

## *Special Topic: Connections between IPM and WDM*

### *Introduction*

# **Parallel universes? Increasing connections between IPM and WDM**

**LYNN BRABAND**, New York State IPM Program of Cornell University, 2449 St. Paul Blvd., Rochester, NY 14617, USA [LAB45@cornell.edu](mailto:LAB45@cornell.edu)

**Abstract:** Managing damage by wild vertebrates often is important, and wildlife damage management (WDM) has incorporated important tenets of integrated pest management (IPM). However, largely separate academic backgrounds have nurtured the IPM and WDM communities. The controversial “hot button” topics have tended to differ. While WDM research and outreach have received some IPM funding, and wildlife studies occasionally appear in IPM journals, attendance at infrequent wildlife sessions during IPM meetings has been sparse. The objectives of this paper are to review important examples of collaboration, and evaluate possibilities for future synergy between these related disciplines.

**Key words:** collaboration, humane, human–wildlife conflicts, integrated pest management, IPM, pesticide, WDM, wildlife damage management

**ALTHOUGH WILDLIFE** generally is valued by society, conflicts with human interests occur and are increasing. Today’s field of wildlife damage management (WDM) has incorporated many components of an integrated pest management (IPM) approach for resolving human–wildlife conflicts. These include a focus on preventing, not just reacting to, conflicts with wildlife. Monitoring potential pest species, and preventing conditions that may promote conflicts are common to both disciplines. For example sanitation and removal of or covering food that could attract pest species are core principles of both IPM and WDM.

However, WDM has largely developed separately from IPM. The primary academic disciplines have differed, with WDM associated with wildlife and natural resources departments. IPM programs, on the other hand, often are developed by entomology educators. The 2 fields also have developed largely separate outreach outlets and professional meetings.

Important topics are viewed differently between the 2 disciplines. For example, disagreement often occurs concerning the use of lethal versus nonlethal methods to control wildlife. For IPM, use of pesticides

has dominated many interactions in pest management. However, it often it is a minor tool for WDM dealing with wildlife conflicts. Vertebrate wildlife tends to be valued by society more than insect and plant pests, and humane treatment of wildlife is essential for many people (Braband and Clark 1992).

While attention to wildlife issues has been largely lacking in IPM, this situation seems to be changing. Wildlife extension projects and research have received some funding from IPM sources, and wildlife-related studies have appeared in IPM journals. For example, the Internet Center for Wildlife Damage Management was supported with funding from the North Central and Northeastern IPM Centers. Recently, a literature review of crop damage by turkeys appeared in the Entomological Society of America’s *Journal of IPM* (Groeppe et al. 2013).

Although attendance at wildlife sessions during IPM meetings has been sparse (personal observation), the Eighth International IPM Symposium, held during March 2015 in Salt Lake City, Utah, was an exception. The WDM session, titled “Increasing connections between IPM and wildlife damage management,” drew >40 participants. The objectives of the session

were to review important examples of recent collaborations and assess the future of WDM.

Three articles in this special topics section of *Human–Wildlife Interactions* are based on papers presented at the conference. They include an innovative review of the history of WDM by Maureen Frank and Michael Conover. In addition, 2 papers, one by Raj Smith, Paul D. Curtis, and Scott Hygnstrom and other by L. C. (Fudd) Graham, Janet Hurley, and Kathy Flanders, discuss recent IPM-WDM collaborations, with an eye to the future, including major IPM-funded wildlife outreach projects and extension interactions.

### Literature cited

- Braband, L. A., and K. D. Clark. 1992. Perspectives on wildlife nuisance control: results of a wildlife damage control firm's customer survey. *Proceedings Eastern Wildlife Damage Management Conference* 5:34–37.
- Groepper, S., S. E. Hygnstrom, B. Houck, and S. M. Vantassel. 2013. Real and perceived damage by wild turkeys: a literature review. *Journal of Integrated Pest Management* 4:A1–A5.
- 



**LYNN BRABAND** is a certified wildlife biologist and senior extension associate of the New York State Community IPM Program of Cornell University. He joined that program in 1999 as an extension educator. From 1986 through 1997, he was a company vice president and franchise owner of Critter Control Inc, a firm specializing in nuisance wildlife control. He has been an active participant and leader in both state and national vertebrate pest control organizations. He has also taught several college biology courses since 1980. Since joining the Community IPM Program, he has had major responsibilities in assisting New York State schools and municipalities in the implementation of IPM. As a volunteer, he regularly runs U.S. Geological Survey Breeding Bird Survey routes and participates on the management committee of a private wetland preserve. He holds B.S. and M.S. degrees from Iowa State University.