

crested cormorant (DCCO). Alternatives have been fully described and evaluated in the August 2003 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on DCCO management in the United States.

This ROD is intended to: (a) State the Service's decision, present the rationale for its selection, and describe its implementation; (b) identify the alternatives considered in reaching the decision; and (c) state whether all means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from implementation of the selected alternative have been adopted (40 CFR 1505.2).

Project Description

Increases in DCCO populations over the past 25 years, combined with other environmental and social factors, have led to greater occurrences of both real and perceived conflicts with human and natural resources. In 1999, in response to urgings from the public and from State and Federal wildlife agencies, the Service decided to prepare a programmatic EIS, in cooperation with the Wildlife Services program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS/WS), to evaluate the significance of, and consider alternatives to address, conflicts associated with DCCOs.

Key Issues

Public involvement occurred throughout the EIS and rulemaking process. From 1999 to 2003, we held 22 public meetings over the course of more than 10 months of total public comment. Through public scoping (the first stage of public comment) and agency discussions, key issues were identified. Key issues can be placed into two general categories: (1) Impacts caused by DCCOs (including impacts to other birds, fish, vegetation, aquaculture, Federally listed species, water quality, hatcheries, recreational fishing economies, and commercial fishing); and (2) impacts caused by control actions (including impacts to DCCO populations, other birds, Federally listed species, and existence and aesthetic values). In the EIS environmental analysis, these issues made up the environmental categories for which effects of the different alternatives were considered.

The alternatives were also considered in terms of their ability to fulfill the purpose of the proposed action: to reduce resource conflicts associated with DCCOs in the contiguous United States, to enhance the flexibility of natural resource agencies in dealing with DCCO-related resource conflicts,

and to ensure the long-term conservation of DCCO populations.

Alternatives

Since the FEIS is a programmatic document, the alternatives reflect general management approaches to the alleviation of DCCO resource damages. Six alternatives were examined in the EIS: (A) No Action, (B) Nonlethal, (C) Increased Local Damage Control, (D) Public Resource Depredation Order, (E) Regional Population Reduction, and (F) Regulated Hunting.

Alternative A

Alternative A is essentially the no change, or status quo, alternative. The main features of this alternative are the issuance of a small number of depredation permits to address DCCO conflicts; an aquaculture depredation order that allows commercial, freshwater aquaculture producers in 13 States to shoot DCCOs without a permit; unregulated nonlethal harassment of DCCOs; and Director's Order No. 27, which prevents most public fish hatcheries from conducting lethal take of DCCOs.

Alternative B

Alternative B would not allow the take of DCCOs or their eggs. Only harassment methods and physical exclusion devices would be used to prevent or control DCCO damages.

Alternative C

Alternative C would allow for increased take of DCCOs, through a revision of our cormorant damage management practices, but agencies and individuals would still have to obtain a depredation permit. It would also revise the aquaculture depredation order to allow winter roost control.

Alternative D

Alternative D, the selected action, creates a public resource depredation order to authorize State fish and wildlife agencies, Federally recognized Tribes, and APHIS/WS to take DCCOs found committing or about to commit, and to prevent, depredations on the public resources of fish (including hatchery stock at Federal, State, and Tribal facilities), wildlife, plants, and their habitats. This authority applies to all lands and freshwaters (with appropriate landowner permission) in 24 States (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, and

Wisconsin). This alternative also revises the aquaculture depredation order by specifying that it is applicable to commercial freshwater facilities and State and Federal fish hatcheries, and by authorizing APHIS/WS employees to take DCCOs at roost sites in the vicinity of aquaculture facilities during the months of October, November, December, January, February, March, and April. Depredation permits would continue to be used to address conflicts outside the authority of the depredation orders.

Alternative E

Alternative E would reduce regional DCCO populations to pre-determined levels. Population objectives would be developed on an interdisciplinary, interagency basis and would be based on the best available data, while giving consideration to other values. Control would be carried out at nesting, roosting, wintering, and all other sites in order to achieve those objectives as rapidly as possible without adversely affecting other protected migratory birds or threatened and endangered species.

Alternative F

Under Alternative F, frameworks to develop seasons and bag limits for hunting DCCOs would be established jointly by Federal and State wildlife agencies. These seasons would coincide with those for waterfowl hunting.

Decision

The Service's decision is to implement the preferred alternative, Alternative D, as it is presented in the final rule. This decision is based on a thorough review of the alternatives and their environmental consequences.

Other Agency Decisions

A Record of Decision will be produced by APHIS/WS. The responsible officials at APHIS/WS will adopt the FEIS.

Rationale for Decision

As stated in the CEQ regulations, "the agency's preferred alternative is the alternative which the agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical and other factors." The preferred alternative has been selected for implementation based on consideration of a number of environmental, regulatory, and social factors. Based on our analysis, the preferred alternative would be more effective than the current program; is environmentally sound, cost effective, and flexible enough to meet different management needs around the country;