

**DECISION
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:
MANAGEMENT OF AQUATIC RODENT DAMAGE IN MISSOURI**

September 7, 2011

I. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services program (WS) receives and responds to a variety of requests for assistance from individuals, organizations, and agencies experiencing damage and other problems related to wildlife. Wildlife damage management is the alleviation of damage or other problems caused by or related to the presence of wildlife, and is recognized as an integral part of wildlife management (The Wildlife Society 1992). In November 2004, WS released an Environmental Assessment (EA) “*Management of Aquatic Rodent Damage in Missouri*” (USDA 2004). The EA documented the need for aquatic rodent damage management (ARDM) in Missouri and assessed potential environmental impacts of various alternatives to reduce aquatic rodent damage and associated risks to human health and safety. The alternative selected was, “*Alternative 3. Fully Integrated Beaver, Nutria, Muskrat Damage Management Program for all Public and Private Land (No Action/Proposed Action)*” in which WS provides technical assistance and direct control activities to reduce aquatic rodent damage. The alternative allows for the integrated use and recommendation of nonlethal and lethal methods for aquatic rodent damage management. In 2010, WS prepared a Supplement which updated the information and analyses in the original EA. This document includes WS’ response to public comments on the Supplement, selection of a management alternative and determination regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed action.

Ordinarily individual WS damage management actions are categorically excluded and do not require an environmental assessment (EA) (7 CFR 372.5(c), 60 Fed. Reg. 6000-6003, 1995). However, in order to facilitate planning, interagency coordination, and the streamlining of program management, and to clearly communicate with the public the analysis of cumulative impacts from WS’s proposed program, the EA on alternatives for managing aquatic rodent damage in Missouri was prepared. The EA and Supplement relied on existing data contained in published documents, and agency (WS, U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) data and reports., and the Animal Damage Control Final Environmental Impact Statement (USDA 1997 Revised). The EA and Supplement also incorporate information from the WS programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (USDA 1997) by references. Wildlife Services consulted with the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) during the preparation of the EA and Supplement regarding impacts on state wildlife populations and state laws and regulations. All WS ARDM activities are conducted applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations.

I. SCOPE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The current WS program reduces damage to property, crops, and natural resources and risks to human health and safety resulting from the activities of beaver (*Castor canadensis*), muskrat (*Ondatra zibethica*), and nutria (*Myocastor coypus*) in Missouri. Wildlife Services may conduct the ARDM program on private and public property wherever such management is needed and assistance is requested from the WS program. The scope and need for action have not changes substantially from those established in the EA. Some of the types of damage that resource owners/managers seek to alleviate are: flooding of agricultural lands and roads; burrows weakening levies and water control structures; road bed failures due to impounded water, damage to commercial timber and ornamental trees and shrubs from flooding and cutting, structural degradation of storm water ditches, loss of or damage to habitat for native wildlife and fish species, and hazards to aviation at airports. Additionally, nutria are an introduced species and often compete for food and space with native wildlife. Details on the conflicts and benefits associated with aquatic rodents in Missouri are provided in the EA and Supplement. State agencies in Missouri provide little to no direct assistance to landowners with beaver, nutria, and muskrat damage management due to time and funding constraints and a lack of expertise. Similarly, private trappers generally prove inadequate for reducing beaver damage due to the high costs to landowners, low number of licensed trappers, and lack of expertise in ARDM.

Missouri state statute (3CSR10-4.130) authorizes landowners or agents of the landowner to protect property, subject to federal regulations, from migratory birds and any other wildlife except deer, turkey, bear and any endangered species which beyond reasonable doubt is damaging property. With the exceptions noted, depredating wildlife may be captured or killed at any time without a permit. The MDC may also use aquatic rodent harvest regulations as a population management tool. Resource owners/managers can make their land available to trappers as a means of addressing damage problems. The WS EA and supplement only evaluated alternatives for WS involvement in ARDM and cannot change Missouri State Statutes and MDC policy permitting private landowners access to lethal and nonlethal alternatives for managing aquatic rodent damage. Therefore, a major overarching factor in determining how to analyze potential environmental impacts of WS' involvement in ARDM is that such management will likely be conducted by state, local government, or private entities that are not subject to compliance with NEPA if WS is not involved. This means that the Federal WS program has limited ability to affect the environmental outcome of ARDM in the state, except that the WS program is likely to have lower risks to nontarget species and less impact on wildlife populations than some alternatives available to resource owners/managers. Therefore, WS has limited ability to affect the environmental *status quo*.

III. ISSUES ANALYZED IN THE EA

The following issues were identified as important to the scope of the analysis (40 CFR 1508.25) and each of the proposed alternatives was evaluated relative to its impacts on these issues.

- Effects on beaver, nutria, and muskrat populations,
- Effects on plants and other wildlife species, including T&E species,
- Effects on public and pet health and safety,
- Humaneness of methods to be used,
- Effects on wetlands,
- Economic losses to property, and
- Impacts to stakeholders, including aesthetics

An additional 5 issues were discussed but not addressed in detail for each alternative including:

- WS' impact on biodiversity;
- Wildlife damage management should not be conducted at taxpayer expense (wildlife damage management should be fee based);
- Aquatic rodent damage management should be managed by trappers and Nuisance Wildlife Control Agents;
- Breaching/removal of dams or use of water control structures; and
- Appropriateness of preparing an EA instead of an EIS for such a large area.

IV. ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN DETAIL

The following Alternatives were developed to analyze and respond to the issues listed above. Six additional alternatives were considered but not analyzed in detail. A detailed discussion of the effects of the Alternatives on the issues is analyzed in the EA. In all alternatives in which WS conducts ARDM, WS actions would be consistent with other uses of the area and would comply with applicable federal, state and local laws.

Alternative 1 – No WS Beaver, Nutria, or Muskrat Damage Management in Missouri

This alternative would result in no assistance from WS in reducing beaver, nutria, or muskrat damage in Missouri. All requests for beaver, nutria, or muskrat damage management assistance would be referred to the MDC, local animal control agencies, or private businesses or organizations. Assistance may or may not be available from any of these entities.

Alternative 2 – Only Lethal Beaver, Nutria, and Muskrat Damage Management

Under this alternative, WS would only provide technical assistance and operational beaver, nutria, and muskrat damage management for lethal management techniques. Non-lethal capture devices such as snares, leghold traps, and cage traps could be used under this alternative. However, all aquatic rodents captured in non-lethal devices would be euthanized. The WS Decision Model would be used to select among the lethal management alternatives available to WS in order to meet the needs of the specific damage situation while minimizing potential harmful effects of damage management

measures on humans, target and non-target species, and the environment. Requests for information regarding non-lethal management approaches would be referred to MDC, local animal control agencies, or private businesses or organizations. WS would not remove or breach beaver dams under this alternative. Individuals or agencies could choose to implement WS lethal recommendations on their own, implement non-lethal methods or other methods not recommended by WS, request WS assistance with lethal management techniques, use contractual services of private businesses, use volunteer services, or take no action. WS would provide assistance with lethal aquatic rodent damage management when requested on private or public property only after an *Agreement for Control* or other comparable document has been completed and funding has been secured.

Alternative 3 - Fully Integrated Beaver, Nutria, and Muskrat Damage Management for all Public and Private Land (No Action/Proposed Action)

The No Action alternative is a procedural NEPA requirement (40 CFR 1502.14(d)) and is a viable and reasonable alternative that could be selected and serves as a baseline for comparison with the other alternatives. The No Action alternative, as defined here, is consistent with guidance from the CEQ (CEQ 1981). In this guidance, the No Action alternative for situations where there is an ongoing management program may be interpreted as "no change" from current management direction or level of management intensity.

This alternative would continue the current ARDM program in the state of Missouri. An IWDM approach, including technical assistance and operational damage management services, would be implemented to reduce beaver, nutria and muskrat damage to property, roads, bridges, railroads, agricultural and natural resources, and risks to public health and safety. Damage management would be conducted on public and private property in Missouri where a need exists and when landowners/managers request WS assistance. The IWDM strategy would encompass the use of practical and effective non-lethal and lethal methods of preventing or reducing damage while minimizing harmful effects of damage management measures on humans, target and non-target species, and the environment. The WS Decision Model (Slate et al. 1992; Section 3.2.3) would be used to select among the full range of management methods available when developing site-specific plans to address aquatic rodent damage. When appropriate, physical exclusion or habitat modification could be recommended and utilized to reduce aquatic rodent damage. Other non-lethal methods may include but are not limited to textural barriers, Clemson beaver pond levelers, beaver deceivers, and beaver exclusions devices. Aquatic rodents captured in non-lethal devices (leg-hold traps, snares, cage traps, etc.) would subsequently be euthanized. In other situations problem animals would be removed as humanely as possible using: body gripping traps (e.g., Conibear-type), snares, zinc phosphide bait for muskrats and nutria, leg-hold traps and shooting. When appropriate, beaver dams could be removed by using binary explosives or by hand. Preference would be given to practical and effective non-lethal methods, but non-lethal methods may not always be applied as a first response to each damage problem. The most appropriate response could be a combination of non-lethal and lethal methods, or

there could be instances where application of lethal methods alone would be the most appropriate strategy.

Alternative 4- Technical Assistance Only

This alternative would only allow Missouri WS to provide technical assistance to individuals or agencies requesting beaver, nutria, or muskrat damage management in Missouri. WS would not remove or breach beaver dams under this alternative. The WS Decision Model (Section 3.2.3) would be used when recommending management alternatives that meet the needs of the specific damage situation. Landowners/managers could implement their own aquatic rodent damage management program, use contractual services of private businesses, use volunteer services, or take no action. This alternative would place the immediate burden of operational damage management work on the property owners and other Federal, State, or county agencies.

Alternative 5- Non-lethal Beaver, Nutria, and Muskrat Damage Management

Under this alternative, WS would only provide technical assistance and operational beaver, nutria, and muskrat damage management for non-lethal management techniques. The WS Decision Model (Section 3.2.3) would be used to select among the non-lethal management alternatives available to WS in order to meet the needs of the specific damage situation. Requests for information regarding lethal management approaches would be referred to MDC, local animal control agencies, or private businesses or organizations. Individuals or agencies might choose to implement WS non-lethal recommendations on their own, implement lethal methods or other methods not recommended by WS, contract for WS non-lethal damage management services, use contractual services or private businesses, use volunteer services, or take no action. Unwanted beaver dams could be removed or breached by hand or with binary explosives under this alternative. WS would provide assistance with non-lethal aquatic rodent damage management on private or public property only after an *Agreement for Control* or other comparable document has been completed and funding has been secured.

New Methods: The EA analyzed the potential environmental impacts of including live-capture and relocation and improved water control and beaver exclusion devices to the methods which may be used by WS. As analyzed in the supplement, these methods could be available for use and/or recommendation by WS under Alternatives 3-5 above.

V. MONITORING

The Missouri WS program will monitor the impacts of its actions relative to each of the issues analyzed in detail in the EA and supplement. This evaluation will include reporting the WS take of all target and nontarget species to help ensure no adverse impact on the viability of any target or non-target species including State and Federally listed threatened/endangered species. MDC expertise will be used to assist in determining impacts on state wildlife populations.

VI. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The original EA was prepared and released to the public for review and comment from November 16, through December 20, 2004. A legal notice of availability was published in the Kansas City Star (Kansas City, MO), St Louis Post Dispatch (St Louis, MO) and the Springfield News Leader (Springfield, MO). The EA was also mailed directly to agencies, organizations, and individuals with probable interest in the proposed program. There were three requests for copies of the EA for review, but WS did not receive any comments on the EA. The Decision/FONSI was made available to the public using the same methods as listed for the EA on January 27, 2005. The original EA and Decision/FONSI may be viewed at the WS website http://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife_damage/nepa.shtml.

The EA, the Decision/FONSI, and this Supplement were made available for public review and comment from March 21 to April 22, 2011 through a legal notice in the Jefferson City News Tribune March, by direct mailing to agencies, organizations, and individuals with probable interest in the proposed program, and by posting on the WS website. Public notification was conducted in compliance with WS' NEPA implementation procedures published in the Federal Register March 21, 2007 (Vol. 72, No. 54: 13237-13238). WS received one request for a copy of the EA/Supplement for review and one comment letter on the EA/Supplement. Issues noted in the letter and WS' responses to comments are provided in Appendix A of this document. This Decision/FONSI will be made available to the public using the same methods described for the Supplement.

VII. AGENCY AUTHORITIES

Wildlife Services: Under the Act of March 2, 1931, as amended (7 U.S.C.426-426b), WS is authorized to conduct a program of wildlife services with respect to injurious animal species; and, under the Act of December 22, 1987 (7 U.S.C. 426c), WS is authorized to control nuisance mammals and birds and those mammal and bird species that are reservoirs for zoonotic diseases..

Missouri Department of Conservation: The MDC, under the direction of a Governor-appointed Conservation Commission, is charged by the Legislature with the management of the State's wildlife. The MDC has the responsibility to manage all protected and classified wildlife in Missouri, except migratory birds and federally listed T/E species. The legal authorities of the Conservation Commission and the MDC are established in the Wildlife Code of Missouri. The Conservation Commission mission statement helps clarify and interpret the role of MDC in managing natural resources in Missouri.

VIII. DECISION AND RATIONALE

I have carefully reviewed the EA and Supplement, and WS' response to public comments on these documents. I believe the issues identified in the EA Supplement are best addressed by selecting Alternative 3, *Continue the Current WS Adaptive Integrated Beaver, Nutria, and*

Muskrat Damage Management for all Public and Private Land (No Action/Proposed Action), including incorporating limited use of capture and relocation and improvements to water control and beaver exclusion devices discussed in the supplement. WS will continue to apply the Standard Operating Procedures and monitoring measures discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA. Alternative 3 provides the best range of damage management methods considered practical and effective, addresses the issues, and accomplishes WS' Congressionally directed role in protecting the Nation's agricultural and other resources. WS policies and social considerations, including humane issues, will be considered when conducting ARDM. Although Alternative 3 does not require non-lethal methods to be used, WS will continue to provide information and encourage the use of practical and effective non-lethal methods (WS Directive 2.101).

The analyses in the EA and Supplement demonstrate that Alternative 3 provides WS the best opportunity to address the issues and will have low impacts on target and non-target species. Alternative 3 best addresses the issues identified in the EA, provides safeguards for public safety, and enables WS to meet its obligations to the MDC, and cooperating counties and residents of Missouri. Alternative 3 provides a mix of technical assistance, non-lethal and lethal methods. As a part of this Decision, the Missouri WS program will continue to provide biological and non-lethal management techniques information that could reduce damage. I have also adopted the Supplement as final because comments from public comments did not change the analysis.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The EA Supplement indicates that there will not be a significant impact, individually or cumulatively, on the quality of the human environment because of this proposed action, and that these actions do not constitute a major Federal action. I agree with this conclusion and therefore determine that an EIS will not be necessary or prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

1. Aquatic rodent damage management, as conducted in Missouri is not regional or national in scope.
2. The proposed action will not have an impact on unique characteristics of the areas such as historical or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecological critical areas.
3. The proposed action will not significantly affect public health and safety. No accidents associated with WS aquatic rodent damage management are known to have occurred in Missouri.
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment are not highly controversial. Although there is opposition to WS damage management, this action is not controversial in relation to size, nature or effects.
5. Standard Operating Procedures adopted as part of the proposed action lessen risks to the public and prevent adverse effects on the human environment and reduce uncertainty and risks.

6. The proposed action does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects. This action would not set precedence for additional WS damage management that may be implemented or planned in Missouri.
7. The number of animals taken (both target and non-target) by WS annually is small in comparison to the total population. Adverse effects on wildlife and wildlife habitats would be minimal.
8. No significant cumulative effects were identified by this assessment or other actions implemented or planned within the area.
9. Aquatic rodent damage management would not affect cultural or historic resources. The proposed action does not affect districts, sites, highways, structures or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will it cause a loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.
10. An evaluation of the proposed action and its effects on state and federally listed T/E species determined that no significant adverse effects would be created for these species. The proposed action will fully comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Consultations with the USFWS and the MDC have taken place and their input was used to develop Standard Operating Procedures for the proposed action.
11. This action would be in compliance with applicable federal, state and local laws or requirements for damage management and environmental protection.

For additional information regarding this decision, please contact Seth Swafford, State Director, APHIS, WS, 1714 Commerce Court, Suite C, Columbia MO 65202, or by phone @ 573-449-3033 Ext 15.



Robert L. Hudson
Acting Regional Director, USDA-APHIS-WS
Raleigh, North Carolina



Date

Literature Cited

- Boyles, S. L. 2006. Report on the efficacy and comparative costs of using flow devices to resolve conflicts with North American beavers along roadways in the Coastal Plain of Virginia. M.S. Thesis, Christopher Newport University, Newport News, VA. 48pp.
- Boyles, S. L., and B. A. Savitzky. 2008. An analysis of the efficacy and comparative costs of using flow devices to resolve conflicts with North American beavers along roadways in the Coastal Plain of Virginia. *Proceedings of the Vertebrate Pest Conference* 23:47-52.
- Boyles, S. L., and B. A. Savitzky. 2007. An analysis of the efficacy and comparative costs of using flow devices to resolve conflicts with North American Beavers along roadways in the coastal plain of Virginia. *International Beaver Ecology and Management Workshop*. Abstract and slide presentation.
- Brown, S., D. Shafer, and S. Anderson. 2001. Control of beaver flooding at restoration projects. WRAP Technical Notes Collection (ERDC TN-WRAP-01-01), U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg MS. www.wes.army.mil/el/wrap.
- Brown, S. 2010. American's best beaver program, Kudos to Jake Jacobson and Snohomish County, WA Public Works. *Beaversprite*, 25(2):4-7, 13.
- CEQ. 1981. Forty most asked questions concerning CEQ's NEPA regulations. 40 CFR 1500-1508 and Fed. Reg. 55:18026-18038.
- Missouri Department of Conservation. 1/15/2010. Beaver . MDC Web Site
- Missouri Department of Conservation, Outdoor Recreation. 12/10/2010. MDC Web Site
- Nolte, D. M., S. R. Swafford, and C. A. Sloan. 2001. Survey of factors affecting the success of Clemson beaver pond levelers installed in Mississippi by Wildlife Services. Pages 120-125 in M C. Brittingham, J. Kays, and R. McPeake editors, *Proceedings of the Ninth Wildlife Damage Management Conference*. Pennsylvania State University, University Park, USA.
- Slate, D. A., R. Owens, G. Connolly, and G. Simmons. 1992. Decision making for wildlife damage management. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference* 57:51-62.
- The Wildlife Society. 1992. *Conservation policies of the wildlife society: a stand on issues important to wildlife conservation*. The Wildlife Society, Bethesda, Md. 24 pp.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture). 2004. Aquatic Rodent Damage Management in Missouri. USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services, Missouri State Office, 1714 Commerce Court, Suite C, Columbia, Missouri 65202.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture). 1997 revised. Animal Damage Control Program Final Environmental Impact Statement. USDA, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services, Operational Support Staff, 4700 River Road, Unit 87, Riverdale, MD 20737.

WS Directive 2.101. Selecting Wildlife Damage Management Methods.

Appendix A

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Wildlife Services received one comment letter on the Supplement. This appendix contains issues raised in the letter and WS' response to each issue. Comments from the public are numbered and are written in bold text. The WS response follows each comment and is written in standard text.

- 1. Missouri had lost 87% of its original wetlands by the 1980's, according to a USFWS report. Missouri probably now has less than 10% of the state's original beaver population and a similar small fraction of the original wetlands. Wetlands, including those created by beaver, provide valuable ecological and economic benefits in term of reduced flooding, improved water quality and wildlife habitat. Wildlife Services should work to restore the state's wetlands and beaver population by relocating beaver.**

USDA-Wildlife Services agrees that the amount of wetlands in Missouri has been greatly reduced over time. Early records pertaining to the actual numbers of beavers in Missouri are few and far between. However, records indicate that prior to the Civil War; beaver were common on every major watershed in Missouri (Bennitt 1937). In 1911, excessive harvest almost eliminated beaver from the state (Bennitt 1937, MDC 2010). Despite an extreme reduction in their colonies by about 1900, Missouri's beaver population has been re-established throughout the state. (MDC 2010). Although a numeric comparison of historic and current beaver population is not possible, the Missouri beaver population is healthy and sustainable and sustains a regulated trapping trapping season. Annually Missouri trappers harvest an average 7,000 beavers (MDC 2010).

As stated in the EA, 2002 Decision/FONSI and the Supplement, WS also agrees that wetlands, including beaver ponds, can provide numerous ecological benefits. However, Wildlife Service's mission is limited to providing federal leadership in wildlife damage management. Under the Act of March 2, 1931, as amended (7 U.S.C.426-426b), APHIS-WS is authorized to conduct a program of wildlife services with respect to injurious animal species; and, under the Act of December 22, 1987 (7 U.S.C. 426c), APHIS-WS is authorized to control nuisance mammals and birds and those mammal and bird species that are reservoirs for zoonotic diseases. Wildlife Services authorities do not include embarking upon wetland habitat restoration projects. However, beaver relocation is included as a viable management option in the Supplement and has been selected for inclusion in the proposed alternative. If an individual, organization or agency that is engaged in a wetlands restoration project were to ask WS for live beaver from damage management projects WS would not be opposed to participating as long as funds, staff time and permission from MDC to relocate animals were available. It should be noted, that at present, MDC does not encourage the relocation of nuisance wildlife including beaver.

Wildlife Services will continue to recommend nonlethal alternatives such as water control devices and beaver exclusion where practical and effective, however, the choice to implement these methods is at the discretion of the landowner/manager. Any beaver damage management project must consider the landowners objectives for the site, cost of implementation, and other land uses.

The EA and supplement reviewed the impacts of the proposed management alternatives on wetlands in Missouri. These analyses indicate the beaver removals proposed in the EA will not have a significant negative or positive impact on wetlands in Missouri.

2. **A discrepancy appears on Page 12 of the Supplement, which indicates that from 2005-2009 MO WS removed an average of 123 beavers per year. Yet the first paragraph on P. 16 indicated that MO WS takes “approximately 200-500 beaver per year”.**

The discrepancy brought to WS attention is a typographical error in the language on page 16. The document has been corrected to show the range 96-136 beavers per year. Wildlife Services works to accurately report and document all take while conducting damage management activities.

3. **The determination that beaver dam removal will not adversely impact newly federally-listed threatened or endangered fish is questionable. A similar determination about another species was later proven to be incorrect.**

Scientists understanding of species and biological systems is constantly undergoing scrutiny and improvement. WS used the best available information when making its determination regarding the impacts of the proposed action on the newly-listed threatened and endangered species. As noted in the Supplement, WS consulted with the USFWS regarding the impact of the proposed action on the newly-listed threatened and endangered species. In an informal Section 7 consultation, the USFWS Missouri Field Office has concurred with this determination (letter from R. Hansen, USFWS, February 11, 2010). WS will continue to monitor the available data and impacts of the ARDM program on threatened and endangered species and will revise the EA and Section 7 consultation as needed in accordance with the requirements of the NEPA and ESA.

4. **Water control and beaver exclusion devices and other nonlethal methods have developed to the point where all beaver conflicts may be resolved using nonlethal methods. The Snohomish County, WA, Public Works Department has not removed any beavers from county road sites for ten years due to a highly cost effective beaver flow devices. See Brown et al. 2001, Boyles and Savitzky 2008 and Brown 2010.**

The EA and supplement review the advantages and limits of nonlethal and lethal damage management methods. The use of exclusion methods, including pre-dam fences, beaver deceivers, beaver bafflers, and culvert outlet installations, is addressed in Appendix D of the original EA and is augmented by information in the Supplement. Brown et al. (2001)

mentioned by the commenter provides greater detail on the devices and is specifically cited in the EA and Supplement.

Boyles and Savitzky (2008) reviewed the cost effectiveness of beaver deceivers, and water control devices at 21 sites with a history of chronic beaver damage to roadways (plugged culverts and/or high water levels associated with free-standing dams). The study analyzed used of the devices in low-gradient streams where devices have had questionable efficacy in other parts of the country (Nolte et al. 2001). Much of the data in Boyles and Savitzky (2008) was from research reported in Boyles (2006) and Boyles and Savitzky 2007 which were used in the Supplement/ Boyles at Savitzky (2008) did review an additional 7 devices which were effective at 6 of 7 sites. Boyles and Savitzky (2008) estimated that the flow devices saved an estimated \$8.37 per dollar spent on damage prevention in contrast to \$0.39 saved per dollar spent in a prior damage management program using lethal removal.

Every beaver damage management technique has advantages and disadvantages. Methods used must be effective, legally available and consistent with the site uses, management objectives and resources of the landowner/manager. WS agrees and the data in the EA and Supplement support that nonlethal methods can be an effective method in situations such as those described by Boyles and Savitzky (2008) and Brown 2010. However, WS deals with a wide variety of damage situations. Road conflicts such as those discussed in Boyles and Savitzky (2008) and Brown (2010) only comprise a small portion (7% in 2009) of all requests for WS assistance with beaver damage management in Missouri (Supplement Section “Summary of WS’ Aquatic Rodent Damage Management Activities”). As discussed in the Supplement, the devices may not be as effective when used for problems such as dams in irrigation canals where beaver may build additional dams up or down stream in response to the water control device. Similarly, the fencing recommended by the commenter may be one method of excluding aquatic rodents from dikes and levees, but may not be desirable in areas where people fish. Given the, variety of conflict situations which WS is asked to address, the multiple factors which must be considered when developing site-specific management plans and the limitations of the methods discussed in the EA and Supplement, we do not concur that nonlethal methods are appropriate for all conflicts.

5. Which Alternative? BWB would to prefer to see MO WS choose Alternative 4- Technical Assistance only.

Wildlife Services has noted and taken into consideration Beaver, Wetlands and Wildlife’s comment of their preferred choice Alternative 4- Technical Assistance only. Thank you for your participation in the Public Comment period of this document.

6. The citation pertaining to a DVD created by Beavers, Wetlands, & Wildlife is incorrect.

The citation has been corrected to read as requested by Beavers, Wetlands, & Wildlife. The citation now reads: Perry, M., D. Quayle and S. Brown. 2006. Coexisting with

beavers. DVD. Spring Farms Cares, Clinton, NY and Beavers: Wetlands & Wildlife, Dolgeville, NY.