

**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE**

The State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (“NJDEP”), Division of Fish and Wildlife (“Division” or “DFW”) sought written public comment on the issuance of a Commercial Shooting Preserve (CSP) license to Hudson Farm in response to the Appellate Division’s remand order in Roseff v. MMK Reinsurance, Ltd., No. A-6209-07T1 (App. Div. August 5, 2010). The plaintiffs-appellants challenged the appropriateness of issuing a CSP license to Hudson Farm, contending that the Division’s licensing decision did not properly account for environmental and other harms that allegedly would result from Hudson Farm operating a CSP on the subject property. Plaintiffs-appellants also challenged the constitutionality of the statutory requirement that the operation of a CSP must not conflict with a prior reasonable public interest pursuant to N.J.S.A. 23:3-29d(1). In accordance with the Appellate Division’s directive for remand, DFW solicited public comment on the issuance of the CSP license, including whether the change from the prior use of the subject property, when compared to its proposed use as a shooting preserve, “would be inimical to a reasonable public interest served by the prior use.” See Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1, at 14 (App. Div. August 5, 2010). The public comment period served as an appropriate forum for DFW to take public comments into consideration in determining whether the CSP license should be issued, pursuant to the direction of the Appellate Division.

A Public Notice was published in the New Jersey Herald on September 29, 2010. Written comments on the issuance of the CSP license to Hudson Farm were accepted through October 27, 2010.

Summary of Public Comments and Agency Response:

A total of 425 individuals submitted written comments on the issuance of the CSP license to Hudson Farm. 209 individuals supported the issuance of a CSP license (49% of total comments). 152 of those letters in support of the CSP license were form letters. A total of 216 individuals opposed the issuance of a CSP license (51%). 163 of the letters received opposed to the issuance of a CSP license were form letters. One commenter was neither opposed to nor supportive of the Division issuing a CSP license to Hudson Farm.

The following individuals submitted written comments on the issuance of the CSP license to Hudson Farm:

- 1 Elias Abilheira
- 2 Francis R. Amabile
- 3 Lou Ambrosio
- 4 David Artler
- 5 Keith Ayres
- 6 Joyce Bambach

- 7 Brian Beckmann
- 8 Scott Bennett
- 9 Deborah Berry-Toon, Project Self-Sufficiency
- 10 Willard F. Bierwas
- 11 Michael L. Blanchard
- 12 David Blumig
- 13 Cathy Blumig
- 14 Gloria Blumig
- 15 Larry Borshard
- 16 John L. Boyce
- 17 Nicole Brennan
- 18 Jonathan M. Brinck-Lund
- 19 Jeffrey C. Brown
- 20 Shari Buchanan
- 21 Richard Bunce, Councilman Borough of Hopatcong, Knights of Columbus
- 22 Donna L. Burke
- 23 Thomas J. Burke
- 24 Scott Burns
- 25 Amy Callahan
- 26 Cathy Callahan
- 27 Thomas Callahan
- 28 Carlos Camaraza
- 29 Mary Carol Cannon
- 30 Jeanne Carlisle
- 31 Robert Caruso
- 32 SueAnn Castellanos
- 33 Lauren Chavez
- 34 Elizabeth *illegible*
- 35 *illegible* Chavez
- 36 Jack T. Chellew
- 37 Susan Chelpaty
- 38 Tony Chelpaty
- 39 Anthony ChimbloIII
- 40 Anthony ChimbloIV
- 41 OJAfranze
- 42 Artie Coddington
- 43 Steve Codignotto
- 44 Jorge Coppen, Traditional Archers of New Jersey
- 45 Raymond W. Cordts
- 46 John Corney, New Jersey Waterfowlers Association
- 47 Jere L. Cossaboon, Quinton Sportsmens Clubs
- 48 Ed Cuneo, NJ State Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs
- 49 Richard D'Ambroso
- 50 Thomas Danielsen
- 51 Gerry Decaro, Traditional Archers of New Jersey
- 52 Charles Deitrich

53 David Del Sontro
54 Joseph Del Sontro
55 Linda Del Sontro
56 Nicholas Del Sontro
57 Nicholas Del Sontro
58 Jim DeStephano
59 Stephen M. DeVito
60 Alexander Diamond
61 Mark Diana
62 Darren D'Onofrio
63 Jean D'Onofrio
64 Philip W. D'Onofrio
65 Stacey D'Onofrio
66 Robert and Ellen Duncan
67 David Eliason
68 Robert E. Eriksen, National Wild Turkey Federation
69 Lou Esposito
70 Troy Ettel, New Jersey Audubon
71 Brendan C. Fahy
72 Jim Farley
73 Herman and Emily Ference
74 John H. Finkeldie III
75 Frederic Finlay
76 Lucian Fletcher
77 Tara Formica
78 Anne and Drew Fornoro
79 Terri Francis
80 Duane Galate
81 Frank D. Genovese
82 Arnold Gentile
83 Robert Gigon
84 Daniel L. Glazier
85 Peter Graziano
86 Roger M. Greene
87 Richard Griffin
88 Peter Grimbilas
89 Michael J. Guarino
90 John G. Gumbs
91 Jonathan Hagen
92 Lynn Harrison
93 Linda Hartman
94 Patricia Hefferan
95 Scott A. Hill, NJ National Wildlife Turkey Federation
96 Ryan Hoehu
97 Virginia Citarella
98 Robert Holzwarth

99 Roy Impink
100 Matthew Jaust
101 Charles M. Jencarelli
102 Joseph Johnson
103 Andrew B. Judd
104 Steve Kalleser
105 Peter P. Karabashian
106 Edward and Lucille E. Karecki
107 Donald H. Kay
108 Joseph A. Kiefer
109 Al Klenk
110 William Kohler
111 Marty Kolenut
112 Renee Korszoloski
113 Frank A. Korszoloski
114 Robert E. Leigh
115 Michael Lerman
116 William J. Losty
117 Steven Lusby
118 Wayne Martin
119 Adelia Matarazzo
120 Robert Maul
121 Anthony P. Mauro, New Jersey Outdoor Alliance
122 Ed Mayer
123 Jerry McCusker
124 Richard Melton
125 Kathleen Meyer
126 Philip T. Meyer
127 Tracy Millien
128 Michael Moore
129 Bob Morris, Patriot's Path Boy Scout Council
130 Chris and Lauren Olivo
131 Barry C. Ott
132 Tom Ombrello
133 Dana M. Natale
134 Diane M. Natale
135 Gerard P. Natale
136 Carol Olivo
137 Dianna B. Palumbo
138 Carl J. Perks
139 Maureen S. Perks
140 Stephen, Tracy and Craig Piacentino
141 Jean Pieros
142 Steve Pitty
143 Thomas Plante, National Wild Turkey Federation
144 Mary Vongas Pluskota

145 Lynn Popelka
146 Robert Popelka
147 John Protopapas
148 Cesar Quiroz
149 Lou Raymond
150 Melissa Reynolds-Hogland, Bear Trust International
151 Joel Richman
152 Frederick G. Riehl
153 Al Rossy
154 Wendy Rossy
155 John Roswech
156 Roxanne Sabatini
157 James Salt
158 Bill Schemel
159 Sean Schweitzer
160 John F. Scott
161 F. Scott Seiler
162 Linda Seiler
163 Stephen P. Serna
164 Lorraine Smario
165 Thomas L. Smario
166 Nancy Meyer
167 Alaino Smario
168 Stephanie Smario
169 Henry Stankiewicz
170 John Stankiewicz
171 Sid Stanlick
172 Sandra and Page Stiger
173 Richard H. Strobel, Sussex County Conservation Foundation
174 Michael E. Sutherland
175 Chris Swisle
176 William C. Tallman Jr.
177 Dennis T. Tornoski
178 Wojuelu K. Tarnowski
179 John ten Berge
180 Richard Toaldo
181 John E. Ursin
182 Richard Van Heest
183 William J. Vindler
184 Jeanette Vreeland
185 Donna Waliky
186 Timothy Walsh
187 John G. Warhol
188 Aaron Warren
189 Sherry Oivo-Wecht
190 Jason Wecht

191 Savannah Wecht
192 Frank Weinberg, III
193 Warren D. Wells
194 Cory G. Wingerter
195 Thomas H. Wiss
196 John A. Withum
197 Leonard Wolgast
198 Ronald T. Wysocki
199 Frank Zsenak
200 William R. Zukowsky
201 Susanna Thompson
202 Christine Aboulhosn
203 Suheil Aboulhosn
204 Adele Aboutok
205 Simons Addison
206 Connie Anderson
207 Robert Anderson
208 Joseph Antonucci
209 Luca Antonucci
210 Steven Antonucci
211 Maxine and Dennis Arnsdorf
212 Stuart Ayres
213 Howard S. Baker
214 J. Baldwin
215 Bruce C. Balut
216 Rosemarie Bancroft
217 Thomas Bancroft
218 Anita L. Beardsley
219 William S. Beardsley
220 Ashley Bongiorno
221 Audra Bongiorno
222 James Bongiorno
223 James D. Bongiorno
224 Curt and Bette Booth
225 Lee A. Bradley
226 Doug Bryer
227 Kathy Bryer
228 Kyle Bryer
229 Sean Bryer
230 Karen Bryson
231 Stephen Bryson
232 James A. Burke
233 James Cahill
234 Bruce W. Callahan
235 Grace Marie Callahan
236 Stacy Cangialosi

237 Jennifer Clek
238 Evan H Comella
239 Robert Dakelman
240 Patrick Davis
241 Ursula Davis
242 Gary B. DeSantis
243 Joan R. DeSantis
244 Chrissy Devenny
245 Debora Devenny
246 Lawrence Devenny
247 Ammie Dlugos
248 Nicholas Dlugos
249 Peter Gregory Dlugos
250 Linda Duncan
251 Leonard Dunne
252 Karen M. Edwards
253 William Ernst
254 Edward T. Farrell
255 Linda Fernandez
256 Mason Fernandez
257 Roy Fernandez
258 Joseph P. Fiteni
259 Henry S. Friedman
260 Marlene L. Friedman
261 Nicole Fritzký
262 Joseph M. Gallo
263 Megan Gallo
264 Nancy G. Gallo
265 Barbara Gardner
266 Barbara Gartland
267 Charles Gartland
268 Alyssa T. Gaul
269 James Gaul
270 Lisa Gaul
271 Rachel Gaul
272 Karen Gentile
273 Nick Gentile
274 Diane Gillespie
275 Fred Gillespie*
276 Joseph P. Gilligan
277 Veronica F. Gilligan
278 Stan and Anne Golemski
279 Adrian Gonzalez*
280 Carol Gonzalez
281 Mary Gonzalez
282 Xavier Gonzalez

283 David Gorman
284 Dorothy Gorman
285 Barrett Gould
286 Aline Griffith
287 Mark A. Haas
288 John R. Hickerson
289 Gregg Hippe
290 Nicole Hippe
291 Dwight Hiscano
292 Kimberly L. Hiscano
293 Peter Hiscano
294 Pat Hoferkamp
295 Clare Hofmann
296 Anna Hruby
297 Bernadette Hruby
298 Kathleen Kantenwein
299 Robert Kantenwein
300 Jay Kaplan
301 Wendy Kaplan
302 Harold Kawalek
303 Judith Kawalek
304 Bob Kelly
305 Maureen L. Kelly
306 Brielle Kelmer
307 Thomas Kepler
308 Gertrude Kimm
309 Harold Kintzel
310 Carolyn Kirk
311 Laurette Koserowski
312 John F. Kuduk
313 Mary J. Kuduk
314 Eileen Kupper
315 Russell Kupper
316 K. Langan
317 Lawrence Laubengeiger
318 Josephine Lee*
319 Merwyn and Lorna Lee*
320 Francis C. LeFurge
321 Joan B. LeFurge
322 Marc Lefurge
323 Rebecca LeFurge
324 Judith Leonard
325 Patricia Levin
326 Robert Levin
327 Steven Levy
328 Edward Lincoln

329 Sharran Lumking
330 W. Lumking
331 Joanne Lynch
332 Patrick Lynch
333 Sarah Lynch
334 Richard Malecz
335 Jay Maltese
336 Constance A. Mancuso
337 William L. Mancuso
338 Barry Marcus
339 Angelo Martinelli
340 Teri Martinelli
341 James McAlister
342 Chris McCaig
343 Shirley McCaig
344 Bob McCall
345 Mark McClung
346 Molly McClung
347 Peggy McDermott
348 Barbara McLoughlin, Brookwood Musconetcong River Property Owner's Assoc.
349 Leslie McPeek
350 Ryan J. McPeek
351 Adrienne Mosley
352 George Mosley
353 Leonard Noonan
354 Wendi Nosenchuk
355 Douglas G. Paul
356 Eddie Perez
357 Grace Perez
358 Julian Perez
359 Karen Perl
360 Thomas Perl
361 Jan and Clair Pero
362 Eva Petolicchio
363 Edward Picard
364 Samantha Prestifilippo
365 Lloyd Reinhardt
366 Chuck Robinson
367 Barbara and Alfred Rolph
368 Harvey S. Roseff*
369 Larry Rotter
370 Susan Rotter
371 Dagmar Rutledge
372 Kathleen Sansone
373 Leonard Sansone
374 Robert Sapienza

375 Barbara Sauchau
376 Kurt and Esther Schau
377 JoAnne Scheidt
378 *illegible* Scheidt
379 Anne Schwartz
380 Bennett Schwartz
381 Heather Scialpi
382 Len Scialpe
383 John and Margaret Scott
384 Janice Shade
385 Timothy Shore
386 Elizabeth Shugg
387 Robert Shugg
388 David Snyder
389 B. Thomas Sporney
390 Richard Storniolo
391 Michael Sullivan
392 Stacey Sullivan
393 Ingrid Taormina
394 Dave C. Telesco
395 Gerald Telesco
396 Dennis Teske
397 Mary Ann Teske
398 Thomas J. Toohey
399 Steve Trentanelli
400 Darryl Umstead
401 Joanne Umstead
402 Arthur Valentine
403 Steve Velmer
404 Jeff Vincent, Forest Lakes Club
405 Justus B. von Lengerke, Stag Lake Corporation
406 Suzanne von Lengerke
407 William S. Wachenfeld
408 Brian Walsh
409 Brigid Walsh
410 Maryann Walsh
411 Molly Walsh
412 Beverly Wasniewski
413 Jennifer Watkins
414 Joseph Watkins
415 Laurie Welborn
416 Michelle Welborn
417 Carol B. Wetmore
418 Beverly E. Widmer
419 Charles Widmer
420 Rosallie Zabita

421 Gary McHugh
422 Phyllis *illegible*
423 Sander Zulauf
424 Joseph W. Sabatini, Byram Township Manager
425 Douglas R. Hiscano

An asterisk (*) has been placed beside the name of each commenter who also was a plaintiff-appellant in the case of Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1 (App. Div. August 5, 2010).

1. COMMENT: It was suggested by the Byram Township Manager that a public hearing be conducted by DFW. (424).

RESPONSE: In lieu of a public hearing, DFW accepted written comments for a one-month period. A written comment period provided greater opportunity to receive comments from those who do not live near the property in question and who might not be available on the date and time of a public hearing.

2. COMMENT: The issuance of the CSP license to Hudson Farm is supported for a number of reasons, including the large acreage of undeveloped property preserved, the small percentage of that property used for hunting and shooting, the good safety record, the public access provided, the good relationship Hudson Farm has had with many of its neighbors, landowner rights, hunting rights, the economic and cultural benefits provided, the history of the shooting preserve permit, opposition to a public comment period, and the charitable causes Hudson Farm has supported. (1-201, 213, 234, 235, 294, 364, 366, 398 and 421)

RESPONSE: The Division acknowledges the comments in support of the issuance of the CSP license.

3. COMMENT: The commercial shooting preserve will have a negative impact on neighboring property values. (205, 208-210, 212, 214-223, 225, 227-229, 231-233, 236, 237-250, 252-266, 268-273, 277, 279, 280, 283-286, 289, 290, 295-307, 309-317, 320-337, 339-346, 348-354, 356-361, 365, 367, 369-373, 377-382, 384-388, 391-397, 400-406, 408-411, 413-420, 422, 424, 425).

RESPONSE: The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division rejected the plaintiffs-appellants' arguments that DFW or the NJDEP had a duty to consider criteria other than those set forth in the statute. See Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1 at 17. A consideration of property values is not required by statute prior to issuing a CSP license. That notwithstanding, it is noted that 620 acres of the Hudson Farm property (Area 1) have been licensed as a commercial shooting preserve since 2000, and this area was a semi-wild shooting preserve prior to that year. The non-contiguous 878 acre parcel located in Byram and Andover Townships (Area 2) has been licensed as a commercial

shooting preserve since 2007, and there was a long history of hunting on the property before that. Considering the prior uses of Area 1 and Area 2 as a semi-wild shooting preserve and an open hunting area, respectively, DFW finds that using the Hudson Farm property as a commercial shooting preserve would be consistent with prior uses. Furthermore, no documentation was provided by any of the plaintiffs-appellants or members of the public to establish that property values in the surrounding area have decreased or will decrease as a result of the presence of a commercial shooting preserve on the Hudson Farm property.

4. COMMENT: The commercial shooting preserve increases noise levels. (202, 203-212, 214-225, 227-229, 231-233, 236-266, 268-275, 277-287, 289-292, 295-323, 325-346, 348-361, 363, 365, 367-389, 391-397, 399, 400-420, 422-425).

RESPONSE: The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division rejected the plaintiffs-appellants' arguments that DFW or NJDEP had a duty to consider criteria other than those set forth in the statute. See Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1 at 17. A consideration of noise level is not required by statute prior to issuing a CSP license. Nevertheless, Area 1 of the Hudson Farm property has been licensed as a commercial shooting preserve since 2000 and was a semi-wild shooting preserve prior to that year. Area 2 has been licensed as a commercial shooting preserve since 2007, and there was a long history of hunting on the site before then. Given that both areas of the Hudson Farm property previously served as open shooting/hunting ground, DFW believes that utilizing those areas as commercial shooting preserves would likely not have a greater effect on noise levels than the prior utilization of those parcels. Hunting is not permitted on commercial shooting preserves throughout the year, but only between September 1 and May 1.

5. COMMENT: A commercial shooting preserve will increase the amount of lead shot deposited in wetlands. (204-210, 212, 214, 216-223, 225, 227-229, 231-233, 236, 237, 239-250, 252-273, 275, 277-280, 282-286, 289, 290-292, 295-307, 309-334, 336-346, 349-361, 363, 365, 367-375, 377-382, 384-388, 390-397, 400-406, 408-416, 418-420, 422-425).

RESPONSE: The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division rejected the plaintiffs-appellants' arguments that DFW or NJDEP had a duty to consider criteria other than those set forth in the statute. See Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1 at 17. A consideration of lead shot potentially deposited in wetlands is not required by statute prior to the issuance of a CSP license. There are no federal regulations that prohibit upland game hunters from using lead shot anywhere in the country. Nor are there state regulations that prohibit upland game hunters from using lead shot to pursue upland game elsewhere in New Jersey. The Hudson Farm property is mostly upland, and the use of lead shot by upland game hunters would not be statutorily prohibited. New Jersey Game Code regulations, specifically N.J.A.C. 7:25-5.14, prohibit sportsmen, including those at Hudson Farm, who pursue waterfowl from using lead shot or lead pellets.

6. COMMENT: A process for determining a prior reasonable public interest was not established. (204-210, 212, 214, 216-223, 225-229, 231-233, 236, 237, 239-250, 252-257, 259-273, 275, 277, 278, 280, 283-286, 288-293, 295-307, 309-334, 336, 337, 339-347, 349-354, 356-361, 363, 365, 367-375, 377-382, 384-388, 390-397, 400-406, 408-416, 418-420, 424, 425).

RESPONSE: The Division disagrees. As stated in the notice published on September 29, 2010, DFW invited public comment on all aspects of the CSP license issuance to Hudson Farm, including whether the change from the prior use of the subject property, when compared to its proposed use as a shooting preserve, “would be inimical to a reasonable public interest served by the prior use.” See Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1, at 14. The public comment period itself served as the process by which individuals could offer their input as to what constituted the prior reasonable public interest in the subject property.

Hudson Farm has hosted hunting and sporting clubs since the late 1990s. Since 2000, the Division has issued a CSP license for property located at 270 Stanhope Road, which previously served as a semi-wild shooting preserve. In 2007, the CSP license was amended to include Hudson Farm West (formerly known as the Westby Farm), which also has a long history of hunting activity. CSP license applications were modified in 2010 so that the applicant must describe the history of hunting on the property before the permit is issued. In light of the longstanding history of hunting on the Hudson Farm property and the fact that both areas are large enough to provide a safe hunting environment, DFW concludes that utilizing the Hudson Farm property as a CSP would not be inimical to any reasonable public interest served by the property’s prior use as an open area for hunting.

7. COMMENT: A commercial shooting preserve near a residential neighborhood creates a safety hazard. (204, 206, 207, 224, 275, 278, 279, 291, 319, 338, 363, 367, 368, 375, 390, 404-406, 412, 417, 423-425).

RESPONSE: Hudson Farm has hosted hunting and sporting clubs since the late 1990s. N.J.S.A. 23:3-28 states that commercial shooting preserves must contain a minimum of 50 huntable acres, the boundaries of which are to be clearly posted at intervals of no more than 200 feet. The Division requires that a tax map be submitted with each CSP license application, marking the property and safety zones in red and noting the acreage of each proposed tract. All buildings on the proposed CSP property and on each adjoining property also must be marked on the map. The Division’s Bureau of Law Enforcement inspects each new commercial shooting preserve and any amendments to existing permits to verify that the preserve is large enough to allow for safe hunting. The Hudson Farm property was inspected in September 2007, after 1,738 acres were added to the existing Hudson Guild Farm, and the property became Hudson Farm. 860 acres were added to the original property on Stanhope Road, and 878 acres were added to the Roseville Road property. The property was again inspected by the

Division's Bureau of Law Enforcement in August 2010, after an additional 25 acres were added to the property at 300 Roseville Road in Byram and Andover Townships, prior to issuing an amended license in September 2010. The Hudson Farm property substantially exceeds the minimum acreage requirement under N.J.S.A. 23:3-28, and the preserve's boundaries are clearly posted at appropriate intervals. Moreover, sportsmen who hunt within a commercial shooting preserve must abide by the same safety zone regulations (N.J.S.A. 23:4-16) that apply to all other sportsmen in the state. Consequently, DFW has determined that the CSP operation on the Hudson Farm property does not create a safety hazard.

8. COMMENT: A commercial shooting preserve near the Forest Lakes community negatively impacts the residents' quality of life. (205, 208-210, 212, 214, 216-223, 225, 227-229, 231-233, 236, 237, 239-250, 252-257, 259-266, 268-273, 277, 280, 283-286, 289, 290, 295-307, 309-317, 320-323, 325-334, 336, 337, 339-346, 349-354, 356-361, 365, 369-373, 377-382, 384-388, 390-397, 400-403, 408-411, 413-416, 418-420, 422).

RESPONSE: The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division rejected the plaintiffs-appellants' arguments that DFW or the NJDEP had a duty to consider criteria other than those set forth in the statute. See Roseff, No. A-6209-07T1 at 17. A consideration of quality of life is not required by statute prior to issuing a CSP license. That notwithstanding, Hudson Farm has hosted hunting and sporting clubs since the late 1990s. As early as 2000, Area 1 of the property has been licensed as a commercial shooting preserve and served as a semi-wild shooting preserve prior to that time. There also is a long history of hunting at Area 2 of the property, which has been licensed as a commercial shooting preserve since 2007. DFW has determined that continuing to utilize the Hudson Farm property as a commercial shooting preserve would not be inimical to any reasonable public interest served by the property's prior use as an open shooting/hunting area and, as such, would not negatively affect the quality of life of neighboring residents.

9. COMMENT: Hunting of any kind is opposed. (362).

RESPONSE: N.J.S.A. 23:2-2 states that the duties of the Division shall include the protection and propagation of fish, birds, and game animals and the enforcement of the laws relating thereto. Further, N.J.S.A. 23:2A-2 provides that it is the policy of this State to manage all forms of wildlife to insure their continued participation in the ecosystem. The mission of the Division is to protect and manage the State's fish and wildlife to maximize their long-term biological, recreational, and economic values for all New Jersey residents. One of the Division's stated goals is to maximize the recreational and commercial use of New Jersey's fish and wildlife for both present and future generations. The Division recognizes that some people may be opposed to hunting for philosophical, moral, or other reasons.