

**SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:
REDUCING BIRD DAMAGE IN THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**United States Department of Agriculture
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
Wildlife Services**

**In cooperation with the
United States Fish and Wildlife Service**

February 2019

INTRODUCTION

An environmental assessment (EA) was prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services (WS) program to analyze the potential impacts to the quality of the human environment from resolving or alleviating damage to agriculture, property, natural resources and threats to human health and safety caused by birds in the state of New Hampshire (USDA 2016). The EA evaluated the need for bird damage management and assessed potential impacts on the human environment of three alternatives to address that need. WS' proposed action in the EA implements an integrated damage management scheme to fully address the need to manage bird damage and threats while minimizing impacts to the human environment. The EA analyzed the effects of WS' activities to reduce damage and threats associated with resident and migratory bird species.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the EA will remain as addressed in section 1.2 of the EA. This Supplement examines potential environmental impacts of WS' projects as it relates to an increase in the number of requests, both actual and potential, for assistance to manage bird damage and threats from double-crested cormorants (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), red-winged blackbirds (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), common grackles (*Quiscalus quiscula*), brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*), common ravens (*Corvus corax*) and bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) since the issuance of the Decision and FONSI in 2016. This Supplement will evaluate the potential environmental effects from an increase and/or change in management techniques to the above mentioned target species.

NEED FOR ACTION

A description of the need for action to reduce damage to resources and threats to human health and safety caused by birds in the state of New Hampshire is listed in Section 1.3 of the EA. The need for action addressed in the EA remains applicable to this Supplement; however, WS has received increased requests for assistance and/or has experienced increased numbers of red-winged blackbirds as well as common ravens and reasonably expects an increase in requests for assistance for common grackles, and brown-headed cowbirds causing damage and threats of damage since the completion of the EA. In addition, WS received a request to trap an injured bald eagle for transportation to and evaluation from a licensed wildlife rehabilitator and reasonably expects to be requested to assist with injured eagles in the future. Also, double-crested cormorant biology and population impacts will be evaluated with updated scientific data.

Some species of wildlife have adapted to and have thrived in human altered habitats. Birds, including red-winged blackbirds, common grackles, common ravens, brown-headed cowbirds and double-crested

cormorants are often responsible for conflicts with people. Those conflicts often lead people to request assistance with reducing damage to resources and to reduce threats to human safety. Other species of birds considered sensitive either due to decreasing populations or special protections, including bald eagles, sometimes become injured or require rehabilitation. The need for action to manage damage and threats associated with birds arises from requests for assistance received by WS to reduce and prevent damage from occurring to four major categories: agricultural resources, property, natural resources, and threats to human safety. The number of technical assistance projects involving bird damage or threats of bird damage to those four major resource types for blackbirds from fiscal year FY 2014 through FY 2018 is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 – Technical assistance projects conducted by WS in New Hampshire, FY 2014 – FY 2018

Species	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	AVERAGE
Red-winged blackbird	2	1	1	3	3	2.0
Blackbirds (Mixed species)	1	1	1	2	1	1.2
Common grackle	3	1	1	0	0	1.0
Brown-headed cowbird	0	1	2	0	0	0.6
Bald Eagle	1	3	2	12	22	7.8
Double-crested cormorant	4	2	1	3	0	2.0
Common raven	3	2	1	2	3	2.2

Red-winged blackbirds, common grackles, brown-headed cowbirds

WS has increased the proposed removal of red-winged blackbirds, common grackles and brown-headed cowbirds as a result of the requests from FY 2014-FY 2018. In FY 2015, WS responded to a request for assistance at a farm to alleviate damage to sweet corn caused by red-winged blackbirds, common grackles and brown-headed cowbirds estimated to be \$20,000. In FY 2016, WS responded to two requests for assistance at farms to alleviate damage to sweet corn estimated at \$16,540. WS received three requests for assistance in FY 2017 and one request for assistance in FY 2018 for damage to sweet corn estimated at \$14,975. Within the United States large flocks of red-winged blackbirds are responsible for most of the damage reported to sweet corn with damage also occurring from grackles and starlings (Besser 1985). Damage occurs when birds rip or pull back the husk exposing the ear for consumption. Damage can also occur to sprouting corn as birds pull out the sprout or dig the sprout up to feed on the seed kernel (Besser 1985). Damage to sprouting corn occurs primarily from crows but red-winged blackbirds, grackles, and common ravens are also known to cause damage to sprouting corn (Mott and Stone 1973). Rogers and Linehan (1977) found that grackles damaged two corn sprouts per minute on average when present at a field planted near a breeding colony. Damage to sprouting corn is likely localized and highest in areas where breeding colonies exist in close proximity to agricultural fields planted with corn (Mott and Stone 1973, Rogers and Linehan 1977). Brown-headed cowbirds are known to cause damage to agricultural resources, primarily from the consumption of livestock feed and from the increased risks associated with the transmission of diseases from fecal matter being deposited in feeding areas and in water used by livestock. Williams (1983) estimated seasonal feed losses from five species of blackbirds (primarily brown-headed cowbirds) at one feedlot in south Texas at nearly 140 tons valued at \$18,000. It has been reported that brown-headed cowbirds can cause damage to fruit and nut crops as well. Besser (1985) documented that cowbirds, along with red-winged blackbirds, woodpeckers, and crows, are known to cause damage to blueberries typically by plucking and consuming the berry. WS has increased the proposed removal of red-winged blackbirds, common grackles and brown-headed cowbirds in anticipation that WS will receive more requests to alleviate damage from these species.

Blackbird species can also pose a threat to human health and safety when they are present at airports. When birds are struck by aircraft, and especially when birds enter or are ingested by engines, structural

damage to the aircraft and engine failure can occur. Between FY 2015 and FY 2017 WS harassed 2 flocks of blackbirds consisting of 120 individuals (100 in FY17, 0 in FY16 and 20 in FY15) at an airport near the coast to reduce threats of a bird strike. WS anticipates having to remove an increased number of red-winged blackbirds at airports in the future.

Common ravens

WS has increased the proposed removal of common ravens as a result of the requests for assistance received for direct control to alleviate damage in FY 2017 and FY 2018. In FY 2017, WS responded to a requests for assistance at an electrical substation and an airport. At the substation, common ravens were responsible for the shutdown of the substation on multiple occasions, resulting in disruption of service to over 10,000 customers including police and fire stations, a hospital and elderly housing. Again in FY 2018, WS was requested to assist with alleviation of common raven damage at the substation because of disruption of service.

Adaptability, predacious habits, and ability to benefit from resources provided by human activities sometimes place this species in conflict with human interests (Boarman and Heinrich 1999). Damage to grains, almonds, pistachios, conifer seedlings, and other economically valuable crops can lead to common ravens being considered an agricultural pest (Putman and Zasada 1985, Salmon et al. 1986, Schmidt-Koenig and Prinzing 1992). Common ravens cause predation to livestock by pecking the eyes out of lambs (Larsen and Dietrich 1970). Additionally, common ravens can cause property damage. In Idaho, roosting common ravens in power line towers may cause power outages (Dorn 1972).

Bald eagles

WS has proposed adding capture of bald eagles as a result of a request WS received for direct control to assist with safeguarding natural resources. In FY 2017, with approval from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, WS initiated activities to recover an injured bald eagle for transportation to and evaluation from a licensed wildlife rehabilitator. As bald eagle numbers continue to rebound, WS anticipates an increase in the number of requests for trapping injured bald eagles for evaluation and rehabilitation.

The bald eagle is a large raptor often associated with aquatic habitats across North America (Buehler 2000). Fifty-three pairs of bald eagles nested in New Hampshire in 2017, which is the highest recorded year in recent history (NHFG 2018). Nesting normally occurs from late-March through September with eggs present in nests from late-March through the end of May. Eaglets can be found in nests generally from late-May through mid-September (Buehler 2000). Officially removed from the federal list of threatened and endangered species in 2007, the bald eagle population in the lower 48 states has rebounded from an all-time low of 487 breeding pairs in 1963 to a high of 16,048 pairs in 2009 (USFWS 2016b). In addition, the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department (NHFG) removed the bald eagle from their threatened and endangered list in 2017 (NHFG 2018). As bald eagle numbers continue to rebound, WS anticipates an increase in the number of requests for trapping injured bald eagles for evaluation and rehabilitation.

Bald eagles can also pose threats to human health and safety when they occur in close proximity to airports. Since 1990, 226 bald eagle strikes have been reported to the FAA with 26 bald eagle strikes occurring in 2015 (Dolbeer et al. 2016). WS has received requests for assistance associated with bald eagles at airports in New Hampshire and anticipates an increase in requests for trapping assistance and relocation from airports to protect human health and safety.

Double-crested cormorants

On May 25, 2016, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia vacated the Public Resource Depredation Order (PRDO) and Aquaculture Depredation Order (AQDO) for double-crested cormorants. The Court's vacatur of the Public Resource Depredation Order (PRDO) followed the Court's decision on the merits on March 29, 2016, concluding that the 2014 EA prepared by USFWS in renewing the PRDO and AQDO was insufficient. Specifically, the Court found that USFWS failed to take a "hard look" at the effect of the PRDO and AQDO on double-crested cormorant populations when it did not update previous population model estimates in its 2014 EA (see *Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility v. USFWS*, 177 F. Supp. 3d 146, 153 (D.D.C. 2016)).

Following the Court's decisions, all activities that result in take of double-crested cormorants for the protection of aquaculture or public resources now require a depredation permit issued by USFWS pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 USC 703-712). WS-New Hampshire previously received a statewide depredation permit from USFWS for the take of various species of birds, including double-crested cormorants.

WS-New Hampshire has determined that to the extent that its 2016 EA references the USFWS' vacated 2009 EA and/or 2003 Environmental Impact Statement, by way of this Supplement, WS-New Hampshire will no longer rely on the analyses from those documents regarding the impacts on double-crested cormorant populations nor relate to those documents in any manner.

The USFWS recently completed an EA on the take of cormorants nationwide across 37 central and eastern States and the District of Columbia pursuant to 50 C.F.R. § 21.41. This EA (USFWS 2017a) evaluated the reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of making decisions on cormorant depredation permit applications for certain activities; managing cormorants at or near aquaculture facilities; alleviating human health and safety concerns; protecting threatened and endangered species (as listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended; ESA); reducing damage to property; and protecting species of high conservation concern, and rare and declining plant communities at a local scale. The EA considered the impact to non-target species and the effect to the environment from using lead shot for the take of cormorants. Based on the analysis in this EA (USFWS 2017b), a Decision and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed by USFWS selecting the reduced take alternative.

The need for action with double-crested cormorants in New Hampshire pertains to potential damage to public resources, threatened and endangered (T&E) species, natural resources and property. From FY2014 to FY2018, WS responded to 10 requests for assistance regarding issues involving double-crested cormorants. During that time, WS-New Hampshire saw an increase in the number of complaints of double-crested cormorants causing damage to trees from roosting activities on privately owned property. The presence of suitable trees and shrubs is vital for many nesting colonial waterbirds. Wires and Cuthbert (2001) identified vegetation die off as an important threat to 66% of the colonial waterbird sites designated as 'conservation sites of priority' in the Great Lakes of the United States. Cormorants were present at 23 of the 29 priority conservation sites reporting vegetation die offs (Wires and Cuthbert 2001). Cormorants were reported to impact the herbaceous layers and trees used for nesting due to fecal deposition, and often the herbaceous layer was reduced or eliminated from the colony site (Wires et al. 2001). In addition, natural resource managers reported that the impacts to avian species from cormorants were primarily from habitat degradation and from competition for nest sites (Wires et al. 2001). Although loss of vegetation can have an adverse impact on many species, some colonial waterbirds such as pelicans, gulls and terns do prefer sparsely vegetated substrates.

Forest communities provide nesting and loafing habitat for many bird species. However, cormorants may damage shrubs and trees through the removal of foliage and branches by loafing or for nest making

activities (Koh et al. 2012). Cormorants may also harm forest communities comprising several acres by altering the soil characteristics through the deposition of acidic droppings (Koh et al. 2012). Accumulations of ammonium nitrogen rich guano alter the soil beneath cormorant colonies, decreasing the pH levels and increasing nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations (Cuthbert et al. 2002, Duffe 2006, Koh et al. 2012). Many native trees and vegetation respond poorly to these soil alterations, and begin to die or weaken in as little as three years after use for nesting (Koh et al. 2012). As trees become unstable, cormorants and other breeding birds in the colony will abandon them for more favorable trees (Koh et al. 2012). As the lack of suitable nesting habitat begins to occur, cormorants may adapt by nesting on the ground, but other bird species may abandon the site (Koh et al. 2012).

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) AND WS DECISION-MAKING:

All federal actions are subject to the NEPA (Public Law 9-190, 42 USC 4321 et seq.). WS follows CEQ regulations implementing the NEPA (40 CFR 1500 et seq.). In addition, WS follows the USDA (7 CFR 1b), and APHIS Implementing Guidelines (7 CFR 372) as part of the decision-making process. Those laws, regulations, and guidelines generally outline five broad types of activities to be accomplished as part of any project: public involvement, analysis, documentation, implementation, and monitoring. The NEPA also sets forth the requirement that all major federal actions be evaluated in terms of their potential to significantly affect the quality of the human environment for the purpose of avoiding or, where possible, mitigating and minimizing adverse impacts. Federal activities affecting the physical and biological environment are regulated in part by the CEQ through regulations in 40 CFR 1500-1508. In accordance with the CEQ and USDA regulations, APHIS guidelines concerning the implementation of the NEPA, as published in the Federal Register (44 CFR 50381-50384) provide guidance to WS regarding the NEPA process.

Pursuant to the NEPA and the CEQ regulations, this EA supplement documents the analyses of potential federal actions, informs decision-makers and the public of reasonable alternatives capable of avoiding or minimizing significant effects, and serves as a decision-aiding mechanism to ensure that the policies and goals of the NEPA are infused into federal agency actions. This EA supplement was prepared by integrating as many of the natural and social sciences as warranted, based on the potential effects of the alternatives. The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed action are analyzed.

DECISIONS TO BE MADE

Based on the scope of the EA and this supplement, the decisions to be made are: 1) How can WS best respond to the need to reduce bird damage in New Hampshire; 2) Do the alternatives have significant cumulative impacts meriting an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?

SCOPE OF ANALYSIS

This supplement evaluates red-winged blackbird, common grackle, brown-headed cowbird, bald eagle and double-crested cormorant damage management in order to eliminate or alleviate damage and threats to agriculture, property, natural resources, and human health and safety. Unless otherwise discussed in this Supplement, the scope of analysis remains valid as addressed in section 1.5 of the EA.

Federal, State, County, City, and Private Lands

Under two of the alternatives analyzed in detail, WS could continue to provide damage management activities on federal, state, county, municipal, and private land when a request is received for such services by the appropriate property owner or manager. Actions taken on federal lands have been analyzed in the scope of this EA and supplement.

AUTHORITY AND COMPLIANCE

WS' activities to reduce damage and threats associated with wildlife are regulated by federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The primary statutory authorities for the WS program are the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 USCA 8351; 7 USCA 8352) as amended, and the Act of December 22, 1987 (101 Stat. 1329-331, 7 USCA 8353). The WS program is the lead federal authority in managing damage to agricultural resources, natural resources, property, and threats to human safety associated with wildlife. WS' directives define program objectives and guide WS' activities managing animal damage and threats.

RELATIONSHIP OF THIS DOCUMENT TO OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

WS' Environmental Assessments - *Environmental Assessment- Reducing Bird Damage in the state of New Hampshire* (USDA 2016): WS had previously developed an EA that analyzed the need for action to manage damage associated with resident and migratory bird species within New Hampshire. The EA identified issues associated with bird damage management and analyzed alternatives to address those issues. After review of the analyses in the EA, a FONSI was signed on June 21, 2016, selecting the proposed action to implement an integrated approach to managing bird damage.

Changes in the need for action and the affected environment have prompted WS to initiate this new analysis for red-winged blackbirds, common grackles, common ravens, brown-headed cowbirds, bald eagles and double-crested cormorants into this supplement. This supplement will address more recently identified changes and will assess the potential environmental impacts of project alternatives based on a new need for action. Since activities conducted under the previous EA related to red-winged blackbirds, common grackles, brown-headed cowbirds, bald eagles and double-crested cormorants will be re-evaluated under this Supplement to address the new need for action and the associated affected environment, the previous analysis within the EA that addressed these species will be superseded by this analysis and the outcome of the Decision issued based on the analyses in this supplement.

RELATIONSHIPS OF AGENCIES DURING PREPARATION OF THIS EA SUPPLEMENT

Based on agency relationships, Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs), and legislative authorities, WS was the lead agency during the development of the EA and the Supplement to the EA, and therefore, was responsible for the scope, content, and decisions made.

Public Involvement

Issues and alternatives related to bird damage management conducted by WS in New Hampshire were initially developed by WS. Issues were defined and preliminary alternatives were identified through the scoping process. Notice of the proposed action and invitation for public involvement on the pre-decisional EA was placed in the *Concord Monitor* newspaper with statewide circulation. There was a 30-day comment period for the public to provide input on the pre-decisional EA. No comments were received from the public after review of the pre-decisional EA. A Decision and FONSI was signed for the EA on June 21, 2016.

This Supplement, along with the EA, and the associated Decisions and FONSI will be made available for public review and comment through the publication of a legal notice announcing a minimum of a 30-day comment period. The legal notice will be published at a minimum in the *Concord Monitor*, sent to interested parties via the APHIS stakeholder registry, and posted on the APHIS website. Comments received during the public involvement process will be fully considered for new substantive issues and alternatives.

ISSUES ADDRESSED IN DETAIL

The issues analyzed in detail are discussed in Chapter 2 of the EA. Alternatives developed and identified during the development of the EA to address those issues are discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA. The following issues were identified during the scoping process for the EA:

- Effects of Damage Management Activities on Target Bird Populations
- Effects on Non-target Wildlife Species Populations, Including T&E Species
- Effects of Damage Management Methods on Human Health and Safety
- Effects on the Aesthetic Values of Birds

Based on those damage management activities conducted previously by WS since the Decision and FONSI were signed in 2016, no additional issues have been identified that require detailed analyses. Those issues identified during the development of the EA remain applicable and appropriate to resolving damage and threats of damage associated with birds, including red-winged blackbirds, common grackles, brown-headed cowbirds, double-crested cormorants, and bald eagles.

ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The alternatives considered and evaluated using the identified issues are described and discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the EA. In addition, Chapter 4 of the EA analyzes the environmental consequences of each alternative as those alternatives relate to the issues identified. Appendix B of the EA provides a description of the methods that could be used or recommended by WS under each of the alternatives. The EA describes three potential alternatives that were developed to address the issues identified above. Alternatives analyzed in detail include:

- Alternative 1 - Continuing the Current Integrated Approach to Managing Bird Damage (Proposed Action/No Action)
- Alternative 2 - Bird Damage Management by WS using only Non-lethal Methods
- Alternative 3 - No Bird Damage Management Conducted by WS

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR BIRD DAMAGE MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

SOPs improve the safety, selectivity, and efficacy of wildlife damage management activities. WS uses many such SOPs which are discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the EA (USDA 2016). Those SOPs would be incorporated into activities conducted by WS when addressing bird damage management.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES FOR ISSUES ANALYZED IN DETAIL

Potential impacts of Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 on the human environment related to the major issues have not changed from those described and analyzed in the EA and thus do not require additional analyses in this Supplement. Chapter 4 of the EA contains a detailed discussion and comparison of the identified alternatives and the major issues. The issues were identified as important to the scope of the analysis in the EA (40 CFR 1508.25). Alternative 1 (proposed action/no action), as described in the EA, addresses requests for bird damage management using an integrated damage management approach by WS. The following is an analysis of potential impacts for each of the major issues analyzed in the EA since the completion of the EA as related to Alternative 1 (proposed action/no action alternative):

Issue 1 – Effects of Damage Management Activities on Target Bird Populations

A common concern when addressing damage associated with bird species are the effects on the populations of those species from methods used to manage damage. The integrated approach of managing damage associated with wildlife described in the EA under the proposed action alternative uses both non-lethal and lethal methods to resolve requests for assistance. Although non-lethal methods can disperse wildlife from areas where application occurs, wildlife is generally unharmed. Therefore, adverse effects are not often associated with the use of non-lethal methods. However, methods used to lethally remove birds and active nests can result in local reductions in those species' populations in the area where damage or threats of damage were occurring.

Magnitude can be described as a measure of the number of animals killed in relation to their abundance. Magnitude may be determined either quantitatively or qualitatively. Quantitative determinations are based on population estimates, allowable harvest levels, and actual harvest data. Qualitative determinations are based on population trends and harvest data when available. Generally, WS only conducts damage management on species whose population densities are high. WS' take is monitored by comparing numbers of animals killed with overall populations or trends in populations to assure the magnitude of take is maintained below the level that would cause significant adverse impacts to the viability of native species populations. All lethal removal of birds and active nests by WS occurs at the requests of a cooperators seeking assistance and only after the appropriate permit has been issued by the USFWS, when appropriate.

The issue of the effects on target bird species arises from the use of non-lethal and lethal methods identified in the EA to address the need for reducing damage and threats associated with those bird species addressed in the EA. The EA found that when WS' activities are conducted within the scope analyzed in the EA, those activities would not adversely impact bird populations. WS' SOPs are designed to reduce the effects on bird populations and are discussed in section 3.3 and 3.4 of the EA.

WS has provided direct damage management and technical assistance in response to requests for assistance in New Hampshire since the completion of the EA. Descriptions and application of direct damage management and technical assistance projects are discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of the EA. All bird damage management activities conducted by WS were pursuant to applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Information on bird populations and trends are often derived from several sources including the Breeding Bird Survey (BBS), the Christmas Bird Count (CBC), and the Partners in Flight Landbird Population database, published literature, unpublished reports, and harvest data. These methods remain applicable as described in the 2016 EA. Unless noted otherwise, the state population estimate listed for each species analyzed below was obtained from PFSC (2013). Breeding Bird Survey (BBS) population trends from 1966 to 2015 for New Hampshire and the region that the state falls within (Appalachian Mountains) are listed for each species when available (Sauer et al. 2017). The statistical significance of a trend for a given species that is determined by the BBS data is color coded: a black percentage indicates a statistically non-significant positive or negative trend, a red percentage indicates a statistically significant negative trend, and a blue percentage indicates a statistically significant positive trend (Sauer et al. 2017).

Population Impact Analysis from WS' activities in New Hampshire from FY 2016 through FY 2018

WS has provided direct damage management and technical assistance in response to requests for assistance with bird damage and threats since the completion of the EA and the Decision/FONSI signed in 2016. All bird damage management activities conducted by WS were pursuant to relevant federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and were conducted within the parameters analyzed in the EA. Direct operational assistance provided by WS included both non-lethal harassment techniques and the lethal

removal of target bird species.

WS dispersed 75 and killed 199 red-winged blackbirds in 2016, killed 2 red-winged blackbirds in FY 2017 and killed 897 red-winged blackbirds in FY 2018. The proposed annual removal of red-winged blackbirds analyzed in the EA was 20 individuals, which was exceeded in FY 2016 and FY 2018. Since the lethal removal of red-winged blackbirds has exceeded the annual level of removal analyzed in the EA, this species was included in this Supplement. Brown-headed cowbirds and common grackles will be included in this Supplement as these species can exist in mixed flocks with red-winged blackbirds and could be annually removed in larger numbers than was analyzed in the EA. Additionally, WS killed seven common ravens in FY 2018. The proposed annual removal of common ravens analyzed in the EA was 20 individuals. Although the annual level of removal of common ravens was not exceeded, WS anticipates an increase in the number of requests for assistance for common ravens.

Common Grackle Biology and Population Impacts

NH population estimate: 60,000	WS proposed removal: 1,000
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 1966-2015: -1.73%	BBS NH, 1966-2015: -2.27%
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 2005-2015: -1.65%	BBS NH, 2005-2015: -3.52%
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 1966-2015: -2.45%	
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 2005-2015: -2.85%	
WS removal as % of state population: 1.7%	

In New Hampshire, common grackles are found during the breeding season and are year round residents in southern portions of the state (Peer and Bollinger 1997). Common grackles are year round residents throughout much of the United States except for the far northern and western portions of the species range (Peer and Bollinger 1997). They are a semi-colonial nesting species often associated with human activities. During the migration periods, common grackles can be found in mixed species flocks of blackbirds. The number of common grackles observed in areas surveyed during the CBC has shown an overall general declining trend since 1966 (NAS 2010).

Since the removal of blackbird species, including common grackles, can occur without the need for a depredation permit when committing or about to commit damage, the number of common grackles lethally removed by non-WS entities in the state is currently unknown. WS has not dispersed or lethally removed any common grackles from FY 2014 through FY 2018 within New Hampshire. However, in FY2015 and FY2016, WS did disperse mixed species flocks of blackbirds that could have contained common grackles.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects:

WS' proposed annual removal is only a small percentage of the state population estimate. Therefore based on the best scientific data, WS' proposed removal level will have no adverse direct or indirect effects on common grackle populations. While non-WS removal is unknown, common grackle populations have remained abundant enough that the USFWS has maintained the Federal Blackbird Depredation Order. Therefore, WS does not anticipate any significant cumulative impacts to common grackle populations.

Common Raven Biology and Population Impacts

NH population estimate: 3,100
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 1966-2015: 0.51%
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 2005-2015: 0.86%
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 1966-2015: 11.75%
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 2005-2015: 22.95%
WS removal as % of state population: 3.2%

WS proposed removal: 100 + 30 nests (and eggs)
BBS NH, 1966-2015: 5.17%
BBS NH, 2005-2015: 4.30%

Common ravens can be observed year-round in New Hampshire, although they are more commonly observed in northern and western portions of the state (Boarman and Heinrich 1999). Common ravens prefer a broad range of habitats including boreal, conifer and deciduous forests with heavily contoured landscapes (Boarman and Heinrich 1999). In some parts of its range, ravens are considered pests whose populations are rapidly expanding, and programs have been implemented to reduce population sizes (Boarman and Heinrich 1999). The number of common ravens observed during the CBC in the state of New Hampshire has shown an overall increasing trend since 1966 (NAS 2010). The population trend of common ravens in New Hampshire is considered to be increasing (Hunt 2009).

From 2014 through 2018, WS killed eight and dispersed six common ravens. One inactive nest was removed in 2017. The proposed annual removal of common ravens analyzed in the EA was 20 individuals; however WS reasonably expects to annually remove larger numbers than was analyzed in the EA. In addition to the take by WS, the USFWS issued depredation permits to other entities for the take of common ravens during this period. From 2014 to 2018 a total of 21 common ravens have been killed and three nests have been destroyed by all entities to alleviate damage and threats associated with these birds occurring within New Hampshire.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects:

Based on the best scientific data, WS' proposed annual removal (and eggs) will have no adverse direct or indirect effects on common raven populations. Given the increasing population trends observed for common ravens in New Hampshire and the region, this magnitude of take could be considered low. The take of common ravens can only occur when permitted by the USFWS through the issuance of depredation permits. Therefore, all take, including take by WS, is authorized by the USFWS and occurs at the discretion of the USFWS. Permitting of take ensures cumulative take of common ravens in the northeastern United States, including the take proposed by WS in New Hampshire under this Supplement, would not reach a magnitude where undesired adverse effects would occur. The take of common ravens would occur within allowed levels of take permitted by the USFWS.

Red-winged blackbird Biology and Population Impacts

NH population estimate: 140,000
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 1966-2015: -1.87%
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 2005-2015: -1.63%
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 1966-2015: -2.00%
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 2005-2015: -2.38%
WS removal as % of state population: 7.1%

WS proposed removal: 10,000
BBS NH, 1966-2015: -1.06%
BBS NH, 2005-2015: -1.04%

Red-winged blackbirds are one of the most abundant bird species in North America and are a commonly recognized bird that can be found in a variety of habitats (Yasukawa and Searcy 1995). The breeding habitat of red-winged blackbirds includes marshes and upland habitats from southern Alaska and Canada southward to Costa Rica extending from the Pacific to the Atlantic Coast along with the Caribbean Islands (Yasukawa and Searcy 1995). Northern breeding populations of red-winged blackbirds migrate

southward during the migration periods but red-winged blackbirds are common throughout the year in states along the Gulf Coast and parts of the western United States (Yasukawa and Searcy 1995). During the migration periods, red-winged blackbirds often form mixed species flocks with other blackbird species. In New Hampshire, red-winged blackbirds are found during the breeding season and are year round residents in coastal and extreme southern portions of the state (Yasukawa and Searcy 1995). The number of red-winged blackbirds observed during the CBC in the state has shown a variable but stable trend since 1966 (NAS 2010). The population trend of red-winged blackbirds in New Hampshire is considered stable (Hunt 2009).

Since the removal of blackbird species, including red-winged blackbirds, can occur without the need for a depredation permit when committing or about to commit damage, the number of red-winged blackbirds lethally removed by non-WS entities in the state is currently unknown. WS lethally removed 1,098 and harassed 75 red-winged blackbirds in the past three years. Since red-winged blackbirds often form mixed species flocks with other blackbird species, determining the number of birds of each species present in the mixed species flocks can be difficult. Therefore, when dispersing mixed species flocks, the number of red-wing blackbirds present in the flocks is unknown. WS dispersed mixed species flocks of blackbirds that could have contained red-winged blackbirds from FY 2015 to FY 2016.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects:

WS' proposed annual removal of red-winged blackbirds is a small percentage of the state population estimate. Therefore, WS' proposed annual removal level will have no adverse direct or indirect effects on red-winged blackbird populations. While non-WS removal is unknown, red-winged blackbird populations have remained abundant enough that the USFWS has maintained the Federal Blackbird Depredation Order. Therefore, WS does not anticipate any significant cumulative impacts to red-wing blackbird populations.

Brown-headed Cowbird Biology and Population Impacts

NH population estimate: 62,000	WS proposed removal: 1,000
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 1966-2015: -6.28%	BBS NH, 1966-2015: -3.30%
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 2005-2015: -5.68%	BBS NH, 2005-2015: -2.42%
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 1966-2015: 0.30%	
BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 2005-2015: 0.30%	
WS removal as % of state population: 1.6%	

Brown-headed cowbirds are a species of the blackbird family commonly found in mixed species flocks during migration periods. Brown-headed cowbirds are a common summer resident across the United States and southern Canada (Lowther 1993). Breeding populations in the northern range of the cowbird are migratory with cowbirds present year-round in much of the eastern United States and along the West Coast (Lowther 1993). During the breeding season brown-headed cowbirds are found throughout New Hampshire and are year round residents throughout much of state except for northern areas (Lowther 1993). Brown-headed cowbirds are still commonly found in open grassland habitats but also inhabit urban and residential areas. Unique in their breeding habits, cowbirds are known as brood parasites meaning they lay their eggs in the nests of other bird species (Lowther 1993). Female cowbirds can lay up to 40 eggs per season with eggs reportedly being laid in the nests of over 220 species of birds, of which, 144 species have actually raised cowbird young (Lowther 1993). No parental care is provided by cowbirds with the raising of cowbird young occurring by the host species. Similar to the other blackbird species, the number of cowbirds observed during the CBC conducted annually in the state has shown a variable pattern since 1966 (NAS 2010).

Since the removal of blackbird species, including brown-headed cowbirds can occur without the need for a depredation permit when committing or about to commit damage, the number of cowbirds lethally removed by non-WS entities in the state is currently unknown. WS has not dispersed or lethally removed any brown-headed cowbirds from FY 2014 through FY 2018 within New Hampshire, but brown-headed cowbirds were included in this Supplement since they often form mixed species flocks with other blackbird species.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects:

Based on the best scientific data, WS' proposed annual removal level will have no adverse direct or indirect effects on brown-headed cowbird populations. While non-WS removal is unknown, cowbird populations have remained abundant enough that the USFWS has maintained the Federal Blackbird Depredation Order. Therefore, WS does not anticipate any significant cumulative impacts to brown-headed cowbird populations.

Bald eagle Biology and Population Impacts

NH population estimate: 118

WS proposed removal: 2 nests

BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 1966-2015: 6.59%

BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 2005-2015: 8.99%

BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 1966-2015: 10.08%

BBS New England/Mid-Atlantic Coast, 2005-2015: 12.40%

The bald eagle is a large bird of prey considered an opportunistic forager that eats a variety of mammalian, avian and reptilian prey, but generally prefers fish over other food types (Buehler 2000). Bald eagles are a North American species that historically occurred throughout the contiguous United States and Alaska. The largest North American breeding populations are in Alaska and Canada, but there are also significant bald eagle populations in the Great Lakes states, Florida, the Pacific Northwest, the Greater Yellowstone area, and the Chesapeake Bay region (USFWS 2017c).

Although officially removed from the protection of the ESA across most of its range, the bald eagle is still afforded protection under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. In New Hampshire, bald eagles are not listed as state threatened or endangered. During the breeding season in 2017, New Hampshire Audubon confirmed a total of 59 territorial pairs of bald eagles with 38 confirmed pairs incubating and a total of 59 young fledged (Martin 2018).

The USFWS developed an EIS that evaluated alternatives and issues associated with regulations establishing new permits for the take of eagles pursuant to the Act. The preferred alternative in the EIS evaluated the management on an eagle management unit level (similar to the migratory bird flyways) to establish limits on the amount of eagle take that the USFWS could authorize in order to maintain stable or increasing populations. This alternative further establishes a maximum duration for permits of 30 years with evaluations in five year increments (USFWS 2016a). A Record of Decision was made for the preferred alternative in the EIS. The selected alternative revised the permit regulations for the "take" of eagles (see 50 CFR 22.26 as amended) and a provision to authorize the removal of eagle nests (see 50 CFR 22.27 as amended). The USFWS published a Final Rule on December 16, 2016 (81 FR 91551-91553).

Given the definition of "disturb" under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act as described above, the use of trapping methods to capture injured eagles for rehabilitation or to utilize harassment methods to disperse eagles posing threats at or near airports could constitute "take" as defined under the Act, which would require permits from the USFWS to conduct those types of activities.

In FY 2016, FY 2017 and FY 2018 WS dispersed totals of 3, 12 and 22 bald eagles, respectively. The increase is attributed to bald eagles that were inadvertently harassed during WS bird harassment activities targeting different bird species. All eagles inadvertently harassed were authorized under an eagle harassment permit. Additionally, the total number of bald eagles harassed does not necessarily indicate unique individuals; rather the same individuals harassed multiple times. In FY 2017, WS was requested by the USFWS to assist with trapping a bald eagle that was observed with a leg hold trap attached to the right tarsometatarsal. Concern was for the immediate health of the eagle as well as long term health effects from having the trap attached. WS was contacted by the USFWS to assist with trapping the eagle. Although the eagle eventually dispersed uncaptured, WS may be requested to provide similar services in the future.

Under 50 CFR 22.23, WS, airport authorities, state and local municipalities or private citizens could apply for a permit allowing for the “take” of eagles that are injured, or pose threats to aviation safety at civil and military airports. Under this proposed action alternative, WS could employ harassment or remove eagle nests from airports/air bases or surrounding areas as well as trap injured eagles for evaluation and/or rehabilitation when authorized and/or permitted by the USFWS pursuant to the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Therefore, if no permit is issued by the USFWS to trap or harass eagles no activities would be conducted by WS. Activities would only be conducted by WS when; 1) a permit allowing for the harassment or trapping of eagles has been issued directly to WS, 2) issued to an airport authority/military installation, state and local municipality or private citizen where WS is working as a sub-permittee, or 3) written authorization has been granted directly to WS to assist with trapping eagles for rehabilitation efforts. No lethal take of eagles would occur under this proposed action alternative.

Under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 USC 668-668c), the take of bald eagles is prohibited without a permit from the USFWS. Under the Act, the definition of “take” includes actions that “*pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, destroy, molest, or disturb*” eagles. The regulations authorize the USFWS to issue permits for the take of bald eagles and golden eagles on a limited basis (see 81 FR 91551-91553, 50 CFR 22.23, 50 CFR 22.27). As necessary, WS would apply for the appropriate permits as required by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects:

WS would employ harassment and/or trapping methods to disperse or translocate bald eagles and remove up to two active/inactive nests annually from airports and their surrounding areas to protect human health and safety, as well as, transmission lines, and electrical transfer stations when authorized and permitted by the USFWS pursuant to the Act. Therefore, if no permit is issued by the USFWS to harass, capture, or remove the nests of eagles posing a threat to aircraft, New Hampshire’s power grid, or human health and safety, no harassment, capture, or nest removal would be conducted by WS. Harassment at airports, transfer stations, or surrounding areas may benefit individual eagles by preventing these birds from being fatally injured in collisions with aircraft. Additionally, capturing injured eagles for transportation to a licensed rehabilitator can potentially benefit local eagle populations. Impacts due to nest removal and destruction would have little adverse impact on the population. Although there may be reduced fecundity for the individuals affected by nest destruction, this activity has no long term effect on breeding adults. The destruction of up to two nests by WS would not reach a level where adverse effects on eagle populations would occur. No lethal take of bald eagles would occur under this proposed action alternative. WS would abide by all measures and stipulations provided by the USFWS in permits issued for the harassment of bald eagles at airports to reduce aircraft strikes. The USFWS evaluates each nest removal and its potential impacts on a case-by-case basis.

Double-Crested Cormorant Biology and Population Impacts

BCR 14 and 30 regional breeding population: 173,074 ¹	WS proposed take: 500 + 50 nest (and eggs)
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 1966-2015: 3.18%	BBS NH, 1966-2015: 2.39%
BBS Atlantic Northern Forest, 2005-2015: 6.54%	BBS NH, 2005-2015: 2.65%
BBS New England/Mid Atlantic Coast, 1966-2015: 9.91%	WS removal as % of regional population: 0.3%
BBS New England/Mid Atlantic Coast, 2005-2015: 17.14%	Cumulative removal as % of regional population: 0.3%

¹MANEM Waterbird Conservation Plan

Double-crested cormorants are large fish-eating colonial waterbirds widely distributed across North America (Hatch and Weseloh 1999). Wires et al. (2001) and Jackson and Jackson (1995) have suggested that the current cormorant resurgence may be, at least in part, a population recovery following years of DDT-induced reproductive suppression and unregulated take prior to protection under the MBTA.

The population (breeding and non-breeding birds) in the United States was estimated to be greater than one million birds in the 1990's (Tyson et al. 1999). Ninety percent of the global cormorant population resides in North America (MANEM Waterbird Plan 2006). The Mid-Atlantic/New England/Maritimes population was estimated at over 173,000 breeding pairs. Most of New Hampshire is included in Bird Conservation Region (BCR) 14 and the remainder, in Southeastern New Hampshire, is in BCR 30. BCR 30 has approximately 29,700 nesting pairs while BCR 14 has approximately 143,400 nesting pairs (MANEM Waterbird Plan 2006). From the early 1970s to the early 1990s, the Atlantic population of cormorants increased from about 25,000 pairs to 96,000 pairs (Hatch 1995).

Cormorants are most commonly found in New Hampshire during the spring, summer, and fall months when the breeding and migrating populations are present, with peak migration numbers occurring in April and October (Wires et al. 2001). Breeding populations of cormorants occur along the coast with breeding habitat that includes lakes, rivers, swamps, and seacoasts where nesting can occur on the ground, in trees, and on coastal cliffs (MANEM Waterbird Plan 2006).

From FY 2013 through FY 2017, WS has not lethally removed cormorants and non-WS entities lethally took one cormorant in New Hampshire to alleviate damage or threats. Lethal removal of cormorants in New Hampshire between 2013 and 2017 represents <1% of the estimated 173,074 cormorants breeding in BCR 14 and BCR 30. All take occurred under depredation permits issued by the USFWS.

Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Effects:

Although only limited cormorant damage management activities have been conducted by WS in New Hampshire, WS anticipates the number of requests for assistance to manage damage caused by cormorants will increase based on the increasing number of cormorants observed within the state. Based on the best scientific data, WS proposed removal level of 500 birds and 250 nests will have no adverse direct effects on cormorant populations. The potential authorized removal from all non-WS entities combined with WS proposed removal is also not expected to create adverse cumulative impacts. All removal of cormorants would occur within the levels permitted by the USFWS pursuant to the MBTA.

The removal and destruction of nests should have little adverse impact on the population. Although this method may reduce the fecundity of individual birds, nest destruction has no long term effect. The destruction of double-crested cormorant nests annually by WS would occur in localized areas where nesting takes place and would not reach a level where adverse effects on cormorant populations would occur. As with the lethal take of adults, the take of nests must be authorized by the USFWS. Therefore, the number of nests taken by WS annually would occur at the discretion of the USFWS.

The USFWS EA (USFWS 2017a) included a potential biological removal (PBR) model used to estimate the impact of take on the double-crested cormorant population. Results from the PBR revealed that for

the Atlantic Flyway, 26,226 double-crested cormorants could be taken while maintaining a stable population (i.e., allowable take). WS proposed take of double-crested cormorants in New Hampshire falls well below both allowable take and the Reduced Take Alternative of 11,634 double-crested cormorants selected by USFWS (USFWS 2017a, USFWS 2017b). As such, the proposed take is below the amount of take that would likely reduce the population growth rate of double-crested cormorants based on the analysis in the PBR modeling analyzed in the EA (USFWS 2017a). This level of proposed take will have negligible adverse impacts on the Atlantic flyway population of double-crested cormorants or the quality of the human environment. USFWS will monitor double crested cormorant within and across regions in order to prevent cumulative significant impacts from take of double-crested cormorants in Atlantic flyway and the U.S.

Summary

Evaluation of WS' activities relative to wildlife populations indicated that project activities will likely have no cumulative adverse effects on populations in New Hampshire. WS' actions would be occurring simultaneously, over time, with other natural processes and human-generated changes that are currently taking place. Those activities include, but are not limited to:

- Natural mortality of wildlife
- Human-induced mortality through private damage management activities
- Human and naturally induced alterations of wildlife habitat
- Annual and perennial cycles in population densities

All those factors play a role in the dynamics of wildlife populations. In many circumstances, requests for assistance arise when some or all of those elements have contrived to elevate target species populations or place target species at a juncture to cause damage to resources. WS' actions to minimize or eliminate damage are constrained as to scope, duration and intensity, for the purpose of minimizing or avoiding impacts to the environment. WS evaluates damage occurring, including other affected elements and the dynamics of the damaging species; determines appropriate strategies to minimize effects on environmental elements; applies damage management actions; and subsequently monitors and adjusts/ceases damage management actions (Slate et al. 1992). This process allows WS to take into consideration other influences in the environment, such as those listed above, in order to avoid cumulative adverse impacts on target species.

Issue 2 – Effects on Non-target Wildlife Species Populations, Including T&E Species

The issue of non-target species effects, including effects on threatened and endangered (T&E) species, arises from the use of non-lethal and lethal methods identified in the alternatives. The use of non-lethal and lethal methods has the potential to inadvertently disperse, capture, or kill non-target wildlife. WS' SOPs are designed to reduce the effects of damage management activities on non-target species' populations which were discussed in the EA. To reduce the risks of adverse effects to non-target wildlife, WS selects damage management methods that are as target-selective as possible or applies such methods in ways that reduces the likelihood of capturing non-target species. Before initiating management activities, WS also selects locations which are extensively used by the target species and employs baits or lures which are preferred by those species. Despite WS' best efforts to minimize non-target take during project activities, the potential for adverse effects to non-targets exists when applying both non-lethal and lethal methods to manage damage or reduce threats to safety.

Non-lethal methods have the potential to cause adverse effects on non-targets primarily through exclusion, harassment, and dispersal. Any exclusionary device erected to prevent access of target species also potentially excludes species that are not the primary reason the exclusion was erected. Therefore, non-target species excluded from areas may potentially be adversely impacted if the area excluded is

large enough. The use of auditory and visual dispersal methods used to reduce damage or threats caused by target species are also likely to disperse non-targets in the immediate area where the methods are employed. However, the potential impacts on non-target species are expected to be temporary with target and non-target species often returning after the cessation of dispersal methods.

While every precaution is taken to safeguard against taking non-targets during operational use of methods and techniques for resolving damage and reducing threats caused by wildlife, the use of such methods can result in the incidental take of unintended species. Those occurrences are minimal and should not affect the overall populations of any species. WS has not live captured or taken any non-target species.

The EA concluded that effects of control methods on non-target species is biologically insignificant to nonexistent and that WS has not adversely affected the viability of any wildlife species populations through bird damage management activities. Bird damage management activities implemented by WS utilize the most selective and appropriate methods for taking targeted bird species and excluding non-target species. The lethal removal of non-targets from using those methods described in the EA is likely to remain low with removal never reaching a magnitude that a negative impact on populations would occur.

Threatened and Endangered Species

A review of T&E species listed by the USFWS showed that the listing of the red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*) and the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) has occurred since the completion of the EA in 2016. Based on a review of the best scientific data available, WS has determined that activities conducted pursuant to the proposed action would have “No Effect” on these two newly listed species or their critical habitats. WS has not historically conducted operations in red knot or long-eared bat habitat. WS does not anticipate performing operations in these habitats in the future. While WS may make recommendations for habitat modifications, the program does not typically perform these functions.

WS’ activities in New Hampshire to manage damage and threats caused by birds have not changed from those described in the EA. A review of those species listed in New Hampshire and discussed in the EA indicates that WS’ bird damage management activities would continue to have no adverse effects on those species. Project activities and their potential impacts on other wildlife species, including T&E species have not changed from those analyzed in the EA. Impacts on this issue are expected to remain insignificant.

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

Since the completion of the EA and the Decision and FONSI in 2016, no injuries to employees or the public occurred from the implementation of methods under the proposed action. Based on the analyses in the EA, when WS’ activities are conducted according to WS’ directives, SOPs, and in accordance with federal, state, and local laws those activities pose minimal risks to human safety. Project activities and their potential impacts on human health and safety have not changed from those analyzed in the EA. No additional methods or techniques are being proposed for use under the proposed action. Impacts on this issue are expected to remain insignificant.

Issue 4 – Effects on the Aesthetic Values of Birds

As described in the EA, WS employs methods when requested that would result in the dispersal, exclusion, or removal of individuals or small groups of birds to resolve damage to agriculture, property, natural resources, or threats to human health and safety. In some instances where birds are excluded, dispersed, or removed, the ability of interested persons to observe and enjoy those birds will likely

temporarily decline. Even the use of non-lethal methods can lead to dispersal of birds if the resource being protected was acting as an attractant. Thus, once the attractant has been removed or made unattractive, birds will likely disperse to other areas where resources are more available.

The use of lethal methods would result in a temporary reduction in local populations resulting from the removal of target birds to resolve requests for assistance. WS' goal is to respond to requests for assistance and to manage those birds responsible for the resulting damage. Therefore, the ability to view and enjoy those birds will still remain if a reasonable effort is made to view those species outside the area in which damage management activities occurred.

The EA concluded the effects on aesthetics would be variable depending on the stakeholders' values towards wildlife. Project activities and potential impacts on human affectionate bonds with birds and aesthetics have not changed from those analyzed in the EA.

Summary

No significant cumulative environmental impacts are expected from activities considered under the Supplement. Likewise, no significant cumulative impacts have been identified from the implementation of the proposed action in the EA since 2016. Under the proposed action, the reduction of wildlife damage or threats using an integrated approach employing both non-lethal and lethal methods would not have significant impacts on wildlife populations in New Hampshire or nationwide. WS continues to coordinate activities with federal, state, and local entities to ensure activities do not adversely impact wildlife populations. No risk to public safety is expected when WS' activities are conducted pursuant to the proposed action or the proposed supplement to the EA. The EA further describes and addresses cumulative impacts from the alternatives, including the proposed action.

LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

David Allaben,	State Director, USDA-WS, Concord, NH
Carrie Stengel,	Supervisory Wildlife Biologist, USDA-WS, Concord, NH
Joshua Janicke,	Staff Wildlife Biologist, USDA-WS, Concord, NH
Anthony Musante,	Staff Wildlife Biologist, USDA-WS, Concord, NH
Christopher Croson,	Staff Wildlife Biologist, USDA-WS, Mooresville, NC

LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED

Mark Ellingwood,	NH Fish and Game Department
Kent Gustafson,	NH Fish and Game Department
Mike Marchand,	NH Fish and Game Department
Bill Perry	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

LITERATURE CITED

- Besser, J. F. 1985. A grower's guide to reducing bird damage to U.S. agricultural crops. Bird Damage Research Rep. No. 340. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver Wildl. Res. Center. 84 pp.
- Boarman, W. I. and B. Heinrich (1999). Common Raven (*Corvus corax*), version 2.0. In *The Birds of North America* (A. F. Poole and F. B. Gill, Editors). Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.2173/bna.476>
- Buehler, D. (2000). Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). *The Birds of North America*. A. P. a. F. Gill. Philadelphia, PA, USA.
- Dolbeer, R. A., J. R. Weller, A. L. Anderson and M. J. Begier. 2016. Wildlife strikes to civil aircraft in the United States 1990-2015. Federal Aviation Administration, National Wildlife Strike Database, Serial Report Number 22.
- Dorn, J. L. (1972). The Common Raven in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Master's Thesis, Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie.
- Hatch, J. J. 1995. Changing populations of double-crested cormorants. *Colonial Waterbirds* 18 (Spec. Publ. 1): 8-24.
- Hatch, J. J. and D. V. Weseloh. 1999. Double-crested cormorant: (*Phalacrocorax auritus*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 441 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- Hunt, P. 2009. The State of New Hampshire's Birds: A report to the Nongame and Endangered Wildlife Program, New Hampshire Fish and Game Department. New Hampshire Audubon, Concord, New Hampshire.
- Jackson, J. A., and B. J. S. Jackson. 1995. The double-crested cormorant in the south-central United States: habitat and population changes of a feathered pariah. *Colonial Waterbirds* 18 (Spec. Publ. 1): 118-130.
- Koh, S., A. J. Tanentzap, G. Moulant, T. Dobbie, L. Carr, J. Keitel, K. Hogsden, G. Harvey, J. Hudson and R. I. Thorndyke. 2012. Double-crested Cormorants Alter Forest Structure and Increase Damage Indices of Individual Trees on Island Habitats in Lake Erie. *Waterbirds* December 2012: Vol. 35, Issue sp1 (Dec 2012), pgs.13-22.
- Larsen, K. H. and J. H. Dietrich. (1970). Reduction of a raven population on lambing grounds with DRC-1339. *J. Wildl. Manage.* no. 34:200-204.
- Lowther, Peter E. 1993. Brown-headed Cowbird (*Molothrus ater*), version 2.0. In *The Birds of North America* (P. G. Rodewald, editor). Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, New York, USA. <https://doi.org/10.2173/bna.47>.
- MANEM Regional Waterbird Plan. 2006. Waterbird Conservation Plan: 2006-2010.

- Martin, C. 2015. NH Bald Eagle Breeding Season Results. New Hampshire Audubon. <http://www.nh Audubon.org/2015-nh-bald-eagle-breeding-season-results-by-chris-martin/>. Accessed 3 January 2018.
- Mott, D. F., and C. P. Stone. 1973. Bird damage to blueberries in the United States. U.S. Bur. Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Spec. Sci. Rept., Wildl. No. 172. 15 pp.
- NAS. 2010. The Christmas Bird Count Historical Results [Online]. Available <http://christmasbirdcount.org>. Accessed online December 27, 2017.
- New Hampshire Fish and Game (NHFG). 2018. Bald Eagle Project. Concord, New Hampshire, USA. <https://wildlife.state.nh.us/nongame/project-bald-eagle.html>. Accessed May 17, 2018.
- Partners in Flight Science Committee (PFSC). 2013. Population Estimates Database, version 2013. Available at <http://pif.birdconservancy.org/PopEstimates>. Accessed online on December 19, 2017.
- Peer, Brian D. and Eric K. Bollinger. 1997. Common Grackle (*Quiscalus quiscula*), version 2.0. In *The Birds of North America* (P. G. Rodewald, editor). Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, New York. <https://doi.org/10.2173/bna.271>.
- Putman, W. E. and J. C. Zasada. (1985). Raven damage to plastic seeding shelters in interior Alaska. *North. J. Appl. For.* no. 2:41-43
- Rogers, J. G., Jr., and J. T. Linehan. 1977. Some aspects of grackle feeding behavior in newly planted corn. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 41:444-447.
- Salmon, T. P., A. C. Crabb and R. E. Marsh. (1986). Bird damage to pistachios. *Calif. Agric.* no. 40:5-8.
- Sauer, J. R., D. K. Niven, J. E. Hines, D. J. Ziolkowski, Jr., K. L. Pardieck, J. E. Fallon, and W. A. Link. 2017. *The North American Breeding Bird Survey, Results and Analysis 1966 - 2015. Version 2.07.2017.* USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland.
- Schmidt-Koenig, K. and R. Prinzinger. (1992). Raven *Corvus corax* strikes flying pigeon. *Vogelwelt* no. 113:98.
- Slate, D. A., R. Owens, G. Connolly, and G. Simmons. 1992. Decision making for wildlife damage management. *Trans. N. A. Wildl. Nat. Res. Conf* 57:5162.
- Tyson, L. A., J. L. Belant, F. J. Cuthbert, and D. V. Weseloh. 1999. Nesting populations of double crested cormorants in the United States and Canada. Pp. 17-25. *Symposium on Double-crested Cormorants: Population Status and Management Issues in the Midwest*, December 9, 1997, M. E. Tobin, ed. USDA Technical Bulletin No. 1879. 164 pp.
- USDA. 2016. *Environmental Assessment: New Hampshire Bird Damage Management.* United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services, Concord, NH. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife_damage/downloads/nepa/2016%20EA_New%20Hampshire%20Bird%20Damage%20Management.pdf

- USFWS. 2016a. Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Eagle Rule Revision. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C., USA.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2016b. Bald and golden eagles: population demographics and estimation of sustainable take in the United States, 2016 update. Washington, D.C.: Division of Migratory Bird Management (see Supplemental Material, Reference S5, <https://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/EagleRuleRevisions-StatusReport.pdf>).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017a. Environmental Assessment for Issuing Depredation Permits for Double-crested Cormorant Management. Division of Migratory Birds, Falls Church, Virginia.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2017b. Decision and Finding of No Significant Impact- Environmental Assessment: Issuing Depredation Permits for Double-crested Cormorant Management. Division of Migratory Birds, Falls Church, Virginia.
- USFWS. 2017c. Bald Eagle Conservation: Bald Eagle Natural History and Sensitivity to Human Activity Information. https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/conservation/baea_nhstry_snstvtty.html. Accessed 2 January 2018.
- Williams, R. E. 1983. Integrated management of wintering blackbirds and their economic impact at south Texas feedlots. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tex. A&M Univ., College Station. 282 pp.
- Wires, L. R. and Cuthbert, F. J. 2001. Prioritization of waterbird colony sites for conservation in the U.S. Great Lakes. Final Report to USFWS. Available at: <http://www.waterbirds.umn.edu/F2-CWBPrior.pdf>.
- Wires, L. R., F. J. Cuthbert, D. R. Trexel, and A. R. Joshi. 2001. Status of the double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*) in North America. Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arlington, Virginia, USA.
- Yasukawa, Ken and William A. Searcy. 1995. Red-winged Blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), version 2.0. In *The Birds of North America* (P. G. Rodewald, editor). Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, New York, USA. <https://doi.org/10.2173/bna.184>

APPENDIX A

USFWS Listing of Threatened and Endangered Species in New Hampshire

Listed species -- 12 listings

Summary of Animals – 7 listings

Status	Species/Listing Name
T	Bat, Northern long-eared Wherever found (Myotis septentrionalis)
T	Knot, red Wherever found (Calidris canutus rufa)
T	Plover, piping [Atlantic Coast and Northern Great Plains populations] - Wherever found, except those areas where listed as endangered. (Charadrius melodus)
T	Lynx, Canada Wherever Found in Contiguous U.S. (Lynx canadensis)
E	Sea turtle, hawksbill Wherever found (Eretmochelys imbricata)
E	Butterfly, Karner blue Wherever found (Lycaeides melissa samuelis)
E	Sea turtle, leatherback Wherever found (Dermochelys coriacea)
E	Tern, roseate northeast U.S. nesting pop. (Sterna dougallii dougallii)
E	Wedgemussel, dwarf Wherever found (Alasmidonta heterodon)

Summary of Plants -- 6 listings

Status	Species/Listing Name
E	Bulrush, Northeastern (Scirpus ancistrochaetus)
E	Milk-vetch, Jesup's (Astragalus robbinsii var. jesupi)
T	Pogonia, small whorled (Isotria medeoloides)

Notes:

- As of 02/13/2015 the data in this report has been updated to use a different set of information. Results are based on where the species is believed to or known to occur. The FWS feels utilizing this data set is a better representation of species occurrence. Note: there may be other federally listed species that are not currently known or expected to occur in this state but are covered by the ESA wherever they are found; Thus if new surveys detected them in this state they are still covered by the ESA. The FWS is using the best information available on this date to generate this list.
- This report shows listed species or populations believed to or known to occur in New Hampshire
- This list does not include experimental populations and similarity of appearance listings.
- This list includes species or populations under the sole jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Click on the highlighted scientific names below to view a Species Profile for each listing.

Obtained from the USFWS website at

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp0/reports/species-listed-by-state-report?state=NH&status=listed>
on 3/14/2019.