

United States Department of Agriculture
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

WS Directive

2.201 10/29/03

WS DECISION MODEL

1. PURPOSE

To provide WS personnel with a systematic approach to decision-making for wildlife damage management activities.

2. BACKGROUND

Wildlife damage management focuses on reducing conflicts between humans and wildlife that occur when wildlife negatively impact agricultural and natural resources, properties, and public health and safety. Decision-making to resolve each human-wildlife conflict should take into consideration a variety of factors, such as authorities, environmental effects, and management strategies.

3. POLICY

This directive provides WS personnel with a step-by-step approach to help address requests for assistance with wildlife damage (Attachment 1). The major aspects presented in the WS Decision Model should be used when responding to requests for assistance. The WS Decision Model (Attachment 1) is intended to conceptualize and describe the thought process involved in addressing wildlife damage problems. It is designed to serve as a useful management tool and meaningful communication instrument; however, it is not intended to require documentation or a written record each time it is used, and it necessarily oversimplifies complex thought processes.

4. PROCEDURE

The following discussion is depicted in Attachment 1.

- a. Receive Request For Assistance. Wildlife damage management services are provided only in response to requests for assistance.
- b. Assess Problem. First, a determination should be made as to whether the problem is within the authority of WS. If it is, damage information should be gathered and analyzed to determine factors such as what species was responsible for the damage; the type, extent, and magnitude of damage;

Distribution:

Originating Office:

the current economic loss and potential losses; the local history of damage; and what management methods, if any, were used to reduce past damage and the results of those actions.

- c. Evaluate Management Methods. Once a problem assessment is completed, an evaluation of management methods must be conducted. Methods should be evaluated in the context of their legal and administrative availability and their acceptability based on biological, environmental, social, and cultural factors.
- d. Formulate Management Strategy. Methods determined to be practical for use are formulated into a management strategy. The concept of IWDM (WS Directive 2.105, The WS Integrated Wildlife Damage Management Program) should be applied when formulating each management strategy. This approach encourages the use of several management techniques rather than relying on a single method. Consideration of factors such as available expertise, legal constraints on methods used, costs, and effectiveness is essential in formulating each management strategy.
- e. Provide Assistance. Program service can be provided by two basic means: technical assistance and direct management (WS Directive 2.101, Selecting Wildlife Damage Management Methods).
- f. Monitor and Evaluate Results of Management Actions. When direct management is provided, it is necessary to monitor the results. Monitoring is important for determining whether further assistance is required or whether the problem has been resolved. Evaluation is used to determine whether additional techniques are necessary.
- g. End of Project. With technical assistance, the projects normally end after recommendations or advice are provided to the requestor. An operational project normally ends when WS personnel have stopped or reduced the damage to an acceptable level. Problems such as chronic predation on livestock or at aquaculture facilities may require continuing or intermittent attention and may have no well-defined end point.

5. REFERENCES

WS Directive 2.101, Selecting Wildlife Damage Management Methods
10/29/03)

WS Directive 2.105, The WS Integrated Wildlife Damage Management
Program (07/14/98)

ADC Final Environmental Impact Statement, Chapter 2.D.2.b - APHIS
ADC Decision Model, pp 23-35 (October 1997)

Deputy Administrator

Attachment

