

APPLIED ECOLOGY

Artelle *et al.* (2018) miss the science underlying North American wildlife management

Jonathan R. Mawdsley^{1,2}, John F. Organ^{3*}, Daniel J. Decker⁴, Ann B. Forstchen⁵, Ronald J. Regan¹, Shawn J. Riley⁶, Mark S. Boyce⁷, John E. McDonald Jr.⁸, Chris Dwyer⁹, Shane P. Mahoney¹⁰

Artelle *et al.* (2018) conclude that “hallmarks of science” are largely missing from North American wildlife management based on a desk review of selected hunting management plans and related documents found through Internet searches and email requests to state and provincial wildlife agencies. We highlight three fundamental problems that compromise the validity of the conclusions posited: missing information to support selection of “hallmarks of science,” confusion about the roles and nature of science and management, and failure to engage effectively with the scientists and managers actively managing wildlife populations in North America.

Artelle *et al.* (1) conclude that “hallmarks of science” are largely missing from North American wildlife management based on a desk review of selected hunting management plans and related documents found through Internet searches and email requests to state and provincial wildlife agencies. Although several conceptual, methodological, and interpretation errors are evident in Artelle *et al.* (1), we highlight three fundamental problems that compromise the validity of conclusions posited: missing information to support selection of hallmarks of science, confusion about roles and nature of science and management, and failure to engage effectively with scientists and managers actively managing wildlife populations in North America.

The article refers to review of “a broad literature spanning the process and theory of science” but did not cite that literature, making it impossible to discern how hallmarks of science were identified (certainly not repeatable given the lack of process description). In dispelling myths about science, McComas (2) pointed out that there is no single scientific method, and therefore scientists regularly approach and solve problems with imagination, creativity, previous knowledge, and perseverance. Thus, the hallmarks of science identified by Artelle *et al.* (1) may not necessarily be expected to occur in every scientific or science-based inquiry applied to decision-making in wildlife management. Failure to identify process-based hallmarks of science in the documents that they reviewed does not necessarily indicate that science was lacking in development of recommendations or program decisions.

Artelle *et al.* (1) have apparently interpreted the assertion “wildlife management is science-based” to mean “the wildlife management process itself follows the scientific method.” Managing resources differs from imperatives of a scientific method. Management agencies rely on systems, knowledge, and practices, or management tools and methods, grounded in peer-reviewed scientific literature (3–6).

Artelle *et al.* (1) state: “Our results provide limited support for the assumption that wildlife management in North America is guided by science. Most management systems lacked indications of the basic elements of a scientific approach to management.” This conclusion illustrates fundamental confusion within Artelle *et al.* (1) as to whether management is “guided by science” (as a source of inputs or insight) or follows “a scientific approach” (suggesting a particular process). Wildlife and natural resource managers and trustees consider results of scientific investigations as one source of input in making management recommendations (3, 4). Hunted species are managed within a broader sociopolitical system rarely discussed in detail within species management plans (3). Under a “public trust” framework (5), state agencies routinely invite public and expert review and critique of conservation plans through multiple mechanisms (3). Conservation actions by state and provincial agencies are science-informed, meaning that decisions are typically made using best available information and insight from ecological and social science, while also incorporating expertise and wisdom of agency staff, subject experts, stakeholders interested in or affected by the issue, and decision-makers (for example, state wildlife commissioners) (3–6).

This overall process includes the following: defining the need for action; articulating clear objectives, surfacing, understanding, and weighing competing values; considering multiple alternatives; understanding immediate or subsequent consequences of those alternatives; and weighing trade-offs of those consequences against objectives (3–6).

The analyses presented by Artelle *et al.* (1) are based entirely on responses to emails and Internet searches by “one informed non-specialist.” The article does not report any effort to directly engage agency biologists or others [for example, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies; Canadian Wildlife Service; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)] in personal meetings to aid in study design and to help validate whether the approach used would reveal the extent that science underlies management of hunted species. Management plans accessible on agency Internet sites often are intended primarily for lay public and may not include all relevant information about species biology, population dynamics, and harvest management strategies derived from peer-reviewed literature or from direct consultations with wildlife scientists. These documents also may not include all details of processes used to develop the plan. Hence, limited information from a limited search presages conclusions.

Given the disparate sources of information reviewed for the study (harvest statistics, management plans, agency websites about hunting

Copyright © 2018
The Authors, some
rights reserved;
exclusive licensee
American Association
for the Advancement
of Science. No claim to
original U.S. Government
Works. Distributed
under a Creative
Commons Attribution
NonCommercial
License 4.0 (CC BY-NC).

¹Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, 1100 First Street Northeast, Suite 825, Washington, DC 20002, USA.

²National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, 10th Street and Constitution Avenue Northwest, Washington, DC 20560, USA.

³U.S. Geological Survey, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, VA 20192, USA.

⁴Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853–3001, USA.

⁵Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, 100 8th Avenue Southeast, St. Petersburg, FL 33701, USA.

⁶Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, 480 Wilson Road, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA.

⁷Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton T6G 2E9, Alberta, Canada.

⁸The Wildlife Society, 425 Barlow Place, Suite 200, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA.

⁹U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 300 Westgate Center Drive, Hadley, MA 01035, USA.

¹⁰Conservation Visions, 354 Water Street, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador A1C5W4, Canada.

*Corresponding author. Email: jorgan@usgs.gov

regulations, hunter survey results, status, and trends reports), it is difficult to apply the proposed hallmarks systematically and problematic to translate results into practical suggestions for wildlife managers. We suggest that a more robust analysis of these same management systems may very well lead to different conclusions. For example, the article suggests that the reason more hallmarks were identified for big game species is due to the greater significance of these species to hunters. An alternative explanation is that these species may have potentially greater need for current science relative to vulnerability to harvest than other commonly hunted taxa such as leporids and sciurids (7–9), where ample scientific evidence on effects of hunting pressure exists dating back decades, thereby requiring limited investment in additional context-specific science.

Substantial direct and indirect evidence exists to indicate that state fish and wildlife agencies value science and scientific information, as demonstrated by science-focused programs created to support wildlife management, including the USGS Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Program (10), which exists to provide state and federal natural resource agencies with management-relevant research. Of more than 550 current investigations in this program in 2017, at least 120 were directed to harvested fish and wildlife species, at the request of and funded by management agencies, with the remainder focused on other science themes and priorities (10). Individual state and provincial agencies also have significant in-house scientific capacity [including more than 700 staff members at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (11)] that informs management decision-making. For example, applied research on Newfoundland caribou has been nearly continuous for half a century, emphasizing the following questions: population ecology (12); census techniques (13); habitat selection (14–16); human disturbance (17); food limitation (18); predation, predator ecology, and predator manipulations (17, 19); climate effects (17, 20–22); and morphological change (23). Furthermore, important review mechanisms are provided through the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program at USFWS to ensure that proposed state research, survey, and management work is substantial in character and design, meaning that current science has informed their actions (24). We believe that efforts to improve and incorporate science into management should be ongoing and championed; Artelle *et al.* (1), while highlighting the importance of science, have failed to accurately describe current conditions.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. K. A. Artelle, J. D. Reynolds, A. Treves, J. C. Walsh, P. C. Paquet, C. T. Darimont, Hallmarks of science missing from North American wildlife management. *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaao0167 (2018).
2. W. F. McComas, The principle elements of the nature of science: dispelling the myths, in *The Nature of Science in Science Education: Rationales and Strategies* (Kluwer, 2002), pp. 53–70.
3. S. J. Riley, D. J. Decker, W. F. Siemer, Wildlife management as a process within a system, in *Human Dimensions of Wildlife Management* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2012), pp. 87–100.
4. *State Wildlife Management and Conservation*, T. Ryder, Ed. (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, USA, 2018).
5. D. O. Belanger, A. Kinnan, *Managing American Wildlife: A History of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies* (Montrose Press, 2002).
6. *Restoring America's Wildlife*, H. Kallman, Ed. (U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1987).
7. H. S. Mosby, The influence of hunting on the population dynamics of a woodlot gray squirrel population. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **33**, 59–73 (1969).
8. C. M. Nixon, M. W. McLain, R. W. Donohoe, Effects of hunting and mast crops on a squirrel population. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **39**, 1–25 (1975).
9. J. E. Applegate, J. R. Trout, Weather and the harvest of cottontails in New Jersey. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **40**, 658–662 (1976).
10. D. E. Dennerline, D.E. Childs, "U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Units Program, 2016–2017 research abstracts" (USGS Circular 1427, USGS, 2017).
11. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), "FWC Research: The science behind the management, programs of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute" (Interactive Annual Report, FWC, 2017; <http://fwcresearch.com/>).
12. A. T. Bergurud, The population dynamics of Newfoundland caribou. *Wildl. Monogr.* **25**, 3–55 (1971).
13. S. P. Mahoney, J. Virgil, A. MacCharles, D. Fong, M. McGrath, Evaluation of a mark-resighting census technique for woodland caribou in Newfoundland. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **62**, 1227–1235 (1996).
14. S. P. Mahoney, J. A. Virgil, Habitat selection and demography of a non-migratory woodland caribou population in Newfoundland. *Can. J. Zool.* **81**, 321–334 (2003).
15. S. J. Mayor, D. C. Schneider, J. A. Schaefer, S. P. Mahoney, Habitat selection at multiple scales. *Ecoscience* **16**, 238–247 (2009).
16. S. J. Mayor, J. A. Schaefer, D. C. Schneider, S. P. Mahoney, The spatial structure of habitat selection: A Caribou's-eye-view. *Acta Oecol.* **35**, 253–260 (2009).
17. S. P. Mahoney, K. P. Lewis, J. N. Weir, S. F. Morrison, J. G. Luther, J. A. Schaefer, D. Pouliot, R. Latifovic, Woodland caribou calf mortality in Newfoundland: insights into the role of climate, predation, and population density over three decades of study. *Popul. Ecol.* **58**, 91–103 (2016).
18. J. A. Schaefer, S. P. Mahoney, J. N. Weir, J. G. Luther, C. E. Soulliere, Decades of habitat use reveal food limitation of Newfoundland caribou. *J. Mammal.* **97**, 386–393 (2016).
19. N. D. Rayl, G. Bastille-Rousseau, J. F. Organ, M. A. Mumma, S. P. Mahoney, C. E. Soulliere, K. P. Lewis, R. D. Otto, D. L. Murray, L. P. Waits, T. K. Fuller, Spatiotemporal heterogeneity in prey abundance and vulnerability shapes the foraging tactics of an omnivore. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **87**, 874–887 (2018).
20. G. Bastille-Rousseau, N. D. Rayl, E. H. Ellington, J. A. Schaefer, M. J. L. Peers, M. A. Mumma, S. P. Mahoney, and D. L. Murray, Temporal variation in habitat use, co-occurrence, and risk among generalist predators and a shared prey. *Can. J. Zool.* **94**, 191–198 (2016).
21. K. P. Lewis, S. E. Gullage, D. A. Fifield, D. H. Jennings, S. P. Mahoney, Manipulations of black bear and coyote affect caribou calf survival. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **81**, 122–132 (2016).
22. N. D. Rayl, T. K. Fuller, J. F. Organ, J. E. McDonald Jr., R. D. Otto, G. Bastille-Rousseau, C. E. Soulliere, S. P. Mahoney, Spatiotemporal variation in the distribution of potential predators of a resource pulse: Black bears and caribou calves in Newfoundland. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **79**, 1041–1050 (2015).
23. S. P. Mahoney, J. N. Weir, J. G. Luther, J. A. Schaefer, S. F. Morrison, Morphological changes in Newfoundland caribou: Effects of abundance and climate. *Rangifer* **31**, 21–34 (2011).
24. C. K. Phenicie, How P-R works, in *Restoring America's Wildlife* (U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1987), pp. 19–29.

Acknowledgments

Funding: No funding was involved in this work. **Author contributions:** All authors conceived the study and wrote the manuscript. **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests. **Data and materials availability:** All data needed to evaluate the conclusions in the paper are present in the paper and in the references cited. Additional data related to this paper may be requested from the authors.

Submitted 9 April 2018

Accepted 31 August 2018

Published 3 October 2018

10.1126/sciadv.aat8281

Citation: J. R. Mawdsley, J. F. Organ, D. J. Decker, A. B. Forstchen, R. J. Regan, S. J. Riley, M. S. Boyce, J. E. McDonald Jr., C. Dwyer, S. P. Mahoney, Artelle *et al.* (2018) miss the science underlying North American wildlife management. *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaat8281 (2018).