## PROJECT REPORT

**Project Title:** Wildlife Services in California – economic assessments.

Research Agency: National Wildlife Research Center

**Principal Investigator:** S.A. Shwiff

**Budget:** \$148,089.00

## **Summary/ Abstract of Final Report:**

In 2003 VPCRAC funded a comprehensive economic assessment of Wildlife Services (WS) operations in California. That year, WS had cooperative agreements/MOUs with 40 of the state's 58 counties, with El Dorado, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Sierra, Plumas and Placer counties involving special arrangements. This report consists of 38 county assessments, including one joint assessment for Sierra and Plumas counties. Economic impacts of WS operations to reduce wildlife damage or threats to agriculture, public health and safety, property and natural resources were quantified. The assessment involved multiple economic techniques and was specific to the wildlife damage management activities performed in each county.

In 2004, the cumulative cooperative share costs paid by the 39 counties included in the report was \$1,968,328. The mean share paid by these counties was \$51,798, with minimum and maximum shares of \$5,446 and \$128,633.

Annual estimated replacement costs for WS operations for Year 1 and Year 2 of the analysis (approximately equivalent to fiscal years 2003 and 2004) totaled \$6,605,234 and \$8,602,590 for the combined counties, respectively. These costs involved cumulative replacement totals for projected agriculture, health and human safety, natural resource, and property operations. Mean replacement costs for WS operations in the cooperating counties in Year 1 and Year 2 were \$173,822 and \$226,373, respectively. Given that the counties paid an average \$51,798 share to WS in 2003, the counties would have incurred averaged net increased expenses of \$122,024 and \$174,575 for similar services offered by commercial wildlife damage management companies.

The economic impact analyses for planning results included 3 levels of potential economic loss in the livestock sector (e.g., Levels 1, 2, and 3). These vary based upon different levels of predation for sheep and cattle, that would hypothetically occur in the absence of WS. Also, damage to health and human safety, natural resources and property reported by wildlife damage specialists would likely increase in the absence of WS. We provided 3 levels of increase (e.g., 25%, 50%, and 100%) to capture likely wildlife damage costs should WS be discontinued. When combined, results yielded cumulative totals of \$5,758,612, \$8,041,762 and \$10,625,890 in prevented damage benefits of WS to the counties. Mean county projected benefits in prevented

damage were \$151,542, \$211,625, and \$279,628, respectively. Additionally, the analyses projected that a total of 256 (Level 1), 355 (Level 2), and 456 (Level 3) jobs would be lost in the 39 counties if WS cooperative agreements were dropped.

In conclusion, although some services provided by WS can be "replaced" by other programs, these may not provide the same level of wildlife damage mitigation. To compute the total benefits of WS, replacement cost and increased damage estimates must be combined. The total benefits of WS in California as a complete program ranged from \$12,363,852 to \$19,228,476. The costs of the WS operations can be determined by adding the cooperative shares of all counties, which total \$1,968,328. The net benefits to the WS state aggregate, due to county funding for WS, ranged from \$10,395,524 to \$17,260,148.

## **Last Updated:**

08/20/2009