

# PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT

Wildlife Services Program  
Report No. 3026

May 9, 2008

May 9, 2008

Honorable John Hoeven, Governor

Members of the North Dakota Legislative Assembly

Transmitted herewith is the performance audit report on aspects of the Wildlife Services Program. This report contains the results of our review of the adequacy of the system established to monitor the program within the state.

The audit was conducted pursuant to Chapter 36 of the 2007 North Dakota Session Laws. We conducted this audit under the authority granted within North Dakota Century Code Chapter 54-10. Included in the report are the objective and scope, findings and recommendations, and management responses.

Sincerely,

Robert R. Peterson  
State Auditor

---

---

# Table of Contents

---

Transmittal Letter

Executive Summary ..... i

## **Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program**

Introduction.....	1
Making Improvements with Expenses Paid by the State .....	1
Ensuring Expenses Paid by the State are Verifiable .....	1
Determining Amount of Pilot’s Salary to Reimburse .....	2
Improving Documentation of Travel Time .....	3
Monitoring Miscellaneous Time.....	3
Verifying Billed Amounts are Adequately Supported and Reasonable .....	4
Ensuring Blackbird Problems are Addressed.....	4
Improving Monitoring.....	5
Ensuring Requirements of Agreements are Adequate.....	5
Making Changes to State Law .....	6
Reviewing Monitoring and Funding Responsibilities .....	7
Obtaining Federal Information.....	8

## **Chapter 2 Audit and Background Information**

Purpose and Authority of the Audit.....	9
Background Information .....	9
Objective of the Audit .....	10
Scope and Methodology.....	10

**Appendices** ..... 11

Appendix A: List of Recommendations

Appendix B: Additional Background Information

---

# Executive Summary

---

## Results and Findings

Recommendations addressed in this report are listed in Appendix A. Discussions relating to individual recommendations are included in Chapter 1.

### *Monitoring Operations*

We determined the state has not established an adequate system for monitoring the Wildlife Services Program. We identified a number of concerns regarding a lack of monitoring. We identified changes were necessary to restrict payment to certain costs of the program which are reasonable and can be verified in a timely manner. There is a lack of commitment to, and activities performed with, the program related to the problems the state has with blackbirds in sunflowers.

---

# Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

## Introduction

The objective of this performance audit was to answer the following question:

“Has the state established an adequate system for monitoring the Wildlife Services Program?”

We determined the state has not established an adequate system for monitoring the Wildlife Services Program. Significant improvements needed in monitoring the Wildlife Services Program are included in this chapter. Improvements of less significance were communicated in a separate letter to management of the North Dakota Department of Agriculture.

---

## Making Improvements with Expenses Paid by the State

The North Dakota Wildlife Services Program is a cooperative effort of state and federal agencies to provide management of wildlife in situations impacting livestock producers, farmers, homeowners, airports, and public land managers. The program is administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services. A Cooperative Service Agreement between APHIS and the North Dakota Department of Agriculture is entered into each biennium. A separate Cooperative Service Agreement is entered into each biennium between the Department of Agriculture and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department related to funding of the program.

Bills are submitted to the Department of Agriculture by APHIS for salaries of field specialists and a pilot, costs of vehicle and aircraft operations, and miscellaneous expenses for the repair of equipment and expendable supplies needed in performing official duties. We identified a number of improvements were needed to ensure state funds were reasonably spent.

### *Ensuring Expenses Paid by the State are Verifiable*

This performance audit included a review of information from the 2003-2005 biennium through February 2008. We judgmentally selected 12 bills submitted to the ND Department of Agriculture during this time period. In a review of expenditure information and a comparison to information in the Cooperative Service Agreements, we identified a number of concerns in which state funds were being used for expenditures which were not supported or were not reasonable. Examples include:

- The vehicle fuel costs of the field specialists are not readily traceable and are not verifiable. Certain vendors are providing discounts but there is no information as to discount amounts or what vendors offer discounts (program appears to be through the U.S. General Services Administration). Also, there is limited information on the purchase transaction listing which prevents receipts from being traced to the actual billed amount. It should be noted the vehicle fuel amounts charged to the state are less than the actual purchase receipt amounts.

---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

Expenditures paid by the state were not always supported or reasonable.

- The vehicles driven by the field specialists are purchased with federal funds and the state has no control over what vehicles are being purchased. The state does pay for vehicle fuel costs and maintenance such as oil changes. The vehicles driven by the field specialists are ¾ ton pickups including three 2008 diesel pickups. The field specialists incur a significant amount of travel time and these vehicles typically have relatively low miles per gallon. We also identified few controls in place regarding the use of these pickups. For example, no mileage log books are maintained by the field specialists identifying travel information.
- Varying salary amounts are paid by the state each month. For example, the salary amount paid by the state for April 2007 was \$31,708 and was only \$16,724 for May 2007 (federal funds used to pay salary differences). Rather than paying a certain percent of salaries or establishing another type of cost accounting system, APHIS will bill amounts depending upon the amount of funds available from the state and federal government. With the state budgeting cycle being a two year period starting July 1 and the federal budgeting cycle being a one year period starting October 1, costs paid by the state can fluctuate when sufficient federal funding for the program is available.
- Certain receipts were lacking for repairs and fuel purchases. We identified certain receipts also included taxes on purchases. Taxes should not be reimbursed by the state. Amounts we identified in the sample were determined to be insignificant.

State funding for the Wildlife Services Program does not pay for all costs incurred by the federal entity administering the program (APHIS also has federal funds to administer the program). Only those costs which are easily identified, attributed to the program, documented, and reasonable should be paid by the state.

### Recommendation 1-1

We recommend the Department of Agriculture pay salaries of the Wildlife Services' field specialists and other cost(s) which can be verified in a timely and efficient manner.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will reimburse Wildlife Services only for salaries of Wildlife Services field specialists and other easily verified expenses.

### Determining Amount of Pilot's Salary to Reimburse

The pilot's salary is paid by the state when very limited time is spent flying.

APHIS is authorized and does conduct aerial hunting of coyotes in the state. In a review of information, we identified the pilot of APHIS spends a relatively minimal amount of time flying. However, the pilot's salary was still paid by the state for certain months regardless of the amount of time spent flying. For example, from September 17, 2006 through October 14, 2006 (160 hour work period), the pilot flew 3 days and claimed 26.5 hours for these days. The remainder of the pilot's time was coded to regular hours (77 hours) and the remaining 56.5 hours coded to leave and holiday. The state paid all 160 hours of the pilot time

---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

over this four week period. We were informed when not flying, the pilot spends time working in the shop doing maintenance work on equipment. The pilot is paid a relatively high salary amount (over \$15,000 more a year than the maximum a pilot employed by a state agency and classified in the state's classification system could earn).

### **Recommendation 1-2**

We recommend the Department of Agriculture review the time of the pilot charged to the Wildlife Services Program and determine what percentage of the pilot's salary will be paid by the state.

### **Management's Response**

We agree with the recommendation and will reimburse Wildlife Services a defined amount of the pilot's salary.

### *Improving Documentation of Travel Time*

The field specialists of the Wildlife Services Program complete time sheets every two weeks and identify their work time under the category of "regular time." The field specialists also document their time spent on activities into the Management Information System (MIS, computer system used by APHIS). The information entered into MIS identifies activities by category (such as trapping, office duties, etc.) and identifies the time spent each day for each category.

In a comparison to the regular hours claimed on timesheets and the hours identified in MIS, we identified hours claimed did not equal the amount of time documented in MIS. For example, a field specialist identified one hour to trapping and claimed 8 hours worked for that same day. The difference was identified to us to be "travel time." There is no accounting of this travel time and a significant number of hours were identified as being "travel time." For example, a field specialist had nearly 50% of their time to "travel" one week with the next week having over 70% of their work time going to "travel" (excludes time taken for sick leave). This "travel" time is not documented and/or supported by other documentation.

### **Recommendation 1-3**

We recommend the Department of Agriculture require travel time of the Wildlife Services' field specialists be adequately documented.

### **Management's Response**

We agree with the recommendation and will require documentation of field specialists' travel time.

### *Monitoring Miscellaneous Time*

In a review of the field specialists' time worked from September 17, 2006 through October 14, 2006, we identified time being charged to certain categories which appeared excessive. These categories include office duties, miscellaneous, and bad weather (used when a field specialist is scheduled to check on certain devices and is unable to do so because of weather conditions). For example, a field specialist coded time to miscellaneous on three consecutive days in October for 4 hours, 8 hours, and 8 hours respectively. Time charged to these relatively broad categories provides limited information as to what activities were actually performed or what was actually accomplished by the field specialists.

---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

### Recommendation 1-4

We recommend the Department of Agriculture monitor field specialists' time charged to office, bad weather, miscellaneous, or similar categories. Appropriate action should be taken if time charged to these categories is excessive.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will require documentation of field specialists' time spent in the office for paper work, bad weather and other non-field duties.

### *Verifying Billed Amounts are Adequately Supported and Reasonable*

Bills submitted to the North Dakota Department of Agriculture are a one page document with very little detail. Total cost amounts are identified by category such as salary, vehicle fuel, etc. The support for these bills is to be maintained by APHIS, Wildlife Services. The Department of Agriculture does not review support maintained by APHIS to ensure amounts are supported and reasonable. In a review of 12 judgmentally selected bills, we identified a number of concerns. Examples included a lack of support for certain vehicle maintenance and aircraft fuel expenses as well as taxes being included in billed amounts.

### Recommendation 1-5

We recommend the Department of Agriculture periodically verify the Wildlife Services Program billed amounts are adequately supported and reasonable.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will periodically verify supporting documentation for billings.

---

## Ensuring Blackbird Problems are Addressed

Significant damage is caused by blackbirds resulting in a negative economic impact.

In 2007, North Dakota's oil sunflower production was approximately 52% of the entire sunflower oil production in the United States (according to USDA statistics). A major concern identified by various parties, including the North Dakota Department of Agriculture and the National Sunflower Association, was the amount of damage blackbirds do to sunflowers and losses incurred due to blackbirds (while blackbirds eat sunflower seeds the way they sit on the sunflower head results in a number of seeds falling to the ground). Both parties also voiced concerns with the lack of blackbird commitment from personnel operating the Wildlife Services Program. A letter dated February 2006 from the President of the National Sunflower Association identifies the State Director of APHIS, Wildlife Services in North Dakota had informed the National Sunflower Association he had no interest in working on blackbirds. In review of the purpose of the Wildlife Services Program, the problems associated with blackbirds would be an area the program was intended to address.

The loss of revenue and economic impact due to blackbirds in sunflowers can be significant. Using USDA production and pricing information and an estimate of 4% to 5% of damage caused by blackbirds, the blackbird problem equates to approximately \$14.1 million to \$17.6 million in losses in a year. While the blackbird problem would not completely be eliminated, any reduction in the problem could



---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

produce significant savings. Discussions with representatives of the North Dakota Department of Agriculture and National Sunflower Association identified the blackbird problem was occurring in the fall. At this time of the year, the amount of time needed by field specialists for coyote problems would appear to be at a minimum. Our review of activity information for the field specialists indicated it was a slower time for coyote activities.

### Recommendation 1-6

We recommend the Department of Agriculture require the Wildlife Services' field specialists dedicate a certain amount of time in the fall to the state blackbird problem.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will require dedication of some of the field specialists' time in the fall for state blackbird work.

---

## Improving Monitoring

In addition to the improvements already addressed in this report, we also identified additional improvements were needed in monitoring compliance with requirements in the Cooperative Service Agreements entered into for the program. Our review identified certain requirements of agreements in different bienniums were not fulfilled. For example, required discussions related to employment, salaries, expenses, and purchases were not held and required information to be submitted to the Department of Agriculture was not provided. The Department of Agriculture has established an informal monitoring process for the agreements and has relied on APHIS to comply with requirements.

### Recommendation 1-7

We recommend the Department of Agriculture improve monitoring of Cooperative Service Agreements to ensure requirements are complied with.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will require that Wildlife Services complies with all conditions of an existing cooperative service agreement before entering into a new agreement.

---

## Ensuring Requirements of Agreements are Adequate

A number of recommendations in this audit are being made with how the Wildlife Services Program is to operate, be monitored, etc. Certain recommendations will require changes to be made to the Cooperative Service Agreements entered into related to the program. In addition, we identified other changes were needed with the agreements including:

- Certain raises have been given to the field specialists and such raises are able to be granted without Department of Agriculture approval or knowledge. For the time period of October 2003 through September 2007, the average salary increase was 18.5% with the highest increase being 28%.
- The agreements do not contain measurable goals/objectives or other performance information in which the program or activities

---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

Changes to language in the agreements are necessary.

being performed can be compared to for ensuring state funds are used as intended.

- While we identified certain requirements in the agreement were not complied with, it appears certain requirements may not be necessary in monitoring the program.
- Work conducted through the Wildlife Services Program included activities performed in urban areas. North Dakota Century Code does not address activities of this program in urban areas. If such work is to be conducted, information should be in the agreement addressing this work. In June 2007, APHIS established a fee schedule for work performed in areas it determines to be urban.

### Recommendation 1-8

We recommend the Department of Agriculture ensure appropriate changes are made to the Cooperative Service Agreements to address recommendations included in this audit report as well as to:

- a) Approve or require information be provided for salary increases of Field Specialists prior to being effective;
- b) Establish performance measures to evaluate the program;
- c) Require only necessary reports or information regarding the program; and
- d) Identify if, when, and where state funds are to be used for issues arising in urban areas.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will make changes to the Cooperative Services Agreement regarding salary increases, establishing performance measures, reporting requirements, and use of state funds for urban wildlife.

---

## Making Changes to State Law

Through a review of North Dakota Century Code (NDCC) and discussions with representatives, we identified state laws which had not been updated since 1973 and were in need of review. NDCC Chapter 4-01 establishes responsibilities and requirements related to the Wildlife Services Program. An example of a law which is in need of review is NDCC Section 4-01-17.1. This section states the Department of Agriculture may cooperate with APHIS in the control and destruction of certain animals which are injurious to livestock, poultry, and big and small game; injurious field rodents in rural areas; and certain nongame species of birds causing crop damage or substantial economic loss. Work is being conducted in urban areas under the Wildlife Services Program and clarification could be provided as to what areas the program is to serve and what animals are included as part of the program.

---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

**Recommendation 1-9** We recommend the Department of Agriculture, with assistance from the Office of the Attorney General, review North Dakota Century Code requirements related to the Wildlife Services Program. Appropriate action should be taken to modify or clarify sections to make requirements clear and up-to-date.

**Management's Response** We agree with the recommendation and will consult with the Office of the Attorney General regarding appropriate actions regarding North Dakota Century Code requirements related to the Wildlife Services Program.

---

**Reviewing Monitoring and Funding Responsibilities** The Wildlife Services Program is administered and operated by the federal U.S. Department of Agriculture Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services. The North Dakota Department of Agriculture has a cooperative service agreement with this entity for the program and is responsible for the primary monitoring of the program by the state. However, while the primary monitoring responsibility is with this state entity, the primary state funding source is the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. The Game and Fish Department relies on the Department of Agriculture to monitor the use of the funds being provided and has very little if any input as to how the funds are to be used. With the concerns previously identified in this report with the monitoring of the program, there is a need for a review of the monitoring and funding of the program.

**Recommendation 1-10** We recommend the Department of Agriculture and the Game and Fish Department formally identify advantages and disadvantages of the current monitoring and funding of the Wildlife Services Program. A determination should be made as to whether the primary monitoring and/or primary funding of the program need changing.

**Management's Response** Department of Agriculture  
We agree with the recommendation and will jointly identify with the Game and Fish Department advantages and disadvantages of the current monitoring and funding of the Wildlife Services Program. We will also jointly make a determination regarding changes, if any, in the primary monitoring and funding of the program.

Game and Fish Department  
Game and Fish agrees with the recommendation and will work with the Department of Agriculture to review the current monitoring and funding of the Wildlife Services Program. We will work with them to determine whether the primary monitoring and/or primary funding of the program need changing.

---

## Chapter 1 Monitoring the Wildlife Services Program

---

### Obtaining Federal Information

Federal budget and expenditure information is not obtained by the state.

The Wildlife Services Program is funded with general funds (through the North Dakota Department of Agriculture), special funds (through the North Dakota Game and Fish Department), and federal funds (through U.S. Department of Agriculture). The North Dakota Department of Agriculture meets with the federal entity representative (State Director of APHIS, Wildlife Services) in an attempt to identify an appropriate budget request amount. The State Director determined additional funds were needed for the program after the 2007 Legislative Session had started. Rather than addressing this need with the Department of Agriculture, the State Director contacted local organizations and individuals informing them if additional funds were not received, field specialist staffing would be reduced. The Department of Agriculture was unaware of this occurring until information was provided to them from the North Dakota Game and Fish Department.

We reviewed information presented to appropriation committees during the 2007 Legislative Session. In certain instances, we identified information provided regarding the program appeared inconsistent and we were unable to verify certain federal expenditure information. This appears to have led to confusion regarding the funding of the program. Data related to all funding sources used should be obtained to adequately monitor a program. This will assist in determining an appropriate amount of funding to be provided. When APHIS determined additional funds were needed, the Department of Agriculture was unable to determine the reasonableness of the additional request for funding and was unable to provide information to appropriation committees regarding the program funding.

### Recommendation 1-11

We recommend the Department of Agriculture obtain necessary federal budget and expenditure data for monitoring and budgeting purposes.

### Management's Response

We agree with the recommendation and will obtain necessary federal budget and expenditure data from Wildlife Services in order to accurately budget and monitor expenditures.

## Audit and Background Information

---

### Purpose and Authority of the Audit

The performance audit of the Wildlife Services Program was conducted by the Office of the State Auditor pursuant to Chapter 36 of the 2007 Session Laws. As stated in this Session Law, the performance audit was to be conducted during the biennium beginning July 1, 2007 and ending June 30, 2009. The Session Law required the audit to include a review of all funding sources, including grants from the Agriculture Commissioner, Game and Fish funds, and federal funds, for the wildlife damage management program in North Dakota for the last 3 biennium. The results of the performance audit are required to be presented to the Legislative Audit and Fiscal Review Committee and filed with the Appropriations Committees during the 2009 Legislative Session.

Performance audits are defined as engagements that provide assurance or conclusions based on an evaluation of sufficient, appropriate evidence against stated criteria, such as specific requirements, measures, or defined business practices. Performance audits provide objective analysis so management and those charged with governance and oversight can use the information to improve performance and operations, reduce costs, facilitate decision making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and contribute to public accountability. The purpose of this report is to provide our analysis, findings, and recommendations regarding our limited review of the Wildlife Services Program.

---

### Background Information

The North Dakota Wildlife Services Program is a cooperative effort of state and federal agencies to provide management of wildlife in situations impacting livestock producers, farmers, homeowners, airports, and public land managers. The program is administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services through cooperative service agreements with the North Dakota Department of Agriculture and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. Authority for the program comes from the Animal Damage Control Act of March 2, 1931 (7 USC 426, 426b) and the Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1988 (7 USC 426c).

Pursuant to North Dakota Century Code Section 4-01-17.1, the Agriculture Commissioner may cooperate with APHIS or other appropriate federal agencies in the control and destruction of coyotes, wolves, bobcats, and foxes that are injurious to livestock, poultry, and big and small game; injurious field rodents in rural areas; and certain nongame species of birds causing crop damage or substantial economic loss.

The North Dakota Department of Agriculture is primarily responsible for monitoring the Wildlife Services Program. The North Dakota Game and Fish Department is primarily responsible for providing the state funding of the program. While the primary monitoring of the program resides with the Department of Agriculture, the primary state funding provided for

---

## Chapter 2 Audit and Background Information

---

the program comes from the Game and Fish Department. State funding for the program is identified in the table below:

Biennium	Game and Fish (Special Funds)	Department of Agriculture (General Funds)	Total
2003-2005 <sup>1</sup>	\$550,000	\$250,000	\$800,000
2005-2007 <sup>2</sup>	\$680,000	\$250,000	\$930,000
2007-2009 <sup>3</sup>	\$680,000	\$240,000	\$920,000

<sup>1</sup> Expenditure amount  
<sup>2</sup> Expenditure amount including emergency appropriation from the 2007 Legislature  
<sup>3</sup> Appropriated amount

See Appendix B for a more detailed description and federal funding information on the Wildlife Services Program.

---

**Objective of the Audit** The objective of this performance audit is listed below:

Has the state established an adequate system for monitoring the Wildlife Services Program?

---

## Scope and Methodology

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Audit field work was conducted from March 2008 through the beginning of May 2008. The audit period for which information was collected and reviewed was July 1, 2003 thru February 2008. Specific methodologies are identified in the respective chapters of this report.

---

---

# Appendices

---

List of Recommendations ..... A1

Additional Background Information ..... B1

---

## List of Recommendations

---

- Recommendation 1-1** We recommend the Department of Agriculture pay salaries of the Wildlife Services' Field Specialists and other cost(s) which can be verified in a timely and efficient manner.
- Recommendation 1-2** We recommend the Department of Agriculture review the time of the pilot charged to the Wildlife Services Program and determine what percentage of the pilot's salary will be paid by the state.
- Recommendation 1-3** We recommend the Department of Agriculture require travel time of the Wildlife Services' Field Specialists be adequately documented.
- Recommendation 1-4** We recommend the Department of Agriculture monitor Field Specialists' time charged to office, bad weather, miscellaneous, or similar categories. Appropriate action should be taken if time charged to these categories is excessive.
- Recommendation 1-5** We recommend the Department of Agriculture periodically verify the Wildlife Services Program billed amounts are adequately supported and reasonable.
- Recommendation 1-6** We recommend the Department of Agriculture require the Wildlife Services' field specialists dedicate a certain amount of time in the fall to the state blackbird problem.
- Recommendation 1-7** We recommend the Department of Agriculture improve monitoring of Cooperative Service Agreements to ensure requirements are complied with.
- Recommendation 1-8** We recommend the Department of Agriculture ensure appropriate changes are made to the Cooperative Service Agreements to address recommendations included in this audit report as well as to:
- a) Approve or require information be provided for salary increases of Field Specialists prior to being effective;
  - b) Establish performance measures to evaluate the program;
  - c) Require only necessary reports or information regarding the program; and
  - d) Identify if, when, and where state funds are to be used for issues arising in urban areas.
- Recommendation 1-9** We recommend the Department of Agriculture, with assistance from the Office of the Attorney General, review North Dakota Century Code requirements related to the Wildlife Services Program. Appropriate action should be taken to modify or clarify sections to make requirements clear and up-to-date.



---

**Appendix A**  
**List of Recommendations**

---

- Recommendation 1-10** We recommend the Department of Agriculture and the Game and Fish Department formally identify advantages and disadvantages for the current monitoring and funding of the Wildlife Services Program. A determination should be made as to whether the primary monitoring and/or primary funding of the program need changing.
- Recommendation 1-11** We recommend the Department of Agriculture obtain necessary federal budget and expenditure data for monitoring and budgeting purposes.

## Additional Background Information

---

### Description

The North Dakota Wildlife Services Program is a cooperative effort of state and federal agencies to provide management of wildlife in situations impacting livestock producers, farmers, homeowners, airports, and public land managers. The program is administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services through cooperative service agreements with the North Dakota Department of Agriculture and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. Authority for the program comes from the Animal Damage Control Act of March 2, 1931 (7 USC 426, 426b) and the Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1988 (7 USC 426c).

Pursuant to North Dakota Century Code Section 4-01-17.1, the North Dakota Agriculture Commissioner may cooperate with APHIS or other appropriate federal agencies in the control and destruction of coyotes, wolves, bobcats, and foxes that are injurious to livestock, poultry, and big and small game; injurious field rodents in rural areas; and certain nongame species of birds causing crop damage or substantial economic loss.

Field Specialists are scattered throughout the state in 10 regions developed by the Wildlife Services Program. Each region has one field specialist. Each field specialist is responsible for incidents in their own region. A pilot is located in Bismarck and is responsible to assist all 10 field specialists with aerial hunting when needed. The field specialists are monitored by a supervisor located in the Bismarck office.

---

### History

While the program has had various names and has been placed in different federal agencies, the annual reports prepared by the federal government on the program in North Dakota identified minimizing/reducing economic loss and/or minimizing damage caused by wildlife as a primary purpose. A brief outline of the history of the program in the state is below and is taken from annual reports:

- 1949: the Predator Control Program was administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife Division and was providing services for the district of Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota with the main office in Mitchell, South Dakota
- 1961: in February, North Dakota became a separate district
- 1966: the branch of Predator and Rodent Control reorganized as the Division of Wildlife Services which included Animal Control and functions of Wildlife Enhancement and Pesticides Surveillance
- 1969: wetland enhancement activities became an operational branch of the Division of Wildlife Services
- 1974: administration of the program went from the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife Division to the Department of Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; for the first time, all funding for the program

---

**Appendix B**  
**Additional Background Information**

---

was from federal and state appropriations (previously counties and other entities provided funding)

- 1985: Animal Damage Control Program was officially transferred from the Department of Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to the Department of Agriculture – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
- 

**Funding**

The primary monitoring of the Wildlife Services Program is conducted by the Department of Agriculture. The primary state funding for the program is provided by the Game and Fish Department. State funding for the program is identified in the table below:

<b>Table 2</b>			
Wildlife Services Program State Funding			
Biennium	Game and Fish (Special Funds)	Department of Agriculture (General Funds)	Total
2003-2005 <sup>1</sup>	\$550,000	\$250,000	\$800,000
2005-2007 <sup>2</sup>	\$680,000	\$250,000	\$930,000
2007-2009 <sup>3</sup>	\$680,000	\$240,000	\$920,000

<sup>1</sup> Expenditure amount  
<sup>2</sup> Expenditure amount including emergency appropriation from the 2007 Legislature.  
<sup>3</sup> Appropriated amount

According to a Cooperative Agreement between APHIS and the Department of Agriculture, state funds are to be used to reimburse APHIS for expenditures of the Wildlife Services Program. Expenditures listed in the Cooperative Agreement include salaries for 10 wildlife specialists and 1 pilot (or as many personnel as dictated by funding levels and need), miscellaneous expenses for the repairs of equipment and expendable supplies needed in performing official duties, and costs of vehicle and aircraft operations. Bills submitted by APHIS are one page. Total amounts are identified for the following categories: salaries, vehicle fuel/oil, vehicle repairs, vehicle tires, aircraft fuel, aircraft labor, aircraft parts, aircraft hanger rent, and miscellaneous vehicle/ATV.

Federal funding for the Wildlife Service Program was obtained from the APHIS Regional Office. Federal funds are made available every federal fiscal year (October 1 thru September 30). Federal funding of the program is to be used to pay for federal retirement, insurance, and health care programs for the wildlife specialists and pilot. Federal funding is also to be used to replace vehicles used in the operations of the wildlife damage management program. Federal funding for the program is identified in the table on the following page. Additional federal funding is provided to the APHIS office in Bismarck for other projects.

**Appendix B  
Additional Background Information**

Federal Fiscal Year	Wildlife Services Program ND	Blackbird Directive	Cattail Directive
2003	\$399,790	\$320,201	\$87,011
2004	\$387,136	\$318,603	\$86,577
2005	\$612,913	\$285,614	\$77,612
2006	\$624,360	\$303,121	\$78,041
2007	\$635,614	\$314,873	\$78,896

<sup>1</sup> Federal funding can be used by the APHIS office in Bismarck for activities in both North Dakota and South Dakota.

**Statistics**

Field specialists for the Wildlife Services Program enter work tasks into a Management Information System (MIS). This system is then used to create information on what is being accomplished by the program. Reports from MIS were provided by APHIS. These reports identify how many animals by species type were taken as a result of the program. The majority of animals taken are coyotes and beavers with other miscellaneous animals including fox, deer, jackrabbits, skunks, pigeons, vultures, etc. Data provided by APHIS identified the following information for the last three calendar years:

Calendar Year	Coyotes	Beavers	Other Animals
2005	2,355	1,217	459
2006	2,535	1,032	831
2007	1,825	909	1,334

Annual reports are also produced by APHIS regarding the Wildlife Services Program. Using the information in these annual reports, the following is a summary of highlights of the program:

2004

- Responded to 648 occurrences of predator conflicts with livestock
- Assistance was provided to 52 landowners in 14 counties to treat cattail wetlands to make the wetland less attractive for blackbirds
- Responded to 531 incidents of beaver damage to trees, roadways, and crops which resulted in losses totaling \$740,000
- Certified explosive specialists used binary explosives to remove 63 beaver dams in order to restore normal water flow in streams and creeks
- 750 pieces of equipment, such as live traps and propane cannons, were loaned free of charge so that individuals could solve their specific problems
- A total of 1,300 personal consultations and 22 instructional sessions were provided for 4,800 individuals and 1,900 information leaflets were distributed to the public

---

## Appendix B

### Additional Background Information

---

#### 2005

- Responded to over 700 occurrences of predator conflicts with livestock
- Treated 5,000 acres of cattail wetlands with an aquatic herbicide to make them less attractive to the blackbirds
- Responded to over 500 incidents of beaver damage to trees, roadways, and crops which resulted in losses totaling more than \$500,000
- Certified explosive specialists used binary explosives to remove 50 beaver dams in order to restore normal water flow in streams and creeks
- Over 700 pieces of equipment, such as live traps and propane cannons, were loaned free of charge so that individuals could solve their specific problems
- Total of 1,100 personal consultations and instructional sessions were provided for 1,100 individuals and 400 information leaflets were distributed to the public

#### 2006

- Responded to 550 occurrences of predator conflicts with livestock
- Treated 5,800 acres of cattail wetlands with an aquatic herbicide to make them less attractive to the blackbirds
- Responded to 390 incidents of beaver damage to trees, roadways, and crops which resulted in losses totaling \$430,000
- Certified explosive specialists used binary explosives to remove 50 beaver dams
- Over 900 personal consultations were provided for individuals throughout the state

#### 2007

- Conducted 3,188 work tasks on 374 properties in response to predator conflicts with livestock
- Treated 4,500 acres of cattail wetlands with an aquatic herbicide to make them less attractive to the blackbirds
- Conducted 1,255 work tasks for 281 properties in response to beaver damage to trees, roadways, and crops
- Certified explosive specialists used binary explosives to remove 31 beaver dams
- Approximately 1,000 personal consultations were provided for individuals throughout the state