



FAWN



FISH AND WILDLIFE NEWS

A NEWSLETTER OF
THE NATIONAL MILITARY FISH AND WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION

VOLUME IV NUMBER 1

MARCH 1987

NMFWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President: Tom Warren, Fort Carson, CO, A-691-4828
Past President: Gene Stout, Fort Sill, OK, A-639-4324
Vice President: Larry Adams, LANTNAVFACENGCOM, VA, A-565-2369
Sec/Treasurer: Jock Beall, Fort Lewis, WA, A-357-5914
At-Large Western Directors: Slater Buck, Camp Pendleton, CA, A-365-3528
Steve Emmons, Fort Carson, CO, A-691-2752
At-Large Eastern Directors: Major Joe Ward, Washington, DC, A-297-4180
Mike Herbaugh, MCAS Beaufort, SC, A-832-7990
Program Chairman: Al Pfister, Fort Carson, CO, A-691-2752
Newsletter Editor: Thomas Wray II, NORTHNAVFACENGCOM, PA, A-443-6207

THE WILD SIDE

TOM WARREN, PRESIDENT NMFWA

As with the passage of time, good things continue to get better! Our recent meeting and training session in Baltimore is indeed indicative of this fact. This organization continues to mature and that developing maturity continues to be demonstrated within our involvement in DOD fish and wildlife management activities at all levels.

I would be remiss if I didn't extend my appreciation and congratulations to those of you who attended the recent training and business sessions in Baltimore. Because of your participation, we had a most successful meeting. Bill Bartush and his Program Committee accomplished an outstanding job in providing us with a unique opportunity to both learn from and interact with our counterparts from within this organization. My thanks for a job well done.

For those of you who couldn't attend, within this newsletter you will find synopses of the Board, training and general business sessions conducted while we were in Baltimore. Highlighted, we amended our Constitution and Bylaws, thereby further defining our operational charter. In addition, we discussed such topics as wildlife law enforcement, the Sikes Act, DNRG participation and items of interest, future meeting policy, DOD joint training sessions, NMFWA membership and future directions of development.

In every respect, I was most pleased with the professionalism and participation exhibited by all in attendance. The mix of individuals from all levels within DOD which attended these sessions are truly beneficial and indicative of the growing respect and importance which the NMFWA has sought to provide for this area of DOD natural resource management.

As I have stated previously both publicly and within this column, I believe that the NMFWA is currently in a state of transition. This Association was formed because of the need to unify and increase management communications between military wildlifers on a year-round basis. We "cut our teeth" on such important issues as OMB Circular A-76, continued program funding and as individuals on the Sikes Act. Now and during this period of somewhat "issue tranquility", I

believe it to be necessary focus on the strengthening of the NFWA from within. As such, I have appointed several special committees designed to evaluate, recommend and initiate those actions which the Board may approve which will provide for the continued strengthening and overall development of this Association.

The following individual and committee assignments have been made: Newsletter, Thomas Wray; Program, Al Pfister; Awards, Rich Griffith; Law Enforcement, Steve Emmons; At-Large Director Requirements, Slater Buck; Membership and Historical, Gene Stout. Again, the purpose of these committees is to improve the overall operational effectiveness of this Association and thereby increase the credibility and importance of the NMFWA as a conservation organization. These committees can afford you the opportunity to provide needed input into how this Association will both function and grow. I encourage you to utilize these mechanisms to their fullest potential.

There has been considerable discussion of late regarding what constitutes membership within the NMFWA and who can participate as a voting member. As stated in Article III, Section 3 of our Constitution and Bylaws, "Membership in the Association shall be open to all persons dedicated to the objectives of the Association". Additionally, "Voting members are limited to persons employed as full time DOD personnel involved in fish and wildlife management on military installations". It is perhaps this latter statement which has resulted in the most consternation. While the NMFWA was formed for military wildlifers with emphasis on management on military installations, there never was nor has been any attempt by the officers of this Association to limit involvement and hence membership to only those DOD personnel employed on individual installations. The determination as to whether an individual member meets voting criteria has been left to the discretion of the individual.

We are all well aware of the organizational diversity which exists throughout DOD. Many of these diverse activities have areas of responsibility and management directions totally unique within themselves. The intent of the NMFWA is to work as a cohesive group to improve fish and wildlife management, including better communications, professional training opportunities and the promotion of other sound natural resource management practices on all DOD lands. All of these features can benefit professional resource managers, even if individuals do not consider themselves to be voting members.

As President of this Association, I will not knowingly allow the dilution of our objectives because of a lack of communications. Therefore, if any member, either of voting status or not, should have a recommendation as to the elimination of what they consider as a discriminatory or semantics problem, please let me hear from you.

Those of you that were in Baltimore will recall that we will now be sending each individual member a copy of this newsletter. This will work well only as long as we can remain fiscally solvent. The NMFWA is totally self supporting in this regard. Therefore, if you didn't make the meeting in Baltimore and feel that the continued publication of Fish and Wildlife News is an effective communication tool, our Secretary/Treasurer, Jock Beall has receipts ready for any donations. Remember, this is your organization; it is everyone's responsibility to support it.

FY 87 NMFWA TRAINING SESSION/BUSINESS MEETING

Synopsis of Annual Business Meeting

President Warren opened the meeting and spoke on the need for increased communication among NMFWA members and with DOD command levels.

Newsletter Chairperson Wray and Past President Stout were commended on the FAWN newsletter as was Program Chairperson Bartush for the program and accommodations.

Secretary/Treasurer Beall reported \$1,200 had been collected in registration fees to add to a previous balance of approximately \$550.

The proposed bylaw changes were accepted as presented.

Elections were conducted as the meeting progressed. All nominated candidates had a background paper prepared by Nominations Chairperson Herbaugh. Director At-Large Buck presented At-Large Committee recommendations.

President Warren discussed the Sikes Act, PL 99-561. Carol Martin of Fort Pickett was presented an award for his efforts on behalf of this legislation.

The Non-Toxic Shot Position Statement was presented to the DNRG following the Reno meeting. NMFWA input was accepted and the DNRG will issue a position statement.

A resolution regarding the Sikes Act was approved after some discussion.

Membership in the NMFWA by COE personnel created discussion concerning voting status of members. The Bylaws exclude most COE Public Works employees from voting privileges. President Warren stated that voting status will be left up to the individual. President Warren will coordinate future actions covering this topic with Phil Pierce, COE Public Works Wildlife Biologist at HQ.

Linton Swindell of Fort Stewart expressed problems with no staff to implement well funded and planned projects. At-Large Directors will try to keep abreast of this common problem throughout DOD.

Past President Stout commended President Warren for a fine job over the past year. President Warren made a closing statement, again emphasizing communication.

The Board of Directors held a short meeting following the Business meeting. The FY 88 NMFWA meeting will be held in conjunction with the Western Association of Fish/Wildlife Agencies in July 1988. The FY 88 program and meeting will allow more time for DOD Branch meetings and retain the panel-type format.

NMFWA Sikes Act Resolution

Whereas, the NMFWA supported the House Version of the Sikes Act, and
Whereas, the final bill was similar to this earlier bill,
Therefore, be it resolved that the NMFWA supports the Sikes Act in whole and urges the Department of Defense to support this Act in its full spirit which includes cooperative planning within installations, review of such multi-use plans by the state wildlife agency and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the preparation of cooperative fish and wildlife plans with these agencies.

A copy of the Sikes Act amendment is available from any Board member.

Program Chairman Comments

The workshop and meetings held in Baltimore were developed into a format that attempted to increase participation through more open discussion and communication between participants. This communication was felt to be essential in promoting a meaningful and productive atmosphere to all persons attending the NMFWA sessions. A consensus of opinions received during and after the Baltimore meeting indicated the structure of sessions as presented was successful and should be pursued in future meetings. The efforts of many went towards the success of the meeting, but I should especially thank the chairpersons of each session and Kyle Rambo, Richard Griffith and Carl Petrick for local assistance.

Recommendations received for the next meeting indicated that more time was needed for individual DOD branch sessions and the following general session when all DOD branches could be present for discussion, questions and answers. Another recommendation centered around the continuation of some workshop panel sessions that consisted of DOD and other related professionals (USFWS, ASCS/SCS, state agency, etc.) that deal with military natural resources management. It was also pointed out that an emphasis should be placed on sufficient time available at the end of each session for open discussion.

These concepts as well as more specific program needs have been conveyed to the 1988 program chairman Al Pfister. The membership should continue to provide input to Al for specific program needs such as topics of current interest that effect all of us (forestry/agronomy/wildlife relationships, predator control, noxious plant control, etc.). These improvements in the structure of NMFWA workshops will continue to make our organization a valuable asset to DOD natural resources management. Bill Bartush

Awards Committee Formed

Under the direction of Association President Tom Warren, an NMFWA awards committee has been formed. This committee will assist the Association President in recognizing the accomplishments of those individuals, groups, and organizations which have made significant contributions towards achieving the objectives of the Association, to the Association, or to natural resources management within DOD. Since the NMFWA has no established procedures for awards or the recognition of individuals, the committee has been asked to develop, and recommend to the President, criteria for those accomplishments and activities that are worthy of Association recognition.

If you have any ideas, suggestions, etc. for this committee, please contact Richard Griffith at Autovon 584-3613/3792/4131 or send him a note at the U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, Pest Management and Pesticide Monitoring Division, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5422.

SECRETARY/TREASURERS REPORT

As of 30 January 1987, the financial assets of NMFWA total \$1,804.93. At the November 1986 Baltimore NMFWA meeting registration fees collected totaled \$1,220 from 61 members, plus a \$25 donation. Seventy percent of the attending members represented the Eastern Region.

The current membership roles have reached an all-time high of 301. The recent increase reflects many new COE natural resource employees. Besides COE and DOD installation fish and wildlife representatives, the membership includes people from state and federal resource agencies, private conservation organizations, and interested individuals and companies. Jock Beall

INSTALLATION REPORT

Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, covering 3481 ha of the extreme eastern tip of Puerto Rico, lies within a subtropical dry life zone. Principal habitats include over 800 ha (excluding open water) of red/black/white mangroves, dry coastal forest areas indicated by *Yeucaena* and mesquite, and beach strand associations characterized by coconut, sea grape, buttonbush, and manzanillo.

The 9150 ha Vieques Naval Reservation (VNR), a unit of Roosevelt Roads, is located on Vieques Island, situated 11 km southeast of the Naval Station. The eastern half of the Naval Reservation is classed as subtropical dry zone, and is dominated by such xerophytic vegetation as mesquite and acacia. The western half of the VNR, one of the few areas on Vieques Island where communities of endemic flora are still preserved, is considered subtropical moist. Approximately 330 ha of mangroves are found on Vieques Navy property.

The mangrove systems located within Roosevelt Roads/VNR provide invaluable habitat as fish nurseries and waterbird rookeries. In addition, nearshore waters encompass extensive coral and turtle/manatee seagrass zones.

Wildlife resources of special concern, encountered on Roosevelt Roads and/or the VNR, include eight federal (excluding migratory cetaceans) and at least 11 Commonwealth of Puerto Rico endangered/threatened species. For example, Roosevelt Roads is designated Critical Habitat for the federally listed yellow-shouldered blackbird. A VNR cay supports the only year-round breeding colony of the endangered West Indian brown pelican found in Puerto Rico. Endangered/threatened marine turtles (hawksbill, leatherback, green, loggerhead) nest on Navy controlled beaches and/or frequent nearshore waters. Up to 40% of the Puerto Rico population of the West Indian manatee breed, feed, and loaf in Navy protected waters.

Through extensive archeological reconnaissance efforts, 218 cultural sites have been identified within the VNR, 33 of which are Class I and are thus eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. These 33 locations include historic (Spanish Colonial tradition) and prehistoric (approximately 1500 BC - 1500 AD) age sites. To date, six Class I sites, including two petroglyphs, have been found on Roosevelt Roads.

The Navy, with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and Puerto Rico Department of Natural Resources assistance, established seven conservation zones that incorporate environmentally sensitive areas on the VNR. These zones protect wetlands, cultural sites, sea turtle nesting beaches, rare flora, a pelican nesting colony, and other valuable resources. Public/military use policies will be finalized for each zone. Supplementary conservation zones have been proposed for the VNR, and these will include important seagrass and additional riparian habitat.

Besides programs that enhance wildlife/endangered species, protect cultural resources, and manage conservation zones, priority resource management efforts address such concerns as: forestry development, cattle/range considerations, mangrove community restoration, soil erosion control, environmental education, and recreational uses of Navy controlled resources. Specific examples include: the recent development of a 40 ha experimental forestry plantation, reestablishing historical circulation patterns in selected mangrove systems, instituting a formal no hunting policy relative to local Navy property, recovery work directed towards the endangered yellow-shouldered blackbird, and interpretive programs to DOD schools.

The Navy has yet to employ a DOD natural resources manager for Roosevelt Roads/VNR. Under the provisions of a Navy/FWS memorandum of understanding, the FWS assigns one employee, full-time, to provide technical assistance to the Navy in all aspects of natural resources management

relative to these two areas. In this capacity, this FWS employee is the principal contact for natural resource activities on Roosevelt Roads and the VNR. Marc Weitzel

NOTWORTHY NEWS

The DOD Natural Resources Group

Under the authority of DOD Directive 4700.1, "Natural Resources Conservation and Management", the DOD Natural Resources Group (DNRG), is made up of representatives of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Currently, the representatives are: Don Manual, Army (military); LTC Kit Valentine, Army (civil works); Ed Johnson, Navy; Marlo Acock, Marine Corps; and Gary Vest, Air Force. DOD components may send any number of representatives to the quarterly meetings of the DNRG and to its committees' meetings to participate and contribute. Occasionally, depending on the agenda of a committee's work, representatives of other agencies such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, may be invited to participate.

According to DOD Directive 4700.1 the DNRG exists to:

- facilitate the shared use of DOD natural resources personnel among the Services
- provide technical natural resources management support to the Assistant Secretary of Defense
- plan and direct a biennial DOD Natural Resources Conference
- recommend natural resources policies
- collaborate on and coordinate resolution of natural resources management problems
- assist with the annual Secretary of Defense Conservation Award program

There are six standing committees of the DNRG. These committees handle most of the issues, do most of the work, and make recommendations to the DNRG. The committees and their current chairpersons are: Historic Preservation, Constance Ramirez (Army); Forestry, Marlo Acock (Marine Corps); Training, Don Cole (Army); Fish and Wildlife, Major Joe Ward (Air Force); Awards, Lewis Shotton (Navy); Research, Bob Wardwell (Armed Forces Pest Management Board). The committee chairs would welcome suggestions on problems that need to be addressed and can furnish information on what they are currently doing.

The DNRG meetings scheduled for 1987 are 19 February, 22 April, 22 July and 21 October. Agendas are distributed to representatives approximately one month before each meeting. If you have any suggestions or issues for DNRG discussion or resolution, please contact your representative, the appropriate committee chairperson, or me. Christina Ramsey

New Directions in Non-Game Management: A Bibliography

Numerous surveys have demonstrated that non-consumptive use of wildlife by the public is comparable to consumptive use. In 1980 the Fish and Wildlife Service/Bureau of the Census survey revealed that 42 million adult Americans fish and 17 million adults hunt each year, while 83 million people engage in non-consumptive pastimes (wildlife-associated recreation). Non-game should be defined to encompass plants because of similarities between plants and (non-consumptive) wildlife management and user needs. Examples of non-consumptive uses of wildlife and plants include: birdwatching, observing wildflowers, collecting wild edibles, shelling, botanizing, tracking animals, wildlife photography, butterfly collecting and the innumerable other ways to enjoy and study nature. Each of these uses require that essentially all subject species be present which are indigenous to the area. A birdwatcher, for example, wants to sight all indigenous birds, not just the common ones.

Because of the need to manage so many non-game vertebrates, invertebrates, and plants, application of general management principles (suitable for all indigenous species) is more useful and effective than management on a species by species basis. It is not efficient to manage most non-game species in the traditional manner of inventory, research into life-cycle, identification of threats and taking appropriate measures (such as constructing bluebird houses or bird feeders and similar actions to protect one species at a time). Management of game and endangered species on a species by species basis has been the pattern for so long that it may be difficult for fish and wildlife managers to adjust to the concept that most non-game species cannot be managed in the traditional manner.

General management principles include providing wildlife migration corridors for recolonization between natural areas following local extirpation due to seasonal, man-made or climatic stresses (Lynch and Whitcomb 1978, Burgess and Sharpe 1981, Oxley et al. 1974, Moss 1983), controlling cowbird parasitism of songbird nests (Raney et al. 1981, Harris 1984), clear cutting very small irregular areas (less than 5 acres) of second growth forest (Moss 1983), utilizing suitable forestry rotation periods (Harlow and Guynn 1983, Thomas et al. 1979, Bender 1985, Imlay 1978, Harris 1984); identifying and protecting unique species assemblages (Hawaiian Agronomics

International Inc. 1985, Arkansas Dept. of Planning, 1974, Teulings and Cooper 1977), avoiding excess edge effect (Noss 1983), reintroducing groups of species (Harris 1984), and maintaining large areas with natural heterogeneity (Matthiae and Stearns 1981, Whitcomb et al. 1981, Diamond 1975, Noss 1981, Conner et al. 1983).

The following bibliography is provided to assist professional wildlife program managers in improving or initiating non-game management programs. Marc J. Imlay.

- Arkansas Dept. of Planning. 1974. Arkansas Natural Area Plan - Technical Appendix to Arkansas Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan of 1974. State of Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas.
- Bender, M. 1985. Large-flowered skullcap. *Endangered Species Technical Bulletin* 10(12):5.
- Brittingham, M.C., and S.A. Temple, 1983. Have cowbirds caused forest songbirds to decline? *BioScience* 33:31-35.
- Burgess, R. L. and D. M. Sharpe, eds. 1981. *Forest Island Dynamics in Man-Dominated Landscapes*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Conner, R.N., J.G. Dickson, B.A. Locke, and C.A. Segelquist, 1983. Vegetation characteristics important to common songbirds in east Texas. *Wilson Bull.* 95:349-361.
- Diamond, J.M., 1975. The island dilemma: lessons of modern biogeographic studies for the design of natural preserves. *Biol. Conserv.* 7:129-146.
- Harlow, R.F. and D.C. Gynn. 1983. Snag densities in managed stands of the South Carolina coastal plain. *Southern Jour. Applied Forestry* 8:224-229.
- Harris, L.D. 1984. *The Fragmented Forest*. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago, Ill.
- Hawaiian Agronomics (International) Inc., 1985. Final Report for Flora and Fauna Survey of Tinian, Northern Marianas Islands (U.S. Navy Contract N62472-84-C-0141).
- Imlay, M.J., 1978. Determination that seven eastern U.S. land snails are endangered or threatened species. *Federal Register* 43 (128) July 3:28932-28935.
- Lynch, J.F., and R.F. Whitcomb. 1978. Effects on the insularization of the eastern deciduous forest on avifaunal diversity and turnover. Pages 461-489 in A. Marmelstein, ed. *Classification, Inventory, and Analysis of Fish and Wildlife Habitat*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.
- Matthiae, P.E. and F. Stearns, 1981. Mammals in forest islands in southeastern Wisconsin. Pages 55-66 in R. L. Burgess and D. M. Sharpe, eds. *Forest Island Dynamics in Man-Dominated Landscapes*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Noss, R.P., 1981. The birds of Sugarcreek, an Ohio nature reserve. *Ohio J. Sci.* 81:29-40.
- _____, 1983. A regional landscape approach to maintain diversity. *BioScience* 33:700-706
- Oxley, D. J., M. B. Fenton and G. R. Carmody 1974. The effect of roads on populations of small mammals. *Jour. Applied Ecology* 11:51-59.
- Ranney, J. W., M. C. Bruner, and J. B. Levenson. 1981. The importance of edge in the structure and dynamics of forest islands. Pages 67-95 in R. L. Burgess and D. M. Sharpe, eds. *Forest Island Dynamics in Man-Dominated Landscapes*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Teulings, R. P. and J. E. Cooper. 1977. Cluster areas. Pages 409-433 in Cooper J. E., S. S. Robinson, and J. B. Punderburg, eds. *Endangered and Threatened Plants and Animals of North Carolina*. N.C. State Museum of Natural History, Raleigh, N.C.
- Thomas, J. W., C. Maser, and J. E. Rodiek, 1979. Edges. Pages 48-59 in J. W. Thomas, ed. *Wildlife Habitats in Managed Forests: The Blue Mountains of Oregon and Washington*. U.S. For. Serv. Agr. Handbook No. 553. Washington, DC.
- Whitcomb, R. F., C. S. Robbins. JH. F. Lynch, B. L. Whitcomb, K. Klimkiewicz, and D. Bystrak, 1981. Effects of forest fragmentation on avifauna of the eastern deciduous forest. Pages 125-205 in R. L. Burgess and D. M. Sharpe, eds. *Forest Island Dynamics in Man-Dominated Landscapes*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Installation Research Symposiums

The Pacific Missile Test Center/Naval Air Station, Point Mugu, California is situated within a 6,000 acre saltmarsh wetland and has an Outlying Landing Field on the 24 sq. mi. San Nicolas Island, one of the Channel Islands off the southern California coast. These two areas with their unique natural and cultural resources attract a wide variety of researchers from around the nation. Some of these include: Hubbs Sea World, Smithsonian Institution, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and many universities.

In 1979, it became apparent that several research projects were beginning to overlap in research strategies and that researchers were unfamiliar with their colleagues in the field. This resulted in the first Mugu Lagoon-San Nicolas Island Ecological Research Symposium where papers were presented on individual research and field biologists could gather on a professional level. This symposium was so successful that three symposiums have been held since 1979. A symposium is now held every two years with an average of twenty papers presented. A two year time period is to allow existing research to gather additional data and for new research to begin. Each paper presented is printed in a proceedings and distributed to all attendees.

These papers have ranged from baseline studies to reintroduce the southern sea otter to the homosexuality in western gulls.

These symposiums have proven to be a valuable tool in educating the scientific community and the public on the importance of the Navy's role in protecting the natural resources under its stewardship. Invited to these symposiums are local interest groups, school teachers, museums, and any interested base personnel.

Our next Mugu Lagoon-San Nicolas Island Ecological Research Symposium will be held this year in November and you are all welcome to attend. Matthew W. Klope

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Endangered Species Act

The Senate failed to act on S. 725 (reauthorization) during the 99th Congress. Although ESA has technically expired, program activities are being funded through a continuing resolution. The reauthorization process will again be initiated during the 1st session of the 100th Congress.

Fish and Wildlife Conservation (Nongame) Act

A 3-year reauthorization (through FY 88) of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 has passed both houses. It was signed by President Reagan on 7 August 1986. Once again, no funds were appropriated for implementation of the Act. Future reauthorization is expected to address establishing permanent funding sources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service responsibilities and programs for nongame migratory birds.

Leghold Trapping Ban

H. R. 1809 was introduced to end use of leghold traps on animals of the U.S. The bill would prohibit transport of animal parts which were captured in these traps and provide for penalties and rewards to aid in the enforcement of prohibitions. The bill was referred to the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment where it received no action. S. 1368 was introduced to end shipment of padded-jaw or steel-jaw leghold traps. The bill eventually died in the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Hunter Protection Act

H. R. 883 was introduced proposing criminal penalties for people employing violence or destruction of property to disrupt sanctioned hunts on federally-owned or federally-managed land. The bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee which took no action.

VIEWPOINT

Continued development on public and private lands surrounding many military installations has placed serious pressures on the installations themselves. One of these pressures is "offsite" mitigation - using military lands to mitigate for development outside the installation.

As development increases it is not surprising that planners are looking to military installations for mitigation sites. Offsite mitigation on military lands is viewed as being relatively inexpensive since it does not further impact land adjacent to the project and eliminates the need to purchase private land for mitigation sites. For outside interests, both public and private, using military lands as mitigation sites is a relatively easy solution to a complex and costly problem.

There may be situations where accepting offsite mitigation will be beneficial. However, I suggest that managers look very carefully at any proposals to mitigate for offsite habitat modification. This is particularly important when the proposed mitigation concerns endangered species. Often, an agency or developer will approach the Command with a proposal that seems very beneficial. A closer examination may reveal that the mitigation is economically unsound and that most of the "benefits" go to those proposing the project.

I am unaware of any formal DOD policy regarding offsite mitigation, although this can be viewed as a form of encroachment. Ongoing and proposed development within endangered species habitat near Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, has caused this issue to frequently occur. In the process of assisting the Command respond to mitigation requests, I have developed several

reasons why I feel accepting offsite mitigation is unwise. These are briefly summarized below. These comments pertain primarily to mitigation for endangered species, but may be applicable to offsite mitigation for other projects. Hopefully, they will provide food for thought and ammunition for convincing a Command to look very closely at requests for offsite mitigation:

1. Each mitigation site removes area from other uses, e.g., training, new facilities, etc. For endangered species, each site represents a permanent commitment. I am not sure most installations realize this. There seems to be an attitude that later on the site can be replanned and developed for other uses.

2. Accepting offsite mitigation may seriously impact the installation's ability to mitigate for onsite projects. This can have serious long-term economic consequences when dealing with limited habitat that occurs for endangered species. Each installation should look carefully at the amount of habitat impacted by planned facilities (then add approximately 33% for the inevitable unplanned projects). Then, ask yourself the key question; Do you have enough acres (at a possible mitigation ratio of 3:1 or greater) to take care of Number One? If offsite mitigation is accepted it should be directly proportional to the benefits of the project. If the installation receives 20% benefit, then no more than 20% of the mitigation should be allowed onsite.

3. Mitigation costs increase for each successive project. Mitigation will usually be done at the best sites first since these have the most values and are cheaper to work with. Mitigation for each successive site becomes more costly until you reach a point where the cost of mitigation is so high it seriously impacts the project (an advantage in some situations). Eventually, you run out of areas to improve and end up spending inordinate amounts of money converting one habitat to another. Therefore, to hold onsite project costs down, each installation needs to retain the best sites for their own needs. The Command needs to be aware that if they give away the best sites to mitigate for X project offsite, then Y project(s) onsite will increase in costs.

4. Importantly, and often overlooked, is the ongoing costs associated with maintaining mitigation sites. These long term "hidden" costs, often not adequately addressed in mitigation proposals, can be substantial. After project completion the attitude of outside interests is likely to be "out of sight, out of mind". I would caution against accepting any offsite mitigation without a detailed agreement outlining long term maintenance/monitoring responsibilities and who will pay for these.

5. Accepting offsite mitigation sets a precedent. When one request is honored, you can expect other proposals to follow. There will be the tendency for the installation to be viewed as a mitigation dumping ground.

6. Aside from the above, in certain cases, the establishment of offsite mitigation may be biologically unsound. This could be the case if the mitigation results in a species or its habitat becoming less widely distributed within its range. For example, eliminating critical habitat from one area offsite and placing it onsite may concentrate a species within a smaller area, thereby making it more vulnerable to environmental extremes. Most USFWS Recovery Plans specify a minimum number of populations necessary for recovery. With endangered species, the Service is unlikely to agree to a mitigation proposal that will further limit a species distribution. Slader Buck

TRAINING/CONFERENCES

Wildlife Law Enforcement Training Session

A wildlife law enforcement training session for game wardens operating on military installations will be conducted at Fort Carson, CO. A two-week basic law enforcement class is intended for persons with little or no law enforcement training, or persons who desire a review of basic techniques and legal requirements. Anticipated dates for this session are 13-24 July 1987. A one-week advanced session emphasizing wildlife aspects of law enforcement will follow the basic class (27-31 July 1987). Participants may attend either or both sessions depending upon previous training and needs. Persons interested in attending either session should contact Steve Emmons at AFZC-FE-EE (Bldg. 304), Fort Carson, CO 80913-5000; (Autovon 691-2752/4828 or commercial (303) 579-2752/4828). Additional information will be sent to attendees around mid-March.

Unique Writing Workshop

A unique writing workshop geared to wildlife, forestry, and environmental professionals is being

offered at Sterling College during 21-27 June 1987. Information on the Wildbranch Writing Workshop may be obtained by calling David Brown at 802-586-7711 or writing Sterling College, Craftsburg Common, VT 05827. Application deadline is 10 April 1987.

ASSISTANCE REQUEST

Snowy Owl Watch

Snowy owls (*Nyctea scandiaca*) are migrating through the Northeast this winter in greater than usual numbers. A few of these distinctive white birds appear in the Continental United States each winter. Severe weather in the arctic regions combined with a cyclic drop in the lemming population seems to have forced large numbers of owls south in search of food. Snowy owls could appear as far south as the Carolinas, Texas and California. These birds are adapted to the open tundra, so they seldom perch in trees. They are often seen on coastal marshes, airports, and large, open fields. Favorite roost sites include boulders, fence posts, runway lights, and rooftops. As many as 17 snowy owls have been observed at one time this winter on and around Logan International Airport in Boston, Massachusetts.

Michael Olmstead is a wildlife cooperator who operates a raptor banding station on Fort Devens, Massachusetts during the autumn migrations. He is currently conducting a study of snowy owl migratory patterns. He and his assistants have captured, banded, and released 34 snowy owls this winter, as of this writing. Each banded bird is marked with a large spot of colored dye on its breast, with a different color for each month of initial capture beginning in November 1986. Over 900 snowy owl "pellets" have been collected for a food preference study. Mr. Olmstead has also logged several hours of behavioral observations along the northeast coast of Massachusetts. Early analysis of data indicate the owls were still moving south through the Boston area in January. The pellets contain large percentages of Norway rat (*Rattus norvegicus*) and black duck (*Anas rubripes*) remains. One observation describes a snowy owl taking a brant (*Branta bernicla*) on the wing!

It is possible that some of the color-marked birds may turn up on or near a military reservation along the east coast, particularly on salt water estuaries, or airfields near the ocean. FAWN readers are invited to call-in confirmed sightings (a sighting by someone who knows a snowy owl from a gull) of color-marked owls to Tom Poole or Dave Crossman at Fort Devens, MA (1-617-796-2747 or A-256-2747). We will pass these onto Mr. Olmstead. Just make a note of the location, date, and the color observed on the bird's breast. Other observations such as feeding behavior and how long the bird stays in your area would be appreciated. Tom Poole

EMPLOYMENT

The Natural Resources and Land Management Branch of Chesapeake Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command may have a natural resources specialist position opening available in FY 87 or 88. We are looking for someone with Federal Government status at the GS-5/7 level with a strong background in wildlife management and general knowledge/experience in forest management and soil and water conservation. This position has promotion potential to GS-11.

Job responsibilities include preparing fish and wildlife management plans and assisting with preparation of forestry and soil and water conservation plans for naval installations in the Chesapeake Bay area. This position requires an effective communicator willing to spend 50% of his/her time in the field.

Anyone interested in this position should forward a current SF 171 to: Code 243, CHESNAVFACENCOM, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC 20374. Questions may be directed to Joe Hautzenroder at 202-433-3586 or A-288-3586.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Thanks to everyone involved in the publication of this issue of FAWN. Although slightly expanded, article submission was still less than anticipated. This was especially disappointing given the recent tasking of At-Large Directors to increase membership participation. My job as editor will remain an easy one until I have to start making decisions on what gets published. The newsletter will continue to be published every 4 to 5 months; its quality depends on you.

The next issue of FAWN is scheduled for publication in August 1987. Articles will not be accepted for this issue after 10 July 1987.

Workshop may be obtained by calling David Brown at 803-584-7711 Writing Sterling College, offered at Sterling College. Information: The Withdrawal Writing Application deadline is 10 April 1987.

ASSISTANCE REQUEST

Snowy Owl Watch

Snowy owls (*Nyctale scandiaca*) are migrating through the Northeast this winter in greater than usual numbers. A few of these distinctive white birds appear in the Continental United States each winter. Severe weather in the arctic regions combined with a cyclic drop in the lemming population seems to have forced large numbers of owls south in search of food. Snowy owls could appear as far south as the Carolinas, Texas and California. These birds are adapted to the open tundra, so they prefer open areas. They are often seen on coastal marshes, airports, and large, open fields. Favored sites include boulders, fence posts, runway lights, and rooftops. As of 17 snowy owls have been observed at one time this winter on and around Logan International Airport in Boston, Massachusetts.

Michael Oimstead is a wildlife biologist who operates a raptor banding station on Port Devens, Massachusetts. He is currently conducting a study of snowy owl migration patterns. Each banded bird is marked with a large spot of colored dye on its breast, with a color for each month of initial capture beginning in November. Over 900 snowy owls have been collected for a food preference study. Mr. Oimstead has also logged several hours of behavioral observations along the northeast coast of Massachusetts. Early analysis of data indicate the owls were still moving south through the Boston area in January. The pellets contain large percentages of Norway rat (*Rattus norvegicus*) and black duck (*Anas rubripes*) remains. One observation describes a snowy owl taking a brand (*Brandt's*) on the wing.



It is possible that some of the color-marked birds may turn up on or near a military reservation along the east coast, particularly on salt water estuaries, or airfields near the ocean. FAWN readers are invited to call in confirmed sightings (a sighting by someone who knows a snowy owl from a dull or color-marked owl to Tom Pool or Dave Crossman at Port Devens, MA (1-617-758-2700 or 1-858-2147). We will pass these onto Mr. Oimstead. The location of the owl in your area would be appreciated. Tom Pool

NORTHNAVFACENGCOM
Natural Resources Management Branch (Code 24B)
Naval Base
Philadelphia, PA 19112-5094



EMPLOYMENT

Resources and Land Management Branch of Chesapeake Division, Naval Facilities Command may have a natural resources specialist position opening available in FY 87. We are looking for someone with Federal Government status at the GS-217 level with a solid background in wildlife management and general knowledge/experience in forest management and water conservation. This position has promotion potential to GS-11.

Job responsibilities include preparing fish and wildlife management plans and assisting with preparation of forestry and soil and water conservation plans for naval installations in the Chesapeake Bay area. This position requires an effective communicator willing to spend 50% of his/her time in the field.

MR. SLADER BUCK
NATURAL RESOURCES OFFICE
BLDG 25154
MARINE CORPS BASE
CAMP PENDLETON, CA 92055

EDITOR'S NOTE

Thanks to everyone involved in the publication of this issue of FAWN. Although slightly expanded, article submission was still less than anticipated. This was especially disappointing given the recent tasking of AC-Large Directors to increase membership participation. My job as editor will remain an easy one until I have to start making decisions on what gets published. The newsletter will continue to be published every 4 to 5 months; its quality depends on you.

The next issue of FAWN is scheduled for publication in August 1987. Articles will not be accepted for this issue after 10 July 1987.