SCIENCE-BASED "PARKNERSHIP" TO EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY PROTECT SPECIAL HABITATS IN FLORIDA FROM FERAL SWINE

Swine adversely affect the environment in most of the places around the world where they have been introduced into the wild, often making their removal the key to protecting many special habitats, particularly wetlands. Their initial introduction to Florida in 1539 by DeSoto was followed by many others. Today, swine flourish and cause widespread damage. A highly successful collaborative "Parknership" approach among UDSA/APHIS/Wildlife Services - Florida Operations, UDSA/APHIS/Wildlife Services - National Wildlife Research Center, and the Florida Park Service has produced practical and valuable methods for enhancing swine removal efforts. We highlight those research thrusts here.

Monitoring swine populations is vital to their management. The logistical and theoretical difficulties associated with density estimation methods typically make indices of abundance the only practical means to operationally monitor swine (e.g., Choquenot *et al.* 1996). We have been using an easily-applied passive tracking index (PTI) with good statistical properties to monitor swine distribution and relative abundance (Engeman *et al.* 2001). This low-tech method places tracking plots throughout the area of interest. At each plot, the number of swine intrusions into the plot is recorded for two consecutive days (the plots are resurfaced between days). The PTI and associated variance are calculated according to Engeman (2005), where a mixed linear model describes the number of intrusions on each plot each day. The mean number of track intrusions on each plot is calculated for each day, and the index value is the mean of the daily means. Adding to index's robustness, the variance formula was derived without assuming independence among plots or days (Engeman 2005). Applications of the method have included 1) optimizing the timing and strategy for swine removal, 2) minimizing labor by identifying areas where swine removal would have maximal effect, 3) assessing efficacy of removal efforts, and 4) detecting re-invasion and identifying directions from which re-invasion occurs.

Reduction in swine damage is the ultimate objective for swine removal, making quantification of damage necessary to evaluate control success. Variability among habitats required different damage sampling methods for different circumstances. A quadrat sampling methodology was used in conjunction with the PTI population surveys to estimate the amount of swine damaged habitat (Engeman *et al.* 2003). Each tracking plot location defined the location for 2 damage assessment plots, 1m outward from each road edge. Each damage plot was a 5x1 m rectangle, established by folding a 1x1m PVC pipe square. String placed in a "+" sign across the square divided it into 4 equal quadrants. Thus, damage was measured over 20 0.25m^2 quadrants for each of the 5x1m plots, providing repeatability within 5%.

Where it was possible to follow a straight-line transect, damage was sampled on transects spaced through the area. This was particularly effective for assessing damage to the exposed portion of an imperiled basin marsh system. Tape measure transects were placed perpendicularly from the water's edge to the interface with surrounding upland vegetation (Engeman *et al.* 2004b). Each transect's total distance was measured, as was the distance directly on the transect that was damaged by swine. This amount could represent a single damage patch or combined distances from multiple patches. The estimated damage was the damage length's proportion of the transect length.

Besides estimating the quantity of swine damaged habitat, we monetarily valued the damage. Determining values for protected habitats is not straight-forward (nor precise). Engeman *et al.* (2004a) discussed a variety of ways to apply monetary values to rare animal species and habitats. Special habitats such as wetlands have limited "market value", and if such habitat is selectively protected, the market value diminishes further (King 1998). The use of contingent valuation surveys tend to provide abstract appraisals of value (King 1998), and rarely form the basis for policy decisions (Adamowicz 2004). The most defensible, logical, and applicable valuation for swine damaged habitat was expenditure data for permitted wetland mitigation projects in the United States. Such data represent an empirical demonstration of willingness-to-pay value. King (1998) presented the dollar amounts per unit-area spent in restoration attempts for a spectrum of wetland habitats. Those numbers represent the dollar amounts that environmental regulators, and to a degree elected governments, have allowed permit applicants to spend to replace lost wetland services and values (King 1998). For our economic assessments, we identified the dollar value for habitats in our swine damage circumstances from the studies cited in King (1998).

Estimation of the amount and value of swine damage allowed economic evaluations of swine control using benefit-cost analyses (BCA). The BCA approach involved estimating the monetary value of the benefits of damage saved versus the costs measured in damage lost plus control costs. Benefit-cost ratios (BCRs) were calculated using the standard format of the ratio of benefits to costs (e.g., Boardman *et al.* 1996). BCR>1 implies the rewards for swine removal exceeded the costs. Universally, the economic analyses demonstrated enormous benefit-cost ratios for swine removal.

Each area of research has contributed positively to the efficacy, efficiency, and perception of swine removal efforts. The PTI is an effective tool for planning and assessing swine removal efforts, and for follow-up monitoring to determine if and where additional control is needed. Pro-

tection and improvement of habitats have been the ultimate goals of our swine removal efforts. Therefore, reliable and practical means to estimate damage levels have provided true evaluations of the need and efficacy of swine control. The ability to value the habitat has provided an effectual tool for evaluating conservation approaches. Economic analyses can greatly assist managers on how most efficiently and effectively to allocate limited funds towards habitat conservation. Ultimately, many conservation funding decisions are made on a political level by people without high levels of training in biological sciences. Placing conservation issues in an economic context can greatly enlighten the political decision making process.

References:

Adamowicz, W. 2004. What's it Worth? An Examination of Historical Trends and Future Directions in Environmental Valuation. Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics 48:419-443.

Boardman, A. E., D.H. Greenberg, A.R. Vining and D.L. Weimer. 1996. Cost-Benefit Analysis: Concepts and Practice. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Choquenot, D., J. McIlroy and T. Korn. 1996. Managing Vertebrate Pests: Feral Pigs. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Bureau of Resource Sciences, Australian Government Publishing Service

Engeman, R.M. 2005. A methodological and analytical paradigm for indexing animal populations applicable to many species and observation methods. Wildlife Research. 32:203-210.

Engeman, R.M., B. Constantin, M. Nelson, J. Woolard, J. Bourassa, 2001. Monitoring changes in feral swine population and spatial distribution of activity. Environmental Conservation. 28:235-240

Engeman, R.M., S.A. Shwiff, H.T. Smith and B. Constantin. 2004a. Monetary valuation of rare species and imperiled habitats as a basis for economically evaluating conservation approaches. Endangered Species Update. 2**1**:66-73.

Engeman, R.M., H.T. Smith, R. Severson, M.A. Severson, J. Woolard, S.A. Shwiff, B. Constantin and D. Griffin. 2004b. Damage reduction estimates and benefit-cost values for feral swine control from the last remnant of a basin marsh system in Florida. Environmental Conservation. 31:207-211.

Engeman, R.M., H.T. Smith, S.A. Shwiff, B. Constantin, M. Nelson, D. Griffin and J. Woolard. 2003. Prevalence and economic value of feral swine damage to native habitat in three Florida state parks. Environmental Conservation 30:319-324.

King, D. 1998. The dollar value of wetlands: trap set, bait taken, don't swallow. National Wetlands Newsletter. July-August: 7-11.

Richard M. Engeman,
National Wildlife Research Cente
4101 LaPorte Ave
Fort Collins,CO 80521-2154
USA

E-mail:
Richard.M.Engeman@aphis.usda.gov

Stephanie A. Shwiff
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Florida Park Service
13798 S.E. Federal Highway
Hobe Sound FL 33455
USA

Henry T. Smith
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Florida Park Service
13798 S.E. Federal Highway
Hobe Sound ,FL 33455
USA

John Woolard
USDA/APHIS/WS
2820 East University Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32641
USA

Bernice Constantin
USDA/APHIS/WS
2820 East University Ave.
Gainesville, FL 32641
USA

Mark Nelson
Jonathan Dickinson State Park,
16450 S.E. Federal Highway
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
USA

NOTES

NOBANIS: A new tool to combat invasive alien species

The NOBANIS Internet portal on invasive alien species was opened in November 2005.

The new portal is an important gateway to data on invasive alien species in Northern and Central Europe. The portal is based on the latest scientific knowledge about invasive alien species. The portal can be used by all interested parties - administrators, journalists and scientists alike.

The new searchable database answers questions such as what alien species are present as well as how, when and why a species was introduced to the region. Information on the status, invasiveness and impact of the alien invasive species is available for each country that is a member of the NOBANIS portal (see below). Maps covering the entire region are available to show the distribution of species which are a particular problem to the environment and livelihoods.

NOBANIS is a network of environmental administrators from the Northern, Baltic and Central European countries working with invasive alien species. The current members of the NOBANIS project are: Denmark, Estonia, Faroe Islands, Finland, Germany, Greenland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland and Sweden. NOBANIS is financed by the Nordic Council of Ministers and the participating countries' environmental authorities.

In the future, details on management and control of the most invasive species will be included on the portal.

Visit the portal at: *http://www.artportalen.se/nobanis/*

Source: *Inger R. Weidema*
Danish Forest and Nature Agency
Ministry of the Environment
Email: Irw@sns.dk