

**DECISION AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: MAMMAL DAMAGE MANAGEMENT
IN GEORGIA**

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services (WS) program, in cooperation with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the potential impacts to the quality of the human environment from resolving damage and threats of damage associated with big brown bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*), bobcats (*Lynx rufus*), beaver (*Castor canadensis*), Brazilian free-tailed bats (*Tadarida brasiliensis*), coyotes (*Canis latrans*), eastern chipmunk (*Tamias striatus*), eastern cottontails (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), evening bats (*Nycticeius humeralis*), fallow deer (*Dama dama*), feral cats (*Felis domesticus*), feral dogs (*Canis familiaris*), feral swine (*Sus scrofa*), gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), gray squirrels (*Sciurus carolinensis*), little brown myotis (*Myotis lucifugus*), mink (*Neovison vison*), muskrats (*Ondatra zibethicus*), nine-banded armadillos (*Dasypus novemcinctus*), raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), Rafinesque's big-eared bats (*Corynorhinus rafinesquii*), red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), river otters (*Lontra canadensis*), roof rats (*Rattus rattus*), silver-haired bats (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), striped skunks (*Mephitis mephitis*), tri-colored bats (*Perimyotis subflavus*), Virginia opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), and woodchucks (*Marmota monax*) (USDA 2016). The EA and this document will collectively refer to those animal species as mammals.

The EA and this Decision ensure that WS complies with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), with the Council on Environmental Quality guidelines (see 40 CFR 1500), and with the APHIS' NEPA implementing regulations (see 7 CFR 372). WS previously developed an EA that analyzed the need for action to manage damage associated with several species of mammals in Georgia (USDA 2008). In addition, WS prepared an EA that evaluated the need to manage damage caused by white-tailed deer in the State (USDA 2002), an EA that evaluated the need to manage aquatic rodents (USDA 2004), and an EA that evaluated the need to manage damage caused by feral swine (USDA 2005). Since the new EA re-evaluated activities associated with mammals to address a new need for action and the associated affected environment, the outcome of this Decision for the new EA will supersede the previous EAs that addressed damage management activities associated with mammals (USDA 2008), white-tailed deer (USDA 2002), aquatic rodents (USDA 2004), and feral swine (USDA 2005).

The need for action identified in Section 1.2 of the new EA arises from requests for assistance that WS receives. The EA evaluates the need for action to manage damage associated with mammals, the potential issues associated with managing damage, and the environmental consequences of conducting different alternatives to meet the need for action while addressing the identified issues. WS defined the issues associated with meeting the need for action and identified preliminary alternatives through consultation with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR)¹. The new EA analyzes three alternatives in detail to meet the need for action and to address the issues analyzed in detail.

A discussion of WS' authority, the authority of the TVA, and the authority of other agencies, as those authorities relate to conducting activities to alleviate mammal damage, occurs in Section 1.5 of the EA. In addition, several laws or statutes authorize, regulate, or otherwise would affect activities associated with managing damage caused by mammals (see Section 1.6 of the EA). The WS program would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations in accordance with WS Directive 2.210. Section 1.7 of the EA identified several decisions to be made based on the scope of the EA.

¹The GDNR has regulatory authority to manage the wildlife populations in the State.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ISSUES

Damage or threats of damage associated with mammals could occur statewide in Georgia wherever mammal species occur. Those mammal species addressed in the EA are capable of utilizing a variety of habitats in the State. Most species of mammals addressed in the EA occur throughout the year across the State where suitable habitat exists for foraging and shelter.

Issues are concerns regarding potential effects that might occur from a proposed activity. Federal agencies, such as the WS program in Georgia, must consider such issues during the NEPA decision-making process. WS and the TVA identified several issues during the development of the EA. Section 2.2 of the EA describes the issues considered and evaluated in detail by WS as part of the decision-making process. Section 2.3 of the EA describes additional issues that WS and the TVA considered but did not analyze in detail within the EA. The rationale for the decision not to analyze those issues in detail occurs in Section 2.3 of the EA.

To identify additional issues and alternatives, WS made the EA available to the public for review and comment through notices published in local media and through direct notification of interested parties. WS made the EA available to the public for review and comment by a legal notice published in the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution* newspaper from November 7, 2016 through November 9, 2016. WS also made the EA available to the public for review and comment on the APHIS website on October 31, 2016 and on the regulations.gov website beginning on October 28, 2016. WS also sent a notice of availability directly to agencies, organizations, and individuals with probable interest in managing mammal damage in the State. The public involvement process ended on December 16, 2016. During the public comment period, WS received two comment responses on the draft EA. Appendix A of this decision summarizes the comments received and provides response to the comments. Based on further review of the draft EA, WS incorporated minor editorial changes into the final EA. Those minor changes enhanced the understanding of the EA, but did not change the analysis provided in the EA.

ALTERNATIVES

The EA evaluated three alternatives in detail to respond to the need for action discussed in Chapter 1 and the issues identified in Chapter 2 of the EA. Section 3.1 of the EA provides a description of the alternatives evaluated in detail. Alternative 1 would continue the current implementation of an adaptive methods approach utilizing non-lethal and lethal techniques, when requested, as deemed appropriate using the WS Decision Model, to reduce damage and threats caused by mammals in Georgia. Alternative 2 would limit WS' involvement to providing recommendations on methods that people could use to manage damage without any direct involvement by WS. Under Alternative 3, the WS program in Georgia would not provide any assistance with managing damage associated with mammals in the State. A detailed discussion of the effects of those alternatives on the issues occurs in Chapter 4 of the EA. WS and the TVA also considered additional alternatives; however, WS and the TVA did not consider those alternatives in detail for the reasons provided in Section 3.2 of the EA.

WS would incorporate those standard operating procedures discussed in Section 3.3 and Section 3.4 of the EA into activities if the decision-maker selected the proposed action/no action alternative (Alternative 1) and when applicable, WS would incorporate relevant standard operating procedures under the technical assistance alternative (Alternative 2), if selected. If the decision-maker selected the no involvement by WS alternative (Alternative 3), the lack of assistance by WS would preclude the employment or recommendation of those standard operating procedures addressed in the EA.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Section 4.1 of the EA analyzes each alternative as those alternatives relate to the issues by analyzing the environmental consequences of each alternative in comparison to determine the extent of actual or potential impacts on the issues. Section 4.1 of the EA provides information needed to make informed decisions when selecting the appropriate alternative to address the need for action. Alternative 1 served as the baseline for the analysis and the comparison of expected impacts among the alternatives.

The following resource values in Georgia are not expected to be significantly impacted by any of the alternatives analyzed in the EA: soils, geology, minerals, water quality/quantity, flood plains, wetlands, critical habitats (areas designated for threatened or endangered species), visual resources, air quality, prime and unique farmlands, aquatic resources, timber, and range. The activities proposed in the alternatives would have a negligible effect on atmospheric conditions including the global climate. Meaningful direct or indirect emissions of greenhouse gases would not occur because of any of the alternatives. Those alternatives would meet the requirements of applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders, including the Clean Air Act and Executive Order 13514. The discussion below provides a summary of the environmental consequences of the three alternatives for each of the issues analyzed in detail.

Issue 1 - Effects of Damage Management Activities on Target Mammal Populations

Under Alternative 1, WS would incorporate non-lethal and lethal methods described in Appendix B of the EA into an integrated methods approach in which WS' personnel could employ all or a combination of methods to resolve a request for assistance. Non-lethal methods can capture, disperse, exclude, or otherwise make an area unattractive to mammals that are causing damage, which could potentially reduce the presence of those animals at the site and potentially the immediate area around the site. Non-lethal methods generally have minimal impacts on overall populations of animals since those species are unharmed.

A common issue is whether damage management actions would adversely affect the populations of target mammal species when WS' employees employ lethal methods. Lethal methods can remove specific mammals that personnel of WS have identified as causing damage or posing a threat of damage, including threats to human safety. The number of individual animals removed from a population by WS using lethal methods would be dependent on the number of requests for assistance received, the number of animals involved with the associated damage or threat, the efficacy of methods employed, and the number of individual animals the GDNR authorizes WS to remove, when authorization is required. Based on those quantitative and qualitative parameters addressed in the EA, the anticipated number of individual animals that WS' employees could lethally remove annually to address requests for assistance under Alternative 1 would be of low magnitude when compared to population trend data, population estimates, and/or harvest data.

The lack of WS' direct involvement does not preclude the lethal removal of mammals by those persons experiencing damage or seeking assistance from other entities. Those people experiencing damage or threats could remove mammals themselves under any of the alternatives when the GDNR authorizes the removal, when authorization is required. In some cases, a landowner or their designee can lethally remove individual animals of certain species at any time they cause damage without the need to have specific authorization from the GDNR. In addition, a resource owner could seek assistance from private businesses to remove mammals causing damage or they could remove certain animals during the regulated hunting and/or trapping seasons in the State.

Therefore, other entities could remove those mammals that WS could lethally remove annually to alleviate damage in the absence of involvement by WS. Since the lack of WS' direct involvement does not preclude the lethal removal of mammals by those persons experiencing damage or threats, WS' involvement in the lethal removal of those mammals under Alternative 1 would not be additive to the number of mammals that other entities could remove in the absence of WS' involvement. The number of mammals lethally removed annually would likely be similar across the alternatives, since the removal of mammals could occur even if WS was not directly involved with providing assistance under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. WS does not have the authority to regulate the number of mammals lethally removed annually by other entities.

Based on the limited removal proposed by WS and the oversight by the GDNR, WS' removal of mammals annually from the implementation of Alternative 1 would have no effect on the ability of those persons interested to harvest mammals. WS would also have no impact on the ability to harvest mammals under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 since WS would only provide technical assistance under Alternative 2 and provide no assistance under Alternative 3. However, resource/property owners or their agents may remove mammals under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 resulting in impacts similar to Alternative 1. The GDNR could continue to regulate mammal populations through adjustments in allowed removal during the regulated harvest season and through permits to manage damage or threats of damage.

Issue 2 - Effects of Activities on the Populations of Non-target Animals, Including T&E Species

WS' personnel have experience with managing animal damage and receive training in the employment of methods. Under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, WS' employees would use the WS Decision Model to select the most appropriate methods to address damage caused by targeted animals and to exclude non-target species. To reduce the likelihood of dispersing, capturing, or removing non-target animals, WS would employ selective methods for the targeted species, would employ the use of attractants that were as specific to the targeted species as possible, and determine placement of methods to avoid exposure to non-target animals. Section 3.3 and Section 3.4 in the EA discuss the standard operating procedures that WS' personnel would follow to prevent and reduce any potential adverse effects on non-target animals when conducting activities under Alternative 1. If applicable, when providing technical assistance, WS' personnel would also incorporate those standard operating procedures into recommendations provided under Alternative 2. Despite the best efforts to minimize non-target animal exposure to methods during program activities, the potential for WS' personnel to disperse, live-capture, or lethally remove non-target animals exists when applying both non-lethal and lethal methods to manage damage or reduce threats to safety.

The unintentional removal or capture of animals during damage management activities conducted under Alternative 1 would primarily be associated with the use of body-grip traps and in some situations, with live-capture methods, such as foothold traps, cage traps, and cable devices. The non-target animals lethally removed unintentionally by WS from federal fiscal year² (FY) 2010 through FY 2015 are representative of non-target animals that WS' personnel could lethally remove under Alternative 1 (see Section 4.1 of the EA). WS could also lethally remove additional species of non-target animals unintentionally when conducting activities under Alternative 1.

Although WS' employees could lethally remove non-target animals, removal of individuals from any species is not likely to increase substantially. WS would continue to monitor activities, including non-target animal removal, to ensure the annual removal of non-target animals would not result in adverse effects to a species' population. Many of the non-target animals that WS' employees lethally removed

²The federal fiscal year begins on October 1 and ends on September 30 the following year.

unintentionally from FY 2010 through FY 2015 were species that people can harvest during annual fishing, hunting, and/or trapping seasons. WS' limited unintentional removal of those species when compared to the harvest level and populations of those species would be of low magnitude. WS' personnel have not captured or adversely affected any threatened or endangered species during previous activities targeting mammals in Georgia.

The ability of people to reduce damage and threats caused by mammals would be variable under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, since the skills and abilities of the person implementing damage management actions or the availability of other entities capable of providing assistance could determine the level of success in resolving damage or the threat of damage. If people or other entities apply those methods available as intended, risks to non-target animals would be similar to Alternative 1. If other entities apply methods available incorrectly or apply those methods without knowledge of animal behavior, risks to non-target animals would be higher under any of the alternatives. If frustration from the lack of available assistance under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 caused those people experiencing mammal damage to use methods that were not legally available for use, risks to non-target animals could be higher under those alternatives. People have resorted to the use of illegal methods to resolve animal damage that have resulted in the lethal removal of non-target animals.

As part of the development of the EA, WS consulted with the USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. As part of that consultation process, WS conducted a review of potential impacts of Alternative 1 on each of the species listed at the time WS developed the EA. The evaluation took into consideration the direct and indirect effects of available methods, including physical exclusion, beaver dam removal/breeching, traps, and shooting. As part of the review process, WS prepared and submitted a biological evaluation to the USFWS as part of the consultation process pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA. For several species listed within the State, WS determined that the proposed activities "*may affect*" those species but those effects would be solely beneficial, insignificant, or discountable, which would warrant a "*not likely to adversely affect*" determination (see Appendix C in the EA). WS also determined the proposed action alternative would have no effect on several species listed as threatened, endangered, proposed for listing, or considered a candidate species by the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (see Appendix C in the EA). The USFWS concurred with WS' effects determination (R. Goodloe, USFWS pers. comm. 2016). WS consulted the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (GDNR 2005) and the draft state Wildlife Action Plan (GDNR 2015) as part of this analysis and the alternatives would be consistent with both plans.

Issue 3 - Effects of Damage Management Methods on Human Health and Safety

WS' employees who conduct activities to manage damage caused by mammals would be knowledgeable in the use of those methods available, the wildlife species responsible for causing damage or threats, and WS' directives. WS' personnel would incorporate that knowledge into the decision-making process inherent with the WS Decision Model, which employees would apply when addressing threats and damage caused by mammals. When employing methods, WS' employees would consider risks to human safety when employing those methods based on location and method.

The threats to human safety from the use of methods would be similar across the alternatives since most of the same methods would be available across the alternatives. The only methods that would have limited availability to other entities under the alternatives would be Gonacon™ (available for deer only), immobilizing drugs, euthanasia chemicals, and the use of aircraft. Gonacon™, immobilizing drugs, and euthanasia chemicals are methods that WS' personnel would apply directly to target animals; therefore, the availability of those methods to WS would not increase risks to human safety since WS' personnel would receive training in the proper use, storage, and personal safety associated with those methods. Similarly, WS' pilots and crewmembers receive training and have experience to recognize the

circumstances that lead to accidents, which would minimize threats to human safety. The expertise of WS' employees in using those methods available likely would reduce threats to human safety since WS' employees would receive training and would have knowledge in the use of those methods. Although risks do occur from the use of those methods, when WS' personnel use those methods in consideration of human safety, the use of those methods would not pose additional risks beyond those associated with the use of other methods.

If other entities used methods incorrectly or without regard for human safety, risks to human safety would increase under any of the alternatives that people employed those methods. No adverse effects to human safety occurred from the use of methods by WS to alleviate mammal damage in the State from FY 2010 through FY 2015. Based on the use patterns of methods available to address damage caused by mammals and the experience/training that WS' personnel receive, this alternative would comply with Executive Order 12898 and Executive Order 13045.

Issue 4 - Effects of Mammal Damage Management Activities on the Aesthetic Value of Mammals

Mammals may provide aesthetic enjoyment to some people in the State, such as through observations, photographing, and knowing they exist as part of the natural environment. Methods available that WS or other entities could use to manage damage under each of the alternatives could result in the dispersal, exclusion, live-capture, or lethal removal of individuals or small groups of mammals to resolve damage and threats. Therefore, the use of methods often results in the removal of mammals from the area where damage was occurring or the dispersal of mammals from an area. Since methods available would be similar across the alternatives, the use of those methods would have similar potential impacts on the aesthetics of mammals. However, even under Alternative 1, the dispersal and/or lethal removal of mammals would not reach a magnitude that would prevent the ability to view those species outside of the area where damage was occurring. Therefore, the effects on the aesthetic values of mammals would be similar across the alternatives and would be minimal.

Issue 5 - Humaneness and Animal Welfare Concerns of Methods

The EA also analyzed the issue of humaneness and animal welfare concerns in relationship to methods available under each of the alternatives. Since many methods addressed in Appendix B of the EA would be available under all the alternatives, the issue of method humaneness and animal welfare would be similar for those methods across all the alternatives. As stated previously, Gonacon™, immobilizing drugs, euthanasia chemicals, and the use of aircraft would be the only methods that would have limited availability to all entities under the alternatives. The ability of WS to provide direct operational assistance under Alternative 1 would ensure WS' personnel employed methods as humanely as possible. Under the other alternatives, other entities could use methods inhumanely if used inappropriately or without consideration of target animal behavior. However, the skill and knowledge of the person implementing methods to resolve damage would determine the efficacy and humaneness of methods. A lack of understanding of the behavior of mammals or improperly identifying the damage caused by mammals along with inadequate knowledge and skill in using methodologies to resolve the damage or threat could lead to incidents with a greater probability of other people perceiving the action as inhumane under Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. Despite the lack of involvement by WS under Alternative 3 and WS' limited involvement under Alternative 2, those methods perceived as inhumane by certain individuals and groups would still be available for use by other entities to resolve damage and threats caused by mammals.

Issue 6 – Effects of Beaver Removal and Dam Manipulation on the Status of Wetlands in the State

If water remains impounded behind a beaver dam, hydric soils and hydrophytic vegetation may eventually form. This process can take anywhere from several months to years depending on pre-existing conditions. Hydric soils are those soils that are saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions. In general, hydric soils form much easier where wetlands have preexisted. Hydrophytic vegetation includes those plants that grow in water or on a substrate that is at least periodically deficient in oxygen because of excessive water content. If those conditions occur, then a wetland has developed that would have different wildlife habitat values than an area more recently impounded by beaver dam activity.

When receiving a request for assistance to manage damage associated with beaver, WS could also receive requests to remove or manipulate beaver dams to alleviate flooding. Requests from public and private individuals and entities that WS receives to remove or manipulate beaver dams involve removing or breaching beaver dams to return an area back to its pre-existing condition. Under Alternative 1, WS could manipulate water levels associated with water impoundments caused by beaver dams using either dam breaching, dam removal, or the installation of water flow devices, including exclusion devices. WS' personnel receive most requests for assistance associated with beaver dams soon after affected resource owners discover damage.

If the area does not have hydric soils, it usually takes many years for them to develop and a wetland to become established. Upon receiving a request to remove/breach beaver dams, WS' personnel would visually inspect the dam and the associated water impoundment to determine if characteristics exist at the site that would meet the definition of a wetland under section 404 of the Clean Water Act. If wetland conditions were present at the site, WS' employees would notify the entities requesting assistance from WS that a permit might be required to remove/breach the dam. WS' employees would recommend the property owner or manager seek guidance from the Environmental Protection Department within the GDNR, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to Georgia State Law and the Clean Water Act. Entities experiencing threats or damage due to flooding could manipulate water levels associated with beaver dams in the absence of WS' assistance. Those methods addressed in the EA would be available to other entities to breach or remove dams, including explosives and water flow devices.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE 1

No significant cumulative environmental impacts were identified from any of the three alternatives, including Alternative 1. Under Alternative 1, the lethal removal of mammals by WS to alleviate damage or threats of damage would be of a low magnitude when compared to the total known removal of those species and the populations of those species. The unintentional removal of non-target animals would likely be limited and would not reach a magnitude where adverse effects would occur. Based on the methods available to resolve mammal damage and/or threats and the analysis in the EA, the WS program in Georgia does not anticipate the number of non-target animals lethally removed to reach a magnitude where declines in those species' populations would occur.

The WS program in Georgia has received no reports or documented any effects to human safety from damage management activities conducted from FY 2010 through FY 2015. WS would employ methods as humanely as possible by applying standard operating procedures to minimize pain. The implementation of Alternative 1 would not adversely affect the status of wetlands in the State. The analysis in the EA indicates that an integrated methods approach to managing damage and threats caused by mammals would not result in significant cumulative adverse effects on the quality of the human environment.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

I have carefully reviewed the EA prepared to meet the need for action. I find the proposed action/no action alternative (Alternative 1) to be environmentally acceptable, addressing the issues and needs while balancing the environmental concerns of management agencies, landowners, advocacy groups, and the public. The analyses in the EA adequately address the identified issues, which reasonably confirm that no significant impact, individually or cumulatively, to animal populations or the quality of the human environment are likely to occur from implementation of Alternative 1, nor does implementation of Alternative 1 constitute a major federal action. Therefore, the analysis in the EA does not warrant the completion of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Based on the analyses in the EA, selecting Alternative 1 would best address the issues identified in Chapter 2 of the EA when applying the associated standard operating procedures discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA. Alternative 1 successfully addresses (1) managing damage using a combination of the most effective methods and does not adversely impact the environment, wetlands, property, human health and safety, target species, and/or non-target species, including threatened or endangered species; (2) it offers the greatest chance of maximizing effectiveness and benefits to resource owners and managers; (3) it presents the greatest chance of maximizing net benefits while minimizing adverse impacts to public health and safety; and (4) it offers a balanced approach to the issues of humaneness, animal welfare, and aesthetics when all facets of those issues are considered. Changes that broaden the scope of damage management activities in the State, changes that affect the natural or human environment, or changes from the issuance of new environmental regulations would trigger further analysis. Therefore, it is my decision to implement Alternative 1 as described in the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the analyses provided in the EA, there are no indications that Alternative 1 would have a significant impact, individually or cumulatively, on the quality of the human environment. I agree with this conclusion and therefore, find that an Environmental Impact Statement should not be prepared. I based this determination on the following factors:

1. WS' activities to manage damage in the State under Alternative 1 would not be regional or national in scope.
2. Based on the analyses in the EA, the methods available during the implementation of Alternative 1 would not adversely affect human safety based on their use patterns.
3. Alternative 1 would not significantly affect unique characteristics such as parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic areas, or ecologically critical areas. Standard operating procedures discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA and WS' adherence to applicable laws and regulations would further ensure that activities conducted by WS during the implementation of Alternative 1 would not harm the environment.
4. The effects on the quality of the human environment from the implementation of Alternative 1 are not highly controversial. Although there is some opposition to managing animal damage and the methods, this action is not highly controversial in terms of size, nature, or effect.
5. Based on the analysis documented in the EA and the accompanying administrative file, the effects on the human environment from the implementation of Alternative 1 would not be

significant. The effects associated with implementing Alternative 1 are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risks.

6. Implementation of Alternative 1 by WS would not establish a precedent for any future action with significant effects.
7. The EA did not identify significant cumulative effects associated with implementing Alternative 1. The EA analyzed cumulative effects and concluded that such impacts were not significant for this or other anticipated actions to be implemented or planned within the State of Georgia.
8. Implementing Alternative 1 would not affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor would implementing Alternative 1 likely cause any loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.
9. WS has determined that the proposed program under Alternative 1 would have no effect on some threatened or endangered species and would not adversely affect the other federally listed threatened or endangered species currently listed in the State and the USFWS has concurred with WS' determination. In addition, WS consulted the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (GDNR 2005) and the draft state Wildlife Action Plan (GDNR 2015) as part of this analysis and the alternatives would be consistent with both plans.
10. WS' activities conducted under Alternative 1 would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws (see WS Directive 2.210).

The rationale for this decision is based on several considerations. This decision takes into account public comments, social/political and economic concerns, public health and safety, and the best available science. The foremost considerations are that: 1) WS would only conduct activities at the request of landowners/managers, 2) management actions would be consistent with applicable laws, regulations, policies and orders, and 3) the analysis did not identify adverse effects to the environment. As a part of this Decision, the WS program in Georgia would continue to provide effective and practical technical assistance and direct management techniques that reduces damage and threats of damage.

Janet Bucknall, Director-Eastern Region
USDA/APHIS/WS
Raleigh, North Carolina

Date

LITERATURE CITED

GDNR. 2005. A comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy for Georgia. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division, Atlanta, Georgia. 797 pp.

GDNR. 2015. State wildlife action plan. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division, Atlanta, Georgia.

USDA. 2002. Environmental Assessment: An integrated wildlife damage management approach for the management of white-tailed deer damage in the State of Georgia. USDA/APHIS/WS, Athens, Georgia.

USDA. 2004. Environmental Assessment: Reducing aquatic rodent damage through an integrated wildlife damage management program in the State of Georgia. USDA/APHIS/WS, Athens, Georgia.

USDA. 2005. Environmental Assessment: Reducing feral hog damage through an integrated wildlife damage management program in the State of Georgia. USDA/APHIS/WS, Athens, Georgia.

USDA. 2008. Environmental Assessment: Mammal damage management in Georgia. USDA/APHIS/WS, Athens, Georgia.

USDA. 2016. Environmental Assessment: Mammal damage management in Georgia. USDA/APHIS/WS, Athens, Georgia.

APPENDIX A

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: REDUCING MAMMAL DAMAGE IN GEORGIA

During the public involvement process for the draft EA, WS received two comment responses. WS reviewed the contents of those comments to identify additional issues, alternatives, and/or concerns that the EA did not address. WS summarizes the contents of the substantive comments and provides a response to those comments below.

I. COMMENTS ON THE NEED FOR ACTION

Comment – There is a need to address damage caused by animals

Response: WS developed alternatives to meet the need for action, which the EA describes in Chapter 1, and to address the identified issues associated with managing damage caused those mammal species addressed in the EA, which were described in Chapter 2 of the EA. The EA analyzed continuing the current program using an integrated methods approach to managing mammal damage (Alternative 1; see Section 3.1 of the EA). Section 4.1 of the EA analyzes the environmental consequences of each of the alternatives in comparison to determine the extent of actual or potential impacts on the issues, including continuing the current program. Based on the analyses of the alternatives that were developed to address those issues analyzed in detail within the EA, including individual and cumulative impacts of those alternatives, the WS program will issue a decision for the final EA.

Comment – Armadillos can also cause damage

Response: Armadillos can cause damage to resources in Georgia. For example, armadillos can cause damage to sod, landscaping, structures, and other property. The GDNR classifies armadillos as a nuisance species and no permit or license is required to address armadillos causing damage. Armadillos are a species that WS addressed in the EA. WS regularly provides technical and direct operational assistance to individuals experiencing damage caused by armadillos. This assistance includes telephone and personal consultation, loaning of traps, and removal of damaging armadillos.

Comment – The activities of WS are contrary to the desires of the American taxpaying public.

Response: People in Georgia have requested assistance from WS previously and continue to request assistance from WS. WS only provides assistance after receiving a request for such assistance. Therefore, the need for action to manage damage and threats associated with mammals in Georgia arises from requests for assistance received by WS (see Section 1.2 of the EA). WS receives requests to reduce or prevent damage from occurring to agricultural resources, natural resources, property, and threats to human safety. WS has identified those mammal species most likely to be responsible for causing damage in the State based on previous requests for assistance. Section 1.5 of the EA discusses the authority of the WS program to manage damage caused by animals when requested.

II. COMMENTS ON PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Comment – WS sneaks into areas with no notice to anyone. WS only consults with farmers. Farmers should not be the only ones making decisions about wildlife.

Response: The WS program only provides assistance after receiving a request for such assistance and only after the entity requesting assistance and WS sign a Memorandum of Understanding, work initiation

document, or another similar document. Therefore, the decision-maker for what activities WS conducts is the entity that owns or manages the affected property. The decision-makers have the discretion to involve others as to what occurs or does not occur on property they own or manage. Therefore, in the case of an individual property owner or manager, the involvement of others and to what degree others were involved in the decision-making process would be a decision made by that individual. Section 3.1 in the EA discusses the decision-making process associated with communities, private property owners, and public property managers.

In addition, the GDNR has regulatory authority to manage populations of wildlife in the State (see Section 1.5 in the EA). Therefore, the lethal removal of mammals by WS to alleviate damage would only occur when authorized by the GDNR, when required, and only at levels authorized. The GDNR could consider all known removal when determining population objectives for wildlife and could adjust the species and the number of individuals of a species that people can harvest during the regulated hunting/trapping season and the number of wildlife that people can remove for damage management purposes to achieve the population objectives. Any removal of regulated wildlife species by WS would occur at the discretion of the GDNR. Therefore, any wildlife population declines or increases would be the collective objective for those wildlife populations established by the GDNR through the regulation of lethal removal. The cumulative removal of individuals from a wildlife species annually or over time by WS would occur at the discretion of the GDNR as part of management objectives for wildlife in the State.

WS made the EA available to the public for review and comment by a legal notice published in the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution* newspaper. WS also made the EA available to the public for review and comment on the APHIS website and on the regulations.gov website. In addition, WS sent a notice of availability directly to agencies, organizations, and individuals with probable interest in managing mammal damage in the State. WS encourages people to sign-up for notifications through the APHIS Stakeholder Registry. People can access the registry by going to the APHIS website and clicking on the APHIS Stakeholder Registry link on the home page. People can access the APHIS home page and the registry by visiting the website at <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/home/>.

III. COMMENTS RELATING TO AN ISSUE

Comment – Commenter opposes any involvement by WS.

Response: WS developed alternatives to meet the need for action, which the EA describes in Chapter 1, and to address the identified issues associated with managing damage caused by mammals, which the EA describes in Chapter 2. The EA analyzed a no involvement by the WS program alternative (Alternative 3; see Section 3.1 of the EA). Under Alternative 3, the WS program would not provide assistance with any aspect of managing mammal damage in the State. Section 4.1 of the EA analyzes the environmental consequences of each of the alternatives in comparison to determine the extent of actual or potential impacts on the issues, including the no involvement by WS alternative. Based on the analyses of the alternatives that were developed to address those issues analyzed in detail within the EA, including individual and cumulative impacts of those alternatives, the WS program will issue a decision for the final EA.

Comment – WS only uses lethal methods and wants to kill all wildlife.

Response: The WS Decision Model would be the implementing mechanism for a damage management program under applicable alternatives that personnel adapt to an individual damage situation. When WS receives a request for direct operational assistance, WS would conduct site visits to assess the damage or threats, would identify the cause of the damage, and would apply the Decision Model described by Slate et al. (1992) and WS Directive 2.201 to determine the appropriate methods to resolve or prevent damage.

Discussion of the Decision Model and WS' use of the Model occurs in Section 3.1 of the EA. In addition, WS would give preference to non-lethal methods when practical and effective (see WS Directive 2.101). Appendix B in the EA discusses many non-lethal methods that WS' personnel could recommend or employ to resolve damage under the applicable alternatives. The WS program does not attempt to eradicate any species of native wildlife in the State. WS operates in accordance with federal and state laws and regulations enacted to ensure species viability.

Comment – WS uses lethal methods just for the money.

Response: As discussed in the EA, funding for WS' activities could occur from federal appropriations, through state funding, and through cooperative funding. Cooperative service agreements with individual property owners or managers could also fund WS' activities. WS receives a minimal federal appropriation for the maintenance of a WS program in Georgia. The remainder of the WS program would mostly be fee-based. WS would provide technical assistance to requesters as part of the federally funded activities; however, the majority of funding to conduct direct operational assistance in which WS' employees perform damage management activities associated with mammals would occur through cooperative service agreements between the requester and WS. Therefore, assistance to manage damage that mammals cause would mostly be fee-based and the activities that WS' personnel provide would be the basis for funding, not whether WS' employees use non-lethal or lethal methods. If the WS program provided assistance using only non-lethal methods, the program would continue to be mostly fee-based.

V. COMMENTS ON FUNDING

Comment – Funding for the WS program should be cut to zero. The WS program should be shut down.

Response: Damage management activities are an appropriate sphere of activity for government programs, since managing wildlife is a government responsibility. Eliminating the WS program would be similar to the alternative analyzed in detail in the EA where there would be no involvement by the WS program with any aspect of managing mammal damage in Georgia (Alternative 3). Therefore, adding an analysis of an additional alternative whereby WS or another entity pursued the termination of the funding for WS would not add to the existing analyses in the EA. Under Alternative 3, the WS program would not provide assistance with any aspect of managing mammal damage; however, other entities could conduct damage management activities in the absence of the WS program.

LITERATURE CITED

Slate, D.A., R. Owens, G. Connolly, and G. Simmons. 1992. Decision making for wildlife damage management. *Transcripts of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources* 57:51-62.