinks around human settlements. Because individuals tend to disperse very little from established populations (10–30 km; McLellan and Hovey 2001), it is necessary to maintain corridors of habitat between major protected areas that are also good habitat themselves and corridors must be “wide enough for male Grizzly Bears to live in with little risk of being killed” (McLellan and Hovey 2001).

Hydroelectric impoundments behind dams can significantly affect Grizzly Bears when lowland feeding areas, particularly important in spring, are flooded. The effect of dams, particularly on the Columbia River system, has been to stop anadromous salmon runs, which has probably significantly affected Grizzly Bear feeding opportunities over a very wide area as well.

Forest management

Before the advent of widespread fire suppression (about 1945), the primary forest disturbance regime was fire through most of the province. Currently, logging has replaced fire as the primary agent of forest succession, which can be expected to have an impact on Grizzly Bear habitat independent of any effects of increased access (Zager et al. 1983). Many post-fire habitats typically remain high productivity foraging sites (particularly for berries) for 35–70 years, and Grizzly Bears learn to rely heavily on these sites. Under current timber management and silvicultural regimes, extensive site preparation and soil disturbance by heavy machinery reduce berry productivity in clearcuts, and conifer stands are planted, managed, and tended so they close in and lose any berry foraging values within much shorter time frames than they might have had under natural wildfire regimes.

Grizzly Bears typically used forested habitats adjacent to open foraging habitats such as avalanche chutes, wet meadows, marshes and swamps, and subalpine meadows as security habitat and daytime bedding sites to avoid heat stress. Clearcutting the forests adjacent to these sites can significantly affect the suitability in these high value open sites.

Roads

Roads result in Grizzly Bear habitat alienation, (i.e., displacement from preferred habitats), as well as increased direct mortality from hunters, poachers, and management kills for bears that are not displaced (McLellan 1990; Mace et al. 1999). Vehicles on roads may harass bears, and roads tend to displace them from quality habitats (McLellan 1990). Roads also tend to result in increased human activity in areas, which increases chances for bear–human interactions that result in displacement from these habitats (as well as increases in direct mortality) (McLellan 1990).

The displacement of bears from linear habitats (i.e., roads) can also cause habitat fragmentation. In Banff National Park, the Trans-Canada Highway acts as a complete barrier to adult females, and secondary highways are only regularly crossed by female Grizzly Bears that are relatively habituated to people (Gibeau and Herrero 1998). In British Columbia, the Highway 3 corridor near Nelson/Castlegar/Trail/Salmo has been found to be a genetic barrier between southern Selkirk and central Selkirk mountain Grizzly Bear populations (Proctor 2001). Where there are still extant populations of Grizzly Bears in the northern United States, highways also cause habitat fragmentation (Servheen et al. 1998).

While the construction of access roads is not limited to forestry activities, most new roads constructed in British Columbia are to support forestry activities. The increased access allowed on even infrequently travelled roads has been shown to significantly affect habitat use by Grizzly Bears (e.g., Mace et al. 1996; Archibald et al. 1987; McLellan and Shackleton 1988). Even increases in non-motorized and non-hunting-related recreation allowed by increased access to areas can significantly affect Grizzly Bear habitat use (e.g., for mountain climbing) (White et al. 1998b). While road closures or access limitations can be implemented to reduce the effects of forest access roads on Grizzly Bears, road closures implemented in wildlife management areas on national forests in Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, and Montana were found to be relatively ineffective

(27%) at keeping all vehicles off closed roads (Havlick 1998).

Historically, conflict with ranchers and livestock grazing operations have been a major cause of Grizzly Bear population decline or local extirpation in the United States (Storer and Trevis 1978), and this impact is thought to have reduced British Columbia populations as well. Potential impacts include mortalities if ranchers shoot bears to protect livestock, competition for forage, displacement from or alteration of preferred habitats from grazing and trampling. Preferred habitats which may be impacted by grazing or trampling include wetland areas and fruit-producing areas (IGBC 1987). More information on grazing impacts on grizzly bears is provided in the IGBC (1987).

Legal Protection and Habitat Conservation

The Grizzly Bear is protected under the provincial *Wildlife Act* from unrestricted hunting. All hunting seasons on Grizzly Bears are managed through Limited Entry Hunts (LEH) open by lottery to resident hunters or by quotas granted to licensed guides. There are no LEH seasons on Grizzly Bears in any threatened Grizzly Bear Population Unit.

Within the occupied range of Grizzly Bears in British Columbia, >106 000 km² or 13.4% is protected. Some parks that are important for the conservation of Grizzly Bears include Khutzymateen, Spatsizi, North and South Tweedsmuir provincial parks and Tatshenshini-Alsek National Park.

The Grizzly Bear Conservation Strategy (MELP 1995a) identified habitat as one of the key conservation needs for Grizzly Bears in British Columbia and established a framework for establishing Grizzly Bear management areas throughout the province. Habitat management would largely be achieved through strategic land use plans that would establish goals and objectives, and would set the means to attain those on publicly owned land in local areas throughout the province.

Strategic land use planning on publicly owned lands, either land use plans (LUP) or land and resource

management plans (LRMP), have been completed or approved in 73% of the province by area as of January 2002. LRMP processes are underway in an additional 12% of the area or the province.

Most of the strategic land use plans that have been completed or approved to date address Grizzly Bear habitat issues (Table 2), some in more detail and length than others. In particular, LRMPs such as the Okanagan-Shuswap and Kalum have addressed Grizzly Bear habitat issues at great length and in detail, while others, such as the Kootenay-Boundary LUP, appear to have treated Grizzly Bear habitat issues only in part, and the Kamloops LRMP is silent on the issue of Grizzly Bear habitat management.

Identified Wildlife Provisions

Sustainable resource management and planning recommendations

Given that Grizzly Bears have large home ranges, both the landscape and stand level requirements of Grizzly Bears should be considered during strategic or landscape level planning. Wildlife habitat areas may be established under strategic level plans to address stand level requirements, provided a timber supply budget is negotiated by the strategic level plan or under the IWMS provincial timber supply limit (see “Wildlife habitat area” below) when within a Threatened Grizzly Bear Population Unit or Grizzly Bear Management Area.

The following strategic level recommendations may be considered for translation into specific legal objectives, strategies, and general guidelines by the strategic level plan and must be clearly defined geographically at an appropriate map scale. The intent is to apply these recommendations to ensure that:

- ❖ adequate amounts of well-distributed, seasonally important habitats are available across the landscape and through time;
- ❖ these habitats can be effectively used by Grizzly Bears (i.e., areas are not unduly impacted by habitat fragmentation or displacement resulting from human activities); and
- ❖ human-caused mortality risks are minimized.

Table 2. Current approaches to Grizzly Bear habitat management within strategic land use plans in British Columbia. LRMPs are underway in the North Coast, Central Coast, Lillooet, and Sea to Sky. No LRMPs or LUPs are underway in Atlin-Taku, Dease Liard, Nass, Morice, Sunshine Coast, Merritt, or Chilliwack.

Strategic land use plan	Type of resource management zone (RMZ)	Approach to Grizzly Bear habitat management
		<i>General or specific objectives or area-based direction for Grizzly Bear habitat management</i>
Fort Nelson	37 area-specific RMZs	Objectives included recommendations to manage and minimize new access, to ensure industrial exploration and timber management activities are undertaken with sensitivity to Grizzly Bear habitat, and to identify and map important habitat elements incorporated into several RMZs.
Cassiar Iskut- Stikine	15 area-specific RMZs	Objectives include maintenance of large areas of high value Grizzly Bear habitat (which have been mapped) by maintaining areas of well-distributed, seasonally important habitats for Grizzly Bear across the landscape and through time. Strategies are spelled out and include managing all access to and activities in these areas, and maintaining mixes of seral stages for forage and other critical habitat features including connectivity of habitats. In addition, access management is to take into account high value Grizzly Bear habitats.
Mackenzie	72 area-specific RMZs and RM subzones	Under general directions the objectives are to identify and manage to conserve Grizzly Bear habitat to assist in sustaining viable populations; improve the management of interactions between Grizzly Bears and humans; and manage access to maintain healthy Grizzly Bear populations. Strategies to achieve these objectives are included (i.e., developing guidelines for silviculture, timing and activities in high or spring Grizzly habitats, establishment of WHAs).
Fort St. John	24 area-specific RMZs	Objectives and strategies are given for each RMZ, and include Grizzly Bear habitat management in some RMZs where Grizzly Bear management was a priority. For example, in one RMZ, an objective to “Maintain medium and high quality Grizzly Bear habitat” has strategies specified to identify and map the habitat; incorporate habitat protection criteria into landscape and stand level plans; plan and develop access to avoid habitats; incorporate habitats and connectivity corridors into landscape level plans; use WHAs, develop interagency plans where there is the potential for activities to negatively affect habitat; encourage the use of silvicultural systems that minimize negative impacts on habitat; and minimize impacts by ensuring that critical habitat areas are linked by connectivity corridors.
Dawson Creek	12 area-specific RMZs	Specific directions have been left to lower level planning initiatives. Several RMZs contain the following objective: “Manage medium and/or high capability Grizzly Bear habitat to assist in sustaining viable, healthy Grizzly Bear populations” using the strategy of identifying and mapping medium and high capability Grizzly Bear habitat, and incorporating into landscape unit level and operational planning.”

Strategic land use plan	Type of resource management zone (RMZ)	Approach to Grizzly Bear habitat management
		<i>General or specific objectives or area-based direction for Grizzly Bear habitat management</i>
Fort St. James	36 area-specific RMZs	Two objectives in general directions are to maintain or enhance Grizzly Bear habitat and populations, and to minimize conflicts in human–bear interactions. The strategies to achieve the first objective include completing Grizzly Bear habitat mapping in areas of concern; managing for a mosaic of habitat types and characteristics to ensure adequate seasonal foraging sites with adjacent cover; reducing habitat fragmentation by providing FENs or movement corridors; and in high Grizzly Bear habitat suitability areas, undertaking access management planning, establishing management zones around important and valuable habitats, timing development to minimize conflicts, minimizing Grizzly Bear displacement from preferred habitats, creating irregular edges and leaving cover within cutblocks and between cutblocks and roads, and locating roads to avoid valuable Grizzly Bear habitat.
Kispiox	18 area-specific RMZs (not including Protected Areas)	Extensive Grizzly Bear habitat management strategies are included in the general management directions, rather than in area-specific RMZs. Listed strategies include identifying and mapping high value habitat at the landscape planning level that will be protected through management strategies such as buffering with reserves, modifying silvicultural systems, and minimizing clearcut sizes; selection harvesting a minimum of 5% of the forested portion of high value Grizzly Bear habitat outside RMAs or WHAs; using established strategies for management of Grizzly Bear habitat in the development and review of landscape and operational plans, designation of Grizzly Bear management areas, co-ordinated access management plans and modified road construction; and restricting Grizzly Bear hunting in portions of the planning area as part of the provincial conservation strategy.
Kalum	Generic land use class RMZs	Grizzly Bear habitat importance, and objectives and strategies for management are extensively laid out at more length and with more specifics than in any other LRMP. Intent of these objectives and strategies was to maintain or restore Grizzly Bear habitats through access management and forage supply for identified watersheds; conserve, mitigate, or restore critical patch habitats at the stand level no matter where they occur; maintain current Grizzly Bear population density, distribution, and genetic diversity in each GBPU to ensure viability; and recover local Grizzly Bear population where appropriate. The Special RMZ class was divided into 9 types, one of which is “Grizzly Bear benchmark and linkages.” Three Special Grizzly Bear RMZs were created as benchmark or linkage habitats where no hunting is allowed, in addition to the general management directions.
Bulkley	Generic land use RMZs, with	12 Planning Units overlaid on RMZs Specific directions for Grizzly Bear management are given in each of 12 Planning Units (or for subunits). Directions are relatively generic, e.g., “Maintain goat and Grizzly Bear habitat. Prescriptions will focus on the importance of maintaining Grizzly Bear habitat, especially that required for travel and denning,” or “Complete Grizzly Bear interpreted ecosystem mapping and incorporate into management prescriptions as directed by the Babine Local Resource Use Plan (LRUP). Actual management of habitats defaults to lower level plans (LRUP or IWMS).

Strategic land use plan	Type of resource management zone (RMZ)	Approach to Grizzly Bear habitat management <i>General or specific objectives or area-based direction for Grizzly Bear habitat management</i>
Lakes	Established generic land use RMZs	General management direction objectives are to “maintain the diversity and a suitable abundance of wide ranging carnivore populations and the ecosystems upon which they depend.” Strategies to implement this for Grizzly Bears include upgrading capability/suitability mapping, establishing Grizzly Bear management plans and management areas in accordance with the provincial Grizzly Bear conservation strategy, and implementing Grizzly Bear management guidelines in areas of important habitat capability and known occurrence of Grizzly Bear.
Vanderhoof	20 area-specific RMZs	Under general management directions, the objective is to maintain or enhance Grizzly Bear populations and habitat by identifying and mapping of high suitability and capability Grizzly Bear habitat, by deactivating non-essential secondary roads and minimizing the amount and duration of new road access in high value habitats, and by managing for a mosaic of habitat types and characteristics. Further strategies for Grizzly Bear habitat management are made in some RMZs but are fairly generic, referring to inventory of habitats, maintenance of habitats, and “establishment of appropriate management plans.”
Prince George	54 area-specific RMZs	Addressed in each area-specific RMZ. For example, within RMZ#1, the Parsnip High Elevation RMZ in the Special Resource Management Category-Natural Habitat, the objective is to “manage Grizzly Bear habitat to provide opportunity for population levels to increase” by identifying areas of high suitability and critical habitat where there will be access management planning with the intent of deactivating non-essential roads and minimizing the amount and duration of new roaded access, where the use of sheep in vegetation management will be avoided, where a mosaic of habitat types and characteristics and stand attributes that mimic habitat most suitable for Grizzly Bears, and where disturbance will be avoided to known Grizzly Bear denning sites.
Robson Valley	23 area-specific RMZs	General objective is to “maintain or enhance habitat and/or increase numbers, genetic variability, and distribution” through 9 strategies including identifying, conserving, and managing critical habitat in medium and historically high density bear zones, encouraging land use practices that promote the long-term viability of important forage species, managing road access, establishing Grizzly Bear management areas or other land use designations that benefit Grizzly Bear populations, ensuring the continued existence of adequate seasonal foraging sites with adjacent cover, minimizing bear displacement from preferred habitat by preventing habitat fragmentation, locating roads to avoid avalanche paths, leaving forest reserves of 100 m on each side of important avalanche paths, and timing human activities to avoid conflicts with concentrated seasonal bear use areas. Within individual RMZs, the above objective is repeated for wildlife with area-specific strategies on access and on reducing conflicts between Grizzly Bears and commercial recreation use, mining development, and range use.

Strategic land use plan	Type of resource management zone (RMZ)	Approach to Grizzly Bear habitat management <i>General or specific objectives or area-based direction for Grizzly Bear habitat management</i>
Kamloops	6 land use classes with smaller RMZs	Not addressed.
Okanagan-Shuswap	Resource-Use Specific RMZs which overlap with other RMZs	RMZs established for Grizzly Bear habitat management, which overlap with RMZs for other species or other land uses. The Grizzly Bear RMZ establishes (in much more detail than most other LRMPs) the locations of areas managed as Grizzly Bear habitat; and provisions for maintaining screening, security, and thermal cover adjacent to critical habitats. It also establishes how to maintain or enhance forage availability, cover, and connectivity; how to minimize negative interactions associated with access; and how to minimize negative interactions associated with commercial tourism and recreation developments.
Kootenay-Boundary LUP	RMZs are equivalent to forest districts	Addresses land use classes within RMZs by mapping Biodiversity Emphasis Zones, Connectivity Corridors, Enhanced RD Zones (Timber), Caribou Habitat Areas, and Areas managed for mature. The KBLUP-Implementation Strategy has only one objective relating to Grizzly Bear habitat: "To maintain Grizzly Bear habitat, retain adequate amounts of mature, and/or old forests, as determined through Objective 2, adjacent to important avalanche tracks."
Cariboo-Chilcotin LUP	3 resource development zones (RDZ)	Each RDZ is subdivided into areas for which the following clause, or a very close approximation, is included as resource targets: "To manage for Grizzly Bear, moose, furbearer, species at risk, and other sensitive habitats within the areas identified as riparian buffers, recreation areas, caribou habitat, and lakeshore management zones and throughout the polygon under the biodiversity conservation strategy."

Access

Where planning tables propose a conservation objective for Grizzly Bears, they should consider application of a variety of access management measures designed to ensure habitat security, prevent population fragmentation, minimize displacement from preferred habitat, and minimize mortality risk. Access management regimes should be applied over areas roughly equivalent to an average adult female home range, and the practices directed at ensuring adult female security and survival. Access management may include complete closure of roads, seasonal closure of roads, limiting access to commercial or industrial users only, or other access regimes designed to prevent displacement of Grizzly Bears from areas near roads.

Objectives should include provisions that maximize the net amount, quality, and seasonal representation of Grizzly Bear habitat that is >500 m from an open road (i.e., roads that receive any motorized use from 1 April to 31 October). Larger roadless areas (e.g., >1000 ha) are preferred. Wherever possible, retain these areas for at least 10 years. Similarly, objectives should include minimizing the amount of areas with >0.6 km/km² of open road (i.e., a road without restriction on motorized vehicle use) where these are in Grizzly Bear habitat. Consider also the following provisions:

- ❖ Promote one-side development (i.e., road construction and harvesting on one side of a valley at a time).
- ❖ Remove ballast from roads across avalanche chutes. Close permanent roads by removing bridges. Remove bridges when permanently deactivating roads. Revegetate temporary access (e.g., excavated or bladed trails), roads, and landings with non-forage species to minimize mortality risk of attracted bears.
- ❖ Minimize the impact of open roads on Grizzly Bears.
- ❖ Schedule forestry activities to avoid displacing bears from preferred habitat during periods of seasonal use.
- ❖ Provide windfirm visual screening along roads to provide security (i.e., do not conduct vegetation management or stand tending adjacent to roads).

Seral stage distribution

- ❖ Maintain or restore Grizzly Bear foraging opportunities and habitat effectiveness across the landscape and over time.
- ❖ Determine current and future forage values and habitat effectiveness of planning area. Landscapes with extensive areas of mid-seral forest characterized by closed canopies, conifer dominance, and high stocking levels have little Grizzly Bear habitat value. Similarly, suitable foraging habitat may not be effective (i.e., useable) because of the proximity to human settlement, transportation routes, agriculture, or other human activities or development. Current forage values and habitat effectiveness at the landscape level can be determined through interpretations of ecosystem maps (e.g., TEM, PEM, BEI) or other surrogate maps using the 6-class wildlife habitat mapping system (RIC 1999). Interpretations should assess habitat effectiveness that may be reduced in areas near human settlement or developments, agricultural areas, and roads. In addition, the type of disturbance that has created early seral habitats, and likely outcome of the type of disturbance should be assessed. For instance, logging and wildfire both produce early seral habitats that may be mapped similarly by ecosystem mapping, but can be very different in the amount of foraging potential for Grizzly Bears, and in the length of time this foraging potential will be available to Grizzly Bears.
- ❖ Where developments reduce the effectiveness of habitat within a landscape, where forest succession is reducing foraging values, or where restoration is an objective, consider management of early seral stages to recover effectiveness lost to development or to forest succession. Foraging habitat can be created by creating early seral habitats, but only if managed effectively for Grizzly Bear forage, and remain useable by Grizzly Bears.
- ❖ Manage landscapes for steady levels of early seral habitat to avoid “booming” and “busting” forage supply.

Silviculture

- ❖ Lower conifer stocking levels to provide Grizzly Bear forage.

- ❖ In NDTs 1–3, retain 50% of the largest pieces (top 20% diameter and length) of coarse woody debris in decay classes 1–2 for summer foraging on ants.
- ❖ Do not use broadcast vegetation management methods in capable watersheds, except where stand establishment or re-establishment is the objective and broadcast methods are required. Vegetation management methods, listed in increasing order of impact on Grizzly Bear forage are manual, chemical, cover crops, and sheep grazing.
- ❖ Do not use sheep, domestic goats, or cattle for vegetation management in occupied Grizzly Bear habitat to reduce direct and indirect conflicts with bears.

Range

- ❖ Consider establishing zones where range permits will be gradually removed and no new permits issued to reduce direct and indirect conflicts with Grizzly Bears. Use the effectiveness classes (based on BEI or finer-scale mapping interpreted for Grizzly Bear seasonal habitats with the application of habitat effectiveness from roads and human settlement) to decide where to limit grazing.

Restoration

- ❖ Conduct controlled burning to improve berry production (e.g., in ESSF).
- ❖ Plan for extended rotations to recover mature and old-growth characteristics such as more open canopies, greater amounts of understorey forage, and/or large trees (e.g., for rain interception in bedding habitat on coastal floodplains).
- ❖ Implement thinning and/or pruning to maintain open stands.
- ❖ Commercially thin to reopen closed canopies and recover productive shrub understories. Consider uneven spacing to maximize forage benefit.

Preventing human–bear conflict

- ❖ Maintain “attractant”-free main and fly-in camps (e.g., camps for tree planters, cruisers, engineers). Ensure adequate food storage and garbage management.

Wildlife habitat area

Goals

Protect known areas of concentrated seasonal use by Grizzly Bears.

Maintain the ecological integrity of important seasonal habitats.

Ensure the security of the bears using these habitats.

Feature

Establish WHAs for provincially significant areas, or for seasonally important habitats used by Grizzly Bears on a more local basis. Areas that are of provincial significance are those areas of known, consistently high, seasonal congregations of Grizzly Bears. Areas of seasonally important habitats may include salmon spawning areas where Grizzly Bears feed, herb-dominated avalanche tracks and run-out zones on southerly and westerly aspects, and known denning areas. On the coast, important seasonal habitats may also include estuaries, skunk cabbage swamps, and non-forested fen/marsh complexes. In the interior, seasonally important units may include herbaceous riparian meadow/wetland complexes, post-fire stands dominated by *Vaccinium* spp., subalpine parkland meadows, and *Hedysarum* and glacier lily complexes. Seasonally important habitats will be evaluated by Grizzly Bear Population Unit or subpopulation unit. In general, the subpopulation units are equivalent in size to landscape units.

In the absence of higher level plan direction, WHAs established within the provincial IWMS timber supply impact limit will only be established within threatened Grizzly Bear Population Units and Grizzly Bear Management Areas designated under the *Wildlife Act*, except for sites where there is no timber supply impact or the site is considered provincially significant (i.e., areas of known, consistently high, seasonal congregations) and recommended by the Director of the Biodiversity Branch, B.C. Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection.

Size

WHAs will range from 1 to 500 ha but will ultimately depend on area of use, extent of seasonal habitat, and buffer size required to meet goals and objectives.

Design

When the main objective is to minimize disturbance around seasonal concentrations, consider the use of the area by Grizzly Bears and ensure the WHA includes a sufficient management zone to prevent disturbance. When the main objective of the WHA is to maintain seasonally important habitats, the WHA will be based on the extent of the seasonal habitat plus ~50 m but may vary with patch characteristics and objectives.

Use 6-class seasonal Grizzly Bear habitat capability and suitability mapping, where available, to identify seasonally important habitats (see RIC 1999). This assessment should be based on applying the Grizzly Bear densities associated with each capability class at the landscape scale (see Table 3). The result will be an estimate of the number of Grizzly Bears the area could potentially support in each season based on habitat suitability and capability. The season or seasons that would potentially support the lowest number of Grizzly Bears may be limiting or restricting the ability of the area to support Grizzly Bears. The highest suitability habitats within this

limiting season(s) should then be considered priorities for protection through the establishment of WHAs depending on how restrictive the habitat “bottleneck” (i.e., limiting) may be and the habitat effectiveness of sites. Consideration should also be given to seasonal habitat effectiveness (e.g., an area may not be limited by the availability of suitable spring habitat; however, human activities disproportionately impact these habitats the area may be limited by the availability of effective spring habitat).

Otherwise use air photos, forest cover mapping, and any other appropriate sources of information combined with expert knowledge of Grizzly Bear habitat values and human impacts to qualitatively approximate the process described above.

General wildlife measures

Goals

1. Maintain ecological integrity of WHA.
2. Ensure security of Grizzly Bears within WHA by minimizing disturbance to bears within WHA.
3. Maintain Grizzly Bear forage values within WHA.
4. Minimize human-bear interactions.
5. Maintain windfirmness.

Table 3. Habitat capability and suitability classes and associated densities for Grizzly Bears*

Habitat capability or suitability class	Habitat capability or suitability range as % of provincial benchmark density	Grizzly Bear population density	
		Minimum bears/ 1000 km ²	Maximum bears/ 1000 km ²
1 – Very High	76–100	76	100
2 – High	51–75	51	75
3 – Medium	26–50	26	50
4 – Low	6–25	6	25
5 – Very Low	1–5	1	5
6 – Nil	0	0	1

* These densities are suitable to use with 1:250,000+ scale mapping; relative densities should be applied to more detailed mapping.

Measures

Access

- Do not construct roads, trails, or landings.

Harvesting and silviculture

- No forestry practices should be carried out with the exception of treatments approved by the statutory decision maker to restore or enhance degraded habitat or to ensure windfirmness.

Pesticides

- Do not use pesticides.

Range

- Plan livestock grazing to maintain forage value for Grizzly Bears and minimize the potential for conflicts.
- Do not place livestock attractants within WHA.
- Incorporate management strategies in the range use plan to reduce contact and competition between livestock and Grizzly Bears. Consider salt placement, alternate water development, drift fencing, or altering periods of livestock use.

Additional Management Considerations

Ensure that Grizzly Bears do not have access to unnatural food sources (garbage) because of the consequent mortality risk.

Development around security and foraging WHAs should be managed to prevent disruption of natural influences of above- and below-surface drainage, shade, wind, and snow movement within the WHA.

Maintain livestock health.

Do not turn livestock out onto WHAs for Grizzly Bears during calving or lambing times.

Information Needs

1. Further development and application of techniques to monitor Grizzly Bear population and habitat trends.
2. Additional research on effects of human activities on Grizzly Bear habitat use (i.e., temporal response to access management).

3. Further development of techniques for assessing the impacts of proposed developments and land uses and for setting strategic objectives for Grizzly Bear habitat conditions.

Cross References

Bull Trout, Marbled Murrelet

References Cited

- Archibald, W.R., R. Ellis, and A.N. Hamilton. 1987. Responses of Grizzly Bears to logging truck traffic in the Kimsquit River Valley, B.C. *Int. Conf. Bear Res. and Manage.* 7:251–257.
- B.C. Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks (MELP). 1995a. A future for the grizzly: British Columbia Grizzly Bear conservation strategy. Victoria, B.C.
- _____. 1995b. Grizzly Bear conservation strategy: background report. Victoria, B.C.
- Banci, V. 1991. Status report on the Grizzly Bear *Ursus arctos horribilis* in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildl. in Canada, Ottawa, Ont.
- Bunnell, F.L. and R.K. McCann. 1993. The Brown or Grizzly Bear. *In* Bears majestic creatures of the wild. Rodale Press. Emmaus, Penn. 240 p.
- Ciarniello, L.M., J. Paczkowski, D. Heard, I. Ross, and D. Seip. 2001. Parsnip Grizzly Bear population and habitat project: 2000 progress report. Unpubl. report. Available from: <http://web.unbc.ca/parsnip-grizzly/>
- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC). 2002. Canadian species at risk. Available from: <http://www.speciesatrisk.gc.ca>
- Gibeau, M.L. and S. Herrero. 1998. Roads, rails, and Grizzly Bears in the Bow River Valley, Alberta. *In* Proc. Int. Conf. Ecology and Transportation. G.L. Evink (editor). Florida Dep. Transportation, Tallahassee, Fla., pp. 104–108.
- Gyug, L.W. 1998. Forest development plan Blue-listed species inventory for mammals: assessment of Grizzly Bear populations, habitat use and timber harvest mitigation strategies in the North Cascades Grizzly Bear population unit, British Columbia. Report prepared for B.C. Environ., South. Interior Reg., Kamloops, B.C.
- Hamilton, A.N. 1987. Classification of coastal Grizzly Bear habitat for forestry interpretations and the role of food in habitat use by coastal Grizzly Bears. M.Sc. thesis. Univ. B.C., Vancouver, B.C.

- Havlick, D.G. 1998. Closing forest roads for habitat protection: a Northern Rockies case study. *In* Proc. Intl. Conf. Wildl. Ecol. and Transportation. G.L. Evink (editor). Florida Dep. Transportation, Tallahassee, Fla., pp.
- Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee (IGBC). 1987. Grizzly Bear compendium. Natl. Wildl. Fed., Wash., D.C.
- Kansas, J.L. 2002. Status of the Grizzly Bear (*Ursus arctos*) in Alberta. Alberta Sustainable Resour. Dev., Edmonton, Alta. Alberta Wildl. Status Rep. No. 37.
- Mace, R.D., J.S. Waller, T.L. Manley, K. Ake, and W.T. Wittinger. 1999. Landscape evaluation of grizzly bear habitat in northwestern Montana. *Conserv. Biol.* 13(2):367–377.
- Mace, R.D., J.S. Waller, T.L. Manley, L.J. Lyon, and H. Zuuring. 1996. Relationships among Grizzly Bears, roads and habitat in the Swan Mountains, Montana. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 33:1395–1404.
- MacHutchon, A.G., S. Himmer, and C.A. Bryden. 1993. Khutzeymateen Valley Grizzly Bear study, final report. B.C. Min. Environ., Lands and Parks and B.C. Min. For., Victoria, B.C.
- McLellan, B.N. 1981. Akamina-Kishinena Grizzly Bear project. Progress report 1980. B.C. Fish and Wildl. Br., Victoria, B.C. 88 p.
- _____. 1989a. Dynamics of a Grizzly Bear population during a period of industrial resource extraction. III. Natality and rate of increase. *Can. J. Zool.* 67(8):1865–1868.
- _____. 1990. Relationships between human industrial activity and Grizzly Bears. *Int. Conf. Bear. Res. and Manage.* 8:57–64.
- McLellan, B.N. and F.W. Hovey. 1995. The diet of Grizzly Bears in the Flathead River drainage of southeastern British Columbia. *Can. J. Zool.* 73:704–712.
- _____. 2001. Natal dispersal of Grizzly Bears. *Can. J. Zool.* 79:838–844.
- McLellan, B.N., F.W. Hovey, and J.G. Woods. 2000. Rates and causes of Grizzly Bear mortality in the interior mountains of western North America. *In* Proc. Conf. on the Biology and Management of Species and Habitats at Risk, Kamloops, B.C., Feb. 15–19, 1999. L. Darling (editor). B.C. Min. Environ., Lands and Parks, Victoria, B.C. and Univ. Coll. Cariboo, Kamloops, B.C., pp. 673–677.
- McLellan, B.N. and D.M. Shackleton. 1988. Grizzly Bears and resource-extraction industries: effects of roads on behaviour, habitat use and demography. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 25(2):451–460.
- Mattson, D.J. and M.M. Reid. 1991. Conservation of the Yellowstone Grizzly Bear. *Conserv. Biol.* 5:364–372.
- NatureServe Explorer. 2002. An online encyclopedia of life [Web application]. Version 1.6. Arlington, Va. Available from: <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>
- Picton, H.D., D.M. Mattson, B.M. Blanchard, and R.R. Knight. 1985. Climate, carrying capacity and the Yellowstone Grizzly Bear. *In* Proc. Grizzly Bear Habitat Symp. G.P. Contreras and K.E. Evans (editors). U.S. Dep. Agric. For. Serv., Intermtn. Res. Stn., Ogden, Utah, Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-207, pp. 129–135.
- Proctor, M. 2001. Grizzly bear habitat and population fragmentation in the Central Selkirk Mountains and surrounding region of southeast British Columbia. Unpubl. report. Available from: srmwww.gov.bc.ca/kor/wld/reports/pdf/SFP_Grizzly_DNA/SFP_Grizzly_DNA.pdf
- Rausch, R.L. 1953. On the status of some arctic mammals. *Arctic* 6:91–148.
- Resources Inventory Committee (RIC). 1999. BC wildlife habitat ratings standards. Version 2.0. B.C. Min. Environ., Lands and Parks, Victoria, B.C.
- Russell, R.H., J. Nolan, N. Woody, and G. Anderson. 1979. A study of the Grizzly Bear in Jasper National Park 1975 to 1978. Report prepared for Parks Canada by Can. Wildl. Serv., Edmonton, Alta.
- Servheen, C., J. Waller, and W. Kasworm. 1998. Fragmentation effects of high-speed highways on grizzly bear populations shared between the United States and Canada. *In* Proc. Int. Conf. Wildl. Ecol. and Transportation. G.L. Evink (editor). Florida Dep. Transportation, Tallahassee, Fla., pp. 97–10.
- Simpson, K. 1987. Impacts of a hydro-electric reservoir on populations of caribou and Grizzly Bear in southern British Columbia. B.C. Min. Environ. and Parks, Nelson, B.C. Wildl. Work. Rep. WR-24.
- Storer, T.I. and L.P. Trevis Jr. 1978. California Grizzly. Univ. Nebr. Press, Lincoln, Nebr. 335 pp.
- Vroom, G.W., S. Herrero, and R.T. Ogilvie. 1977. The ecology of Grizzly Bear winter den sites in Banff National Park, Alberta. *In* 4th Int. Conf. on Bear Res. and Manage., Kalispell, Mont., Feb. 1977, pp.
- Weaver, J.L., P.C. Paquet, and L.F. Ruggiero. 1996. Resilience and conservation of large carnivores in the Rocky Mountains. *Conserv. Biol.* 10:964–976.

- White, D., Jr., K.C. Kendall, and H.D. Picton. 1998a.
Grizzly Bear feeding activity at alpine army cutworm
moth aggregation sites in northwest Montana. *Can. J.
Zool.* 76(2):221–227.
- _____. 1998b. Potential energetic effects of mountain
climbers on foraging Grizzly Bears. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.*
27(1):146–151.
- Wielgus, R.B. 1986. Habitat ecology of the Grizzly Bear in
the southern Rocky Mountains of Canada. M.Sc.
thesis. Univ. Moscow, Idaho, . 136 p.
- Zager, P., C. Jonkel, and J. Habeck. 1983. Logging and
wildfire influence on Grizzly Bear habitat in
northwestern Montana. *Int. Conf. Bear Res. and
Manage.* 5:124–132.

