Subject Index

4.4	_
Actimeter motion detectors bait station testing, 105-107 evaluation actimeter count patterns, 110(fig) failure rate, 108-109 method validation, 109 Activity determination, 103 Agelaius phoenicus, 29 Agricultural crops bird damage, 27 rodent damage, costs, 116 Agricultural production—rodenticide use evaluation, 115-116 Agriculture—impacts of rodenticide use, 116-127 Alang-alang, Philippines coconut plantation—rat control study site, 94 Albuera, Philippines coconut plantation—rat control study site, 94 Animal behavior—trapping, 155 Animal capture with steel foothold traps, 153 Animal damage information, 12 Animal movement marking techniques, 128 Anticoagulant rodenticides, 75, 89 bait station evaluations, 105-112	Bait acceptance particle flake markers, 129 physiological markers to determine efficacy, 141 bait placement strategies for coyotes, 141 retention by coyotes ingesting bait, 142- 146(tables, figs) strychnine, 75 toxic baits use of bait boxes, 103 Bait animals—owl capture techniques, 65-66 Bait box, tamper-proof, 104 Bait consumption of rats—detection by use of fluorescent bone markers, 134-137 Bait station evaluation, 104 actimeter count patterns, 110(fig) controlled use of anticoagulant rodenticides, 104 fecal counts, 109 food consumption patterns, 110(fig) tamper-proof design efficacy studies, 104- 107 testing methods and materials, 105 results and discussion, 108-112 Bait, rat control studies—Philippines coconut
California, 117(table)	plantations, 94
hazard to mule deer, 170 strychnine, 75	Baiting, tropical and subtropical crops, 89-90 Bal-chatri trap, 65
ASTM style manual—standardization of key	Barn owl, 67
words, 4	Behavior, trapping, 155
Attractants for use with steel foothold traps, 153	Bird damage, agricultural crops, 27 Bird repellent, ultrasonic device efficacy test-
Auditory repellent, 56	ing, 56
Avian perch repellents	Birds
efficacy test methods	corn crop damage, 29, 39
cage design, 52, 53(fig)	aviary tests, 33
results, 54(table), 55	repellent seed treatments, 40
Aviary	varietal resistance, 37
evaluating resistance of corn to birds, 28, 29(fig)	insectivorous feeding habits, 27 perch repellents, 52
influence of bird populations on damage	pest control, 39
amounts, 34	repellent seed treatments, 39
tests, damage ranking, field corn varieties, 33(table)	ultrasonic repellent device, 56
Avoidance, 103	Black-capped chickadee. See Chickadee, black-capped
	o.acir cappon

Blackbird, male red-winged	Chlortetracycline fluorescent bone markers to
most important predator of ripening corn,	detect bait consumption in rats, 13
34, 35(table), 36	Citrus crops, California, rodenticide use eval-
Blue jay	uation, 116–127
ultrasonic repellent device, 57–58	Cliff swallows—ultrasonic repellent device ef-
Brown-headed cowbirds. See Cow birds	ficacy, 56 Climatic influence on trap performance, 155
Bubo virginianus. See Tethered great horned owl	Coconut plantations, Philippines
OWI	rat control methods, 91-96
	rat crop damage, 89-90, 99(table)
	three study sites, 94
\mathbf{c}	treatment efficacy, 96-99(tables, figs)
CAB. See Commonwealth Agricultural Bu-	Cocos nucifera L. See Coconuts
reau	Coffee trees—rodent damage, 89-90
Cacao trees—rodent damage, 89-90	Columba livia. See Pigeons, Rock doves
Cage design—avian perch repellants, 53(fig)	Common grackles, 29
California, Central Valley, Tulare county cit-	Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau (CAB)
rus crops	CAB thesaurus of terms, 3 Compound 1080, 116
production values of crops treated with ro- denticides, 119-120(tables)	Computer aided analysis of survey results, 23
rodent control, 123	Computer retrieval. See Information retrieval
rodenticide treatments, by crop, 118(table)	Cormorants—ultrasonic repellent, 56
rodenticide use impact, 116	Control methods, 12
California, Northern rice fields-Norway rat	Corn crop damage by birds, 27-39
populations, 81	Corn crop damage by rodents, 40
Cap-Chur darts, for mule deer, 172-173	Corn seed repellent treatments
Cap-Chur rifle, for mule deer, 173-174	chemicals, 39
Capture devices—efficiency comparison of	methiocarb, 40
live and kill-type traps, 153	phytotoxicity, 40
Capture techniques	thiram, 40
mule deer, 170–176	enclosure trials, 45(table) field studies, 40-41, 46
owls, 65-66 Captured animals—by steel foothold traps,	germination chamber trials, 45(table), 46
153	plant performance, 44(table)
Carnivores—steel foothold traps for capture,	Corn varieties
148	bird resistance, 27-30
Carpodacus mexicanus. See Finch, house	damage assessment, 31
Census methods	aviary tests, 33(table), 36
assessing Norway rat populations, 81	rankings, 37(table)
bait station testing	damage by birds, 27-30
animals, 105-107	repellent seed treatments
environment, 105-107	field and field enclosure studies, 40-41
results and discussion, 108-112 feeding activities of Norway rats, 82-83,	germination chambers, 42 preparation for testing, 30, 31(fig)
85-87(tables, figs), 109	treatment materials, 40
gnawing activities of Norway rats in Califor-	varietal resistance, 3
nia rice fields, 82-83, 85-87(tables,	weather data, 41
figs)	Cost analysis of rat control methods, 100
Chemical control methods—marking tech-	(table)
niques for determining feeding behav-	Cotton rat-tetracycline fluorescent bone
ior of rats, 128	markers, 134-137
Chemical repellents	Cowbirds, brown-headed, 29
field and field enclosure studies, 39-40	Coyotes—physiological markers
germination chambers, 42 treatments, 40	bait ingestion, 141 predation control costs, 159
Chickadee, black-capped—ultrasonic repel-	Crops
lent device, 57–58	damage by birds, 29, 39
	J - J , , ,

bird resistance, 27 aviary tests, 33(table) effect of alternative food sources, 32 experimental work, 32 damage by rodents agriculture, 115-116 corn seed crops, 40 tropical and subtropical crops, 89-90 Crown baiting of rats on Philippine coconut plantations, 91-93, 95-96 Crown snap trapping of rats on Phillipine coconut plantations, 91 Cyanocitta cristata. See Blue jay D Damage by wildlife, 12 Damage information gathering, 12-16 Damage prevention, California crops rodenti-

cide use evaluations, 123-124, 125 (tables)

Damage prevention, tropical and subtropical crops, 89-90

Damage resistance of crops to birds, 27

ultrasonic repellent device, 56

Damage to coconut crops, Philippines, 94 Damage to corn crops by birds, 29, 39

Damage to tropical and subtropical crops, 89-90, 94

Dark-eyed junco. See Junco, dark-eyed Data bases, key word criteria, 3 Darting—capture technique for mule deer,

ting—capture technique for mule de 171, 172-173

Data collection methods—surveys, 12-23 Deer mice, 46

Deer mice, 40

Deer, mule. See Mule deer

Demeclocycline

fluorescent bone marker to detect bait consumption in rats, 134-137

physiological marker for bait-ingesting coyotes, 141

Dho-gaza trap, 65

Direct predation costs of coyotes to Wyoming sheep producers, 159-168

Domestic pigeons. See Pigeons, domestic Drug capture technique for mule deer, 172 Dye particle markers for rodents, 128

\mathbf{E}

Ecology, species trapping, 155
Economic impact survey, sheep industry methodology—interviews with producers, 160
Economic impacts of closer industry and a

Economic impacts of sheep industry predation costs in Wyoming, 160

Edaphic factors related to trap performance, 155

Efficacy

bait placement strategies on coyotes, 141 bait station design, 104 bird repellent devices, 52-56 physiological marks on coyotes oral marking agents, 141-142

rat baiting treatments on Philippine coconut plantations, 96-98(tables, figs)

tamper-proof bait box design, 104

Electronic attractants for steel foothold traps, 153

Emergence/germination data after corn seed treatment, 42, 43(table)

Enclosure tests

coconut plantation trials, 94 corn seed repellent treatments, 45(table) Environment—testing of bait stations, 105 Environmental exposure evaluations of particle markers, 128

Environmental factors in trapping, 155
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)—
Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration (RPAR) process, 116

Erie County, Ohio

construction of aviary to test bird resistance and damage to corn varieties, 28-30

European starlings. See Starlings

F

Fecal counts—bait station evaluation, 109
Feces—particle flake markers, 129
Feeding behavior and habits
birds, 27
Norway rats, 82-83, 85-87(tables, figs)

rats at bait points metallic flake particle markers, 128

owls, 67

Field corn. See Corn varieties

Field enclosure tests on Philippines coconut plantations, 94

Field evaluations of chemical repellents, 39-40

Finch, house—ultrasonic repellent devices, 57-58

Fluorescence of physiological markers of coyote baits, 141

Fluorescent markers—tetracycline cost comparisons and efficacy, 134-138

Fluorescent markers to detect bait consumption in rats, 134-137

Fluorescent pigment markers to determine rodent feeding behavior, 128

Food consumption

as census method for rats, 81-83, 85-87 (tables, figs) bait station evaluation, 111(fig) Foothold trap for capturing carnivores, 148 Fumigants, 116 Fur harvesting, 148

G

Geographic and vegetative conditions for trapping, 155 Germination of corn seed after repellent treatments, 39, 42-43(table), 48 Germination chamber trials, 45(table), 46 Gnawing behavior of Norway rats—census method for assessing populations, 82-83, 85-87(tables, figs) Golden-mantled ground squirrels, strychnine poisoned, 75 Gophers, pocket—California control programs, 116-117 Goshawk, Swedish trap, 65 Grackles damage to corn crops, 29, 34 ranking in corn crop aviary tests, 35(table) Grapes, California-rodenticide use evaluation, 123 Ground baiting of rats, Philippines, 93

Ground baiting of rats, Philippines, 93
Ground snap trapping of rats, 91-93
Ground squirrels. See Squirrels, ground
Gulls—ultrasonic repellent device efficacy, 56
Gustafsson 42-S Fungicide and Repellent Liquid. See Thiram

H

Habitat use
owls, 67
trapping, 155
Habituation—ultrasonic bird repellent device, 56
Hazard evaluation
radiotelemetry to determine secondary poisoning of owls, 66
rodenticide poisonings of nontarget owl populations, 64, 66, 69
Hoop nets
owl capture techniques, 66
House finch. See Finch, house
House sparrows. See Sparrows, house

I

Identification, 128
Immobilization—mule deer capture techniques, 170

Indexes, 3
Indirect predation costs of coyotes to Wyoming sheep producers, 159-168
Information gathering, 12-16
Information gathering—sheep industry predation costs, 160
Information retrieval, 3
Injuries, trap-related, 154
Insectivorous feeding habits, birds, 27
Interviews, face-to-face surveys, 13
sheep industry producers, 160
Iodine physiological markers—retention by bait-ingesting coyotes, 142(table), 143, 144(table)

Iophenoxic acid—physiological marker for bait-ingesting coyotes, 141, 144, 145(table)

J

Jay, blue—ultrasonic repellent device, 57-58
 Junco, dark-eyed—ultrasonic repellent device, 57-58
 Junco hyemalis. See Junco, dark-eyed

K

Ketamine hydrochloride, 170

Key words proposed for vertebrate pest control alphabetized, 8-10 by subject category, 5-7

Key words retrieval advantages, 3 disadvantages, 4 selection guidelines, 3-5 standards, 4

Kiwi fruit, California

L

rodenticide use evaluation, 123

Laboratory tests, 52
Lambs lost to predators, 159
Lepus californicus. See Rabbits
Leyte, Visayas, Central Philippines—field
studies
crop damage by rats, 90-91
map, five study sites, 92(fig)
Lures and baits for steel foothold traps, 153

M

Macrohon, Philippines coconut plantation rat control study site, 94 Mail surveys, 16, 160 Male red-winged blackbirds. See Blackbirds Markers, 128 Marking, rodent, 89-91 Meadow voles, California, 116 Metallic flake particle markers coconut plantations, 94 feeding behavior of/rats, 89, 128, 129, 130(tables) Metallized polyester film particle flake markers, 129 Methiocarb corn seed treatment, 39, 40, 48-Mesural 50% Hopper-Box Treater (HBT), Mesural Wettable Powder(WP). See Methiocarb Metallic flake marking, 89 Mice, deer, 46 Mice, house-bait animals for owl capture techniques, 65-66 Microtus spp. See Meadow voles Mirex—physiological marker for bait ingesting coyotes, 141, 143, 145(table) Mist nets—capture techniques for owls, 65-66 Moheli Island, Federal Islamic Republic field trials of metallic flake particle markers to determine feeding habits of rats, 131, 132(table) Molothrus ater, 29 Motion detectors. See Actimeter motion de-Mule deer capture operations, 170 Mus musculus. See Mice, house

N

Neophobia, 103 Nest boxes capture techniques for owls, 66 Nonagricultural lands-rodent damage assessment, 115-116 Noncapture sampling techniques, 91 Nonparametric statistics. See Statistics Nonrandom sample. See Sampling Nontarget wildlife hazard potential from strychnine, 75-76 secondary poisoning hazards, 64 Noose carpets—capture technique for owls, 65 - 66Noose poles capture techniques for owls, 66 Northern California rice fields-Norway rat populations, 81 Norway rats. See Rats, Norway Nuthatch, white breasted ultrasonic repellent device, 57-58

O

Odocoileus hemionus. See Mule deer

Odor attractants in steel foothold traps, 153 Oil palm trees—rodent damage, 89-90 Oral marking agent-efficacy of baiting systems, 141 Oranges, California-rodenticide use evaluation, 123 Owl, barn capture techniques, 65-67 diet, 67 habitat preferences, determined by radiotelemetry, 67 Owl, tethered great-horned, 5 Owls—hazard evaluation, field research capture techniques, 65-66 food habits, 67 prey and habitat use, 67 secondary poisoning hazards from rodenticides, 64-65

P

Parametric statistics. See Statistics

Particle markers—identification, 128-129 Parus atricapillus. See Chickadee, blackcapped Parus bicolor. See Titmouse, bicolor Passer domesticus. See Sparrow, house Pellet analysis—owl diet, food chain link to toxicant, 67 Pen trials—Norway rat particle markers, 130 Perch repellent testing test methods, 52 cage design, 53(fig) test results, 54-55, 54(table) ultrasonic repellent devices, 56 Peromyscus maniculatus. See Deer mice Pest management techniques bird control, 39 ultrasonic repellent device, 56 rodent control, 39 Pesticide evaluation, 103 Pesticide use reporting systems, 125 Philippine rice-field rats. See Rats, Philippine rice-field Philippines coconut crops—rat control field studies, 89-94 Physiological markers—retention by bait-ingesting coyotes

Phytotoxicity of seed corn to chemical repellents, 40

efficacy of different baiting systems, 141-

Pigeons, domestic

Rat control methods, Philippines coconut

plantations—cost analysis, 99-100(taperch repellents, 52 ultrasonic repellent devices, 56 ble) Rat gnawing behavior—possible census Pigment, fluorescent marker for rodents to method, 82-87 determine feeding behavior, 128 Plant performance after corn seed repellent Ratoxin, 89 treatment, 39, 48-49 coconut crop damage, 89-90 Plastics in bait stations, possible repellent damage to California crops, 116 properties, 113 feeding behavior-particle markers, 128 Plums, California-rodenticide use evalua-Rats, cotton-tetracycline fluorescent bone tion, 123 Pneudarts-capture technique for mule deer, markers, 134-137 Rats, Norway 172-173 bait animals for owl capture techniques, Pocket gophers-California control programs, 116 65-66Poisoning-secondary hazards to non-target behavioral response in utilization of bait species, 64 stations, 112 Polynesian rats. See Rats, Polynesian census methods for assessing populations in Population densities—control trapping, 155 Northern California rice fields Population monitoring, 81 feeding and gnawing activities, 81-87 Predation control costs tamper-proof bait station design, testing predatory animal tax, 162-163 and evaluation, 105-107 Wyoming sheep production, 159-162, 163-Rats, Philippine rice-fields—damage to tropi-165(tables), 166-168 cal and subtropical crops, 89-90, 94 costs, 162, 163(table), 164-165(tables), Rats, Polynesian-damage to tropical and 166-168 subtropical crops, 89-90 predatory animal tax, 162-163 Rats-tetracycline fluorescent bone markers, Prey and habitat use, owls, 67 134-137 Rattus exulans. See Rats, Polynesian Rattus norveticus. See Rats, Norway 0 Rattus rattus. See Rats, roof Rattus rattus mindanensis. See Rats, Philip-Questionaires-mailed surveys pine rice-field design, 15 Rebuttable Presumption Against Registration disadvantages, 15 (RPAR) of rodenticides, EPA process, question selection process, 18 wording, 19 Recreation trapping, 148 Quiscalus quiscula, 29 Redwinged blackbirds—aviary tests for corn crop damage, 29, 34, 35(table) Repellents R auditory, 56 Rabbits, California avian perch, 52-55 rodenticide use information, 117 chemical, 39 Radiotelemetry plastics, 113 hazard evaluation of secondary rodenticide seed treatments, 40 poisonings germination chambers, 42 nontarget owl populations, 66 ultrasonic devices, 56 owl habitat preferences, 67 Resistance to damage by birds, 27 owl populations, 69 Rhodamine B-physiological marker for bait-Random sample. See Sampling ingesting coyotes, 141, 145-147 Rat baiting treatments, Philippines—effi-Rice field rats. See Rats, rice-field ciency, 96-98 Rice fields of northern California, Norway rat Rat control field studies, Philippines coconut populations, 75 Richardson ground squirrels, strychnine poi-Leyte, Eastern Visayas, 89-91, 93-94 son study, 76 noncapture sampling techniques, 91 Rock doves—bait animals for owl capture

techniques, 65-66

Rodent activity, 109	Roof rat—tetracycline fluorescent bone mark-
Rodent behavior, 112	ers, 134–137
Rodent control	Rubber plantations—rodent crop damage,
bait station evaluations, 105-112	89–90
tropical and subtropical crops, 89–90	
Tulare county, Central Valley, California, 116	S
Rodent damage. See also specific rodents	3
agriculture, control costs, 115-116	S. richardsoni nevadensis, 75
cacao trees, 89-90	Sample design—sheep industry predation
control program costs, 116	control, 161
corn crops, 40	Sampling, 13, 19–22, 160
oil palm trees, 89-90	Sampling techniques
tropical and subtropical crops, 89-90	noncapture rodent control, 91
Rodent marking, 91-93	sheep industry predation control, 161
Rodenticide use information, 117	Seasonal and geographic influences—trap-
Rodenticides	ping, 155
anticoagulant, 75, 89, 112	Secondary poisoning hazards
application, 105	owl field study, 64
bait station design, 113	population effects, 67-69
bait station evaluations, 105-112	Seed germination, 39
baiting in tree crowns, 91	Seed treatments
baiting on ground, 91	bird repellents, 39–40
baiting on tree trunks, 91	rodent control, 39 Sheep and lamba last to produce 150
benefit/cost evaluations, 116 compound 180 (sodium fluoroacetate)—	Sheep and lambs lost to predators, 159 Sigmodon hispidus. See Cotton rat
California rodent and rabbit control,	Sitta carolinensis. See Nuthatch, white-
116	breasted
evaluation of use on agriculture in Califor-	Snap trapping of rats, 91–93
nia, 115-127, 117(table)	Sodium fluoracetate pest repellent, 116
impacts of use on agriculture, 116	Soils and trap performance, 155
production value of treated crops in Califor-	Sound—ultrasonic pest repellent device, 56
nia, 119–120(tables)	Sound attractants for steel foothold traps, 153
radiotelemetry studies of owl populations, 69	Sparrows, house—repellents tests, 52-53
secondary poisoning hazards to nontarget	Special local needs registration, 40 Species ecology, trapping, 155
species of owls—field studies, 64-66,	Spermophilus lateralis. See Squirrels.
68	ground, golden-mantled
strychnine, 75, 89, 116	Spermophilus richardsoni nevadensis
tamper-proof bait station design, 113	See Squirrels, ground, Richardson
treatment for rodent pests in California,	Spermophilus tridecemlineatus. See Squir-
117-122	rels, ground
use impacts	Sprout emergence, 39
compared to damage, 119, 121-122	Squirrels, ground
compared to value of treated hectares,	California, rodenticide evaluation, 116-117
123	citrus crops, 123
versus potential damage, 123	levels of strychnine in stomach, 75
Rodents—bait station evaluations	responses to repellents, 40
activity, 109	Squirrels, ground
behavior, 112	strychnine poison studies, 75-76
feeding behavior for toxic baits, 109	Standards
particle markers, 128–129	ASTM manual, 4
Rodents—control, 105-112	key word retrieval, 3
Rodents—crop damage, 89-91	Steel foothold traps
particle markers Rompun, 170	public opposition, 148
NORDAN, 170	TEST METHODS FOR EVAIDATING 148

vice, 57-58

Starlings, European	Toxic bait—bait boxes, 103
bait animals for owl capture techniques,	Tracer, 128
65–66	Tracking boards, 89
corn crop damage, 29, 36	Trapper performance, 154–155
perch repellent test methods, 52	Trapping
test cage design, 53(fig)	economic factors, 155–156
ultrasonic repellent device, 56	management objectives, 148
Statistics, 12, 23	mule deer capture techniques, 174
Structures—rodent damage, 115-116	owls, 65-66
Strychnine	rat control in coconut crops, 95-96(table,
bait, 75	fig)
California use to control ground rodents,	Traps owls
in poisoned ground squirrel stomachs, 75-	bal-chatri, 65
76, 77–79(tables)	dho-gaza, 65
nontarget hazard, 64, 79	hoop nets, 65
Sturnus vulgaris. See Starlings, European	nest poles, 65
Subtropical crops—rodent damage, 89-90, 94	steel foothold
Sunflower crops—bird damage	criteria, 149
ultrasonic repellent device, 56	efficiency, 153
Surveys	evaluation, 150
computer aided analysis, 23	materials, construction and components,
methods, 12-13. 16-19, 161-162	149-150
costs, 17(table)	performance, 151
selection, 16, 17(table)	field tests, 151-153
results, analysis, 22	laboratory tests, 150
types	tests with captive animals, 151
face-to-face interviews, 13	preparation and maintenance, 150-151
mail, 16	verbail, 65
telephone, 14	Tree crops, tropical and subtropical—rodent
wording of questions, 19	damage, 89-90
Swallows, cliff—ultrasonic repellent device ef-	Tropical and subtropical tree crops rodent
ficacy, 56	damage, 89-90
Swedish goshawk trap, 65	Trunk baiting of rats, 93
Sweet corn. See Corn varieties	Tufted titmouse. See Titmouse, tufted
	Tulare county, California, rodenticide use in
T	agriculture, 116-117
Tamper-proof bait station evaluation	Tyto alba. See Barn owl
testing methods and materials, 105-107	
Tea, crop damage by rodents, 89-90	U
Telephone surveys, 14	Ultrasonic bird repellènt devices
Test cages for evaluating corn resistance to	efficacy tests, 56-57, 59(fig), 60(fig)
bird damage, 28-31	test methods, 57-58, 62
Test environment for bait station evaluation,	test results, 61(tables)
105	Ultrasound pest repellent device, 56
Tethered great horned owl, 65	Uncontrolled vocabulary. See Key word re-
Tetracycline fluorescent bone markers to de-	trieval
tect bait consumption in rats, 134-137	Urban nuisance problems—trapping, 148
Thesaurus of terms versus key word informa-	Utah sheep industry—predation costs, 159
tion retrieval, 4-7	
Thiram—corn pest repellent treatment, 40,	${f v}$
Thomommys spp. See Pocket gophers	Validation of bait station evaluations, 109,
Tile tracking of rats, 91-93	110(fig), 111(fig)
Titmouse, tufted—ultrasonic repellent de-	Verbail traps, 65

Vegetative conditions—trapping, 155

Vertebrate pest control
bait station evaluation, 103-114
crop damage, 39
economic costs, 116
key word thesaurus, 5-10
Norway rats, 81
rodenticide use evaluation
California agriculture, 116, 125
standardized list of key words, 4
standards for information retrieval,3
ultrasonic repellent device, 56
Vetalar, 170
Visual attractants—steel foothold traps, 153
Voles, meadow, California crop damage, 116

W

Walnuts, California, rodenticide use evaluations, 123
Warfarin, 89
Weather data—corn seed repellent testing, 41, 47(table)
White-breasted nuthatch. See Nuthatch, white-breasted
Wild deer capture, 175
Wild mule deer. See Mule deer

Wildlife habitats—rodent damage assessment, 116
Wildlife hazards
radiotelemetry study, 69
rodenticides
secondary poisoning of owls, 69
strychnine, nontarget hazard potential, 76
Wildlife management
damage control, 39
surveys for damage information gathering, 16-18
trapping for population reduction, 148
Wording of survey questions, 19
Wyoming sheep industry—predation costs, 160-168

X

Xylazine hydrochloride, 170

\mathbf{Z}

Zinc phosphide rodenticide, 116
Zoonoses, density dependent—trapping for population reduction, 148