

Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve

June 2008

Prepared by

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve
221 2nd Street West
Devils Lake, North Dakota 58301
701/766 4272

and

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
Division of Refuge Planning
PO Box 25486 DFC
Lakewood, CO 80225
303/236 8145

Contents

<i>Abbreviations</i>	iii
<i>Summary</i>	v
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose and Need for the Plan	3
1.2 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Refuge System	3
1.3 National and Regional Mandates	5
1.4 Refuge Contributions to National and Regional Plans	5
1.5 Ecosystem Description and Threats	7
1.6 The Planning Process	9
2 The Refuge	13
2.1 Establishment, Acquisition, and Management History	13
2.2 Special Values of the Refuge	14
2.3 Purposes for the Refuge.....	15
2.4 Vision.....	15
2.5 Goals	15
2.6 Planning Issues.....	16
3 Alternatives	19
3.1 Elements Common to All Alternatives.....	19
3.2 Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Study	19
3.3 Elements Common to All Alternatives.....	20
3.4 Description of Alternatives	20
3.5 Summary of Alternatives.....	22
4 Affected Environment	49
4.1 General Overview	49
4.2 Physical Environment	52
4.3 Biological Resources	54
4.4 Cultural Resources	61
4.5 Special Management Areas	62
4.6 Visitor Services	63
4.7 Current Socioeconomic Conditions.....	63
5 Environmental Consequences	67
5.1 Methods	67
5.2 Effect Common to all Alternatives.....	68
5.3 Description of Consequences by Alternatives.....	69
6 Implementation of the Proposed Action (draft CCP)	75
6.1 Proposed Goals, Objectives, and Strategies.....	75
<i>Woodland Goal</i>	75
<i>Prairie Habitat Goal</i>	78
<i>Wildlife Population Management Goal</i>	84
<i>Environmental Education, Interpretation, and Outreach Goal</i>	89
<i>Visitor Services Goal</i>	92
<i>Protection and Maintenance Goal</i>	94

6.2 Personnel and Funding	96
6.3 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	96
Glossary	99
<i>Appendices</i>	
A. Key Legislation and Policies	105
B. Preparers.....	109
C. Public Involvement.....	111
D. Species List.....	113
E. Fire Management Program.....	125
F. Draft Compatibility Determination for Environmental Education and Interpretation.....	129
G. Draft Compatibility Determination for Fishing.....	133
H. Draft Compatibility Determination for Wildlife Observation and Wildlife Photography	135
<i>Bibliography</i>	139

Figures

1 Vicinity map for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, North Dakota	2
2 Physiographic areas of the United States	6
3 Missouri Main Stem River Ecosystem map.....	8
4 Steps in the planning process.....	9
5 Sullys Hill National Game Preserve boundary map.....	50
6 Sullys Hill National Game Preserve management units.....	51
7 Vegetative communities within the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve	55
8 Sullys Hill National Game Preserve public use map	93
9 Adaptive management process	98

Tables

1 Planning process summary and timeline for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.....	10
2 Summary of alternatives for the comprehensive conservation plan, Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, North Dakota.....	23
3 Current and proposed staff for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve	96
4 Step-down management plans for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.....	97

Abbreviations

Administration Act	National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act
AMSL	above mean sea level
CCP	comprehensive conservation plan
CO₂	carbon dioxide
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWCS	comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy
CWD	chronic wasting disease
DNC	dense nesting cover
EA	environmental assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
F	Fahrenheit
FMP	fire management plan
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
GIS	Geographic Information System
Improvement Act	National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997
IPM	integrated pest management
NAWMP	North American Waterfowl Management Plan
ND	North Dakota
NDGF	North Dakota Game and Fish Department
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOA	notice of availability
NOI	notice of intent
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA)
ORP	outdoor recreation planner
pers. comm.	personal communication
PL	public law
PPR	Prairie Pothole Region
refuge	Sullys Hill National Game Preserve
Refuge System	National Wildlife Refuge System
Service	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
spp.	species
SWG	state wildlife grant
UND	University of North Dakota
USC	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VOR	visual obstruction reading
WG	wage grade pay schedule (civil service employees)
WMA	waterfowl management area
WMD	wetland management district
WPA	wetlands production area
WUI	wildland-urban interface
YCC	Youth Conservation Corps

Summary

The following summary provides an overview of this draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) and environmental assessment for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, including (1) a general description; (2) purposes of the refuge; (3) vision and goals; (4) alternatives considered, including the proposed action; and (5) the decision to be made regarding the proposed comprehensive conservation plan.

SULLYS HILL NATIONAL GAME PRESERVE LOCATION AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve is a 1,675-acre national wildlife refuge sitting on the south shores of Devils Lake, about ten miles south of the city of Devils Lake, North Dakota. This refuge supports a unique community of habitats such as an oak, ash, basswood, and aspen woodland; mixed-grass prairie; and natural wetlands; along with beaver ponds and created wetlands. These diverse habitats create a large ecotone that provides “edge” habitat for over 250 species of migratory birds, plains bison, Rocky Mountain elk, white-tailed deer, turkeys, and prairie dogs.

The refuge is one of only 19 designated natural areas in North Dakota, of which only four are national wildlife refuges. It is also one of only four refuges established for national bison conservation.



Entrance sign for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve has a long history of visitation with over 60,000 annual visitors, making it the most visited refuge in North Dakota. The refuge is becoming a progressive regional conservation learning center, promoting the conservation role of the National Wildlife Refuge System while educating visitors about the functions and benefits of prairie wetlands and grasslands. The refuge uses both indoor and outdoor education with a focus on the sciences, biodiversity, and human dimensions in the environment, providing area educators an environment that makes learning more exciting and interesting.

SULLYS HILL NATIONAL GAME PRESERVE ESTABLISHMENT

The refuge was first established on April 27, 1904, through Public Law 179, that authorized President Theodore Roosevelt to set aside a portion of unallotted lands as a public park in the Devils Lake Indian Reservation, including the unallotted tract of land known as the Fort Totten Military Reservation. The final Proclamation No. 32, establishing Sullys Hill Park, was signed on June 2, 1904, by President Roosevelt and assigned management to the National Park Service. On June 30, 1914, appropriations were made for the creation of a big game preserve within the park.

On December 22, 1921, President Warren Harding, by Executive Order 3596, ordered that all lands in the boundaries of Sullys Hill National Park Game Preserve be reserved and set apart as a refuge and breeding grounds for birds.

In the Act of March 3, 1931, President Herbert Hoover transferred the preserve to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). It was renamed Sullys Hill National Game Preserve and administered as part of the National Wildlife Refuge System as a big game preserve, refuge, and breeding ground for wild animals and birds.

LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES

Every refuge has a purpose for which it was established. This purpose is the foundation upon

which to build all refuge programs, from biology and public use, to maintenance and facilities. No action that the Service or public takes may conflict with this purpose. The refuge purposes are found in legislative acts or administrative orders, which provide the authorities to transfer or acquire a piece of land for a refuge. Over time, an individual refuge may contain lands that have been acquired under a variety of transfer and acquisition authorities, giving a refuge more than one purpose. The goals, objectives, and strategies identified in the draft CCP are intended to support the individual purposes for which the refuge was established.

The purposes for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve are described in the following legislation and public land orders:

- “All the lands that are now reserved or may hereafter be included within the boundaries of the . . . Sullys Hill National Park Game Preserve . . . are hereby further reserved and set apart for the use . . . as refuges and breeding grounds for birds.” (Executive Order 3596, December 21, 1921)
- “As a big game preserve, refuge, and breeding grounds for wild animals and birds . . . provided, that the said game preserve is to be made available to the public for recreational purposes in so far as consistent with the use of this area as a game preserve . . . provided further, that hunting shall not be permitted on said game preserve.” (46 Stat. 1509, act of March 3, 1931)



REFUGE VISION

The vision for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve is based on the establishing purposes of the refuge, resource conditions and potential, and the issues.

Overlooking North Dakota’s largest natural lake and riding the tops of a glacial thrust block formation, Sullys Hill National Game Preserve is dressed in undulating native woodlands and prairie. Teddy Roosevelt’s vision and broad community support are largely responsible for the successful conservation of these habitats ensuring the preservation of the refuge’s plains bison and Rocky Mountain elk while supporting migrating waves of warblers and other native bird species.

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve is renowned as a regional conservation learning center—greeting families, students, and outdoor enthusiasts of all abilities. Children are able to learn about their natural world using all their senses, which fosters their own environmental ethics. Each visitor’s experience not only enriches their personal lives, but instills a unique understanding and appreciation for preserving native prairie and wetland habitats, the natural resources of the Devils Lake Basin, and the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System to preserve America’s wildlife heritage.

REFUGE GOALS

The goals described below reflect the vision for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.

Goal 1. Prairie Habitat: Maintain prairie plant communities representative of the historical mixed-grass prairies to support healthy populations of grassland-dependent migratory birds in balance with bison, elk, and other indigenous wildlife.

Goal 2. Woodland Habitat: Manage for healthy native woodlands of various age classes and

structure to provide habitat for migratory birds, in balance with bison, elk, and other indigenous wildlife.

Goal 3. Wildlife Population Management: Carry out management practices that ensure healthy populations of Rocky Mountain elk, plains bison, and other indigenous wildlife species that exemplify the genetic integrity of historic prairie wildlife.

Goal 4. Environmental Education and Outreach: Deliver quality, interactive environmental education programming to regional schools, communities, organizations, and local governments to garner support and appreciation for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, North Dakota's wetland and grassland resources, and the conservation role of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Goal 5. Visitor Services and Interpretation: Provide captivating visitor services facilities and activities for visitors of all abilities, as well as community groups, youth groups, and members of Spirit Lake Nation that result in a greater understanding and support for the preservation of native habitats and landscapes of North Dakota's Prairie Pothole Region and the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Goal 6. Protection and Maintenance: Provide for the safety of staff, volunteers, and the visiting public while ensuring the protection and maintenance of refuge facilities, lands, and cultural resources.

THE DRAFT PLAN

After reviewing a wide range of public comments and management needs, the Service developed three alternatives for management of the refuge. Alternative C is the proposed action of the Service and is presented in chapter 6 as the draft comprehensive conservation plan.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

ALTERNATIVE A—CURRENT MANAGEMENT (NO ACTION)

Alternative A, the no-action alternative, reflects the current habitat management of the refuge. It provides the baseline against which to compare other alternatives. It is also a requirement of the National Environmental Protection Act that a no-action alternative be addressed in the planning process.

ALTERNATIVE B

Habitat management under alternative B would begin to address reduced forest regeneration by managing the uncontrolled browsing of captive bison, Rocky Mountain elk, and white-tailed deer within the big game forest, which has resulted in reduced habitat for forest interior birds. The environmental education program would be expanded to provide additional opportunities and improve quality, while providing a consistent message of protecting wetland and grassland habitats. Visitor safety and facility security would improve as a result of cooperative agreements with local law enforcement agencies, regular maintenance, and installing fire and security systems.

ALTERNATIVE C—PROPOSED ACTION

Habitat management under alternative C would address reduced forest regeneration caused by browsing of captive bison, Rocky Mountain elk, and white-tailed deer, as well as deterioration of native prairie as a result of season-long grazing and lack of fire. The environmental education program would be expanded to include additional on-site and off-site opportunities. Visitor safety and facility security would improve as a result of improved staffing, cooperative agreements with local law enforcement agencies, regular maintenance, and installing fire and security systems.

DECISION TO BE MADE

The environmental assessment describes three alternatives for achieving the above goals. Based on the analysis described in the environmental assessment, a decision will be made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's regional director for region 6 (Mountain-Prairie Region) on which alternative will be selected to manage the refuge for the next 15 years.

1 Introduction



Scott Ralston/USFWS

Birders

This document presents an environmental assessment (EA) that evaluates three management alternatives for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve and potential environmental consequences of those alternatives. Alternative C is the proposed action of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and is presented in chapter 6 as the draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) for the refuge. This chapter provides an introduction to the CCP process and describes the involvement of the Service, the state of North Dakota, the public, and others, as well as conservation issues and plans that affect Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has developed this draft CCP to provide a foundation for the management and use of Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, which is located in Benson County near the town of Fort Totten, North Dakota (see figure 1, vicinity map). When finalized, the CCP will serve as a working guide for management programs and actions over the next 15 years.

This draft CCP was developed in compliance with the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Improvement Act) and Part 602 (National Wildlife Refuge System

Planning) of “The Fish and Wildlife Service Manual.” The actions described in this draft CCP and EA meet the requirements of the Council on Environmental Quality regulations that implement the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). Compliance with NEPA is also being achieved through involvement of the public.

The final CCP will specify the necessary actions to achieve the vision and purposes of the refuge. Wildlife is the first priority in refuge management, and public use (wildlife-dependent recreation) is allowed and encouraged as long as it is compatible with the refuge’s purposes.

The draft CCP and EA have been prepared by a planning team comprised of representatives from various Service programs. In addition, the planning team used public input, public involvement, and the planning process as described in section 1.6, “The Planning Process.”

After reviewing a wide range of public comments and management needs, the planning team developed alternatives for managing the refuge. The team recommended alternative C as the Service’s proposed action for management of the refuge. This action addresses all substantive issues, while determining how best to achieve the




Figure 1. Vicinity map for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve, North Dakota.

purposes of the refuge. The proposed action and other alternatives are summarized in chapter 3. Chapter 4 describes the affected environment, and chapter 5 discusses the predicted effects (environmental consequences) of the proposed action and alternatives. Chapter 6 describes how the proposed action would be implemented.

1.1 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PLAN

The purpose of this draft CCP is to identify the role that Sullys Hill National Game Preserve will play in support of the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System (Refuge System) and to provide long-term guidance for management of refuge programs and activities. The CCP is needed:

- to communicate with the public and other partners in order to carry out the mission of the Refuge System;
- to provide a clear statement of direction for management of the refuge;
- to provide neighbors, visitors, and government officials with an understanding of the Service's management actions on and around the refuge;
- to ensure that the Service's management actions are consistent with the mandates of the Improvement Act;
- to ensure that management of the refuge is consistent with federal, state, and county plans; and
- to provide a basis for development of budget requests for the refuge's operation, maintenance, and capital improvement needs.

Sustaining the nation's fish and wildlife resources is a task that can be accomplished only through the combined efforts of governments, businesses, and private citizens.

1.2 THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AND THE REFUGE SYSTEM

The Service is the principal federal agency responsible for fish, wildlife, and plant conservation. The Refuge System is one of the Service's major programs.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The mission of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, working with others, is to conserve, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people.

Over a century ago, America's fish and wildlife resources were declining at an alarming rate. Concerned citizens, scientists, and hunting and angling groups joined together to restore and sustain America's national wildlife heritage. This was the genesis of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Today, the Service enforces federal wildlife laws, manages migratory bird populations, restores nationally significant fisheries, conserves and restores vital wildlife habitat, protects and recovers endangered species, and helps other governments with conservation efforts. In addition, the Service administers a federal aid program that distributes hundreds of millions of dollars to states for fish and wildlife restoration, boating access, hunter education, and related programs across America.

SERVICE ACTIVITIES IN NORTH DAKOTA (2005)

Service activities in North Dakota contribute to the state's economy, ecosystems, and education programs. The following list describes the Service's presence and activities:

- employed 201 people in North Dakota
- assisted by 623 volunteers who donated more than 14,245 hours in support of Service projects
- managed two national fish hatcheries and one fish and wildlife management assistance office
- managed 65 national wildlife refuges encompassing 342,799 acres (0.8 percent of the state)
- managed 12 wetland management districts (WMDs) including:
 - 284,317 acres of fee waterfowl production areas (0.6 percent of the state)
 - 1,046,358 wetland acres under various leases or easements (2.4 percent of the state)
- hosted more than 394,063 annual visitors to Service-managed lands including:

- 152,160 hunting visits
- 2,360 trapping visits
- 83,650 fishing visits
- 142,281 wildlife observation visits
- environmental education programs for over 51,000 students
- provided \$3.3 million to North Dakota Game and Fish Department (NDGF) for sport fish restoration and \$3.4 million for wildlife restoration and hunter education
- helped private landowners restore more than 191,225 acres on 4,464 sites and restore 47.8 miles of river since 1987, through the Partners for Wildlife Program
- employed 11 Partners for Wildlife program managers
- paid North Dakota counties \$352,271 under the Refuge Revenue Sharing Act (funds used for schools and roads)

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

In 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt designated the 5.5-acre Pelican Island in Florida as the nation's first wildlife refuge for the protection of brown pelicans and other native, nesting birds. This was the first time the federal government set aside land for wildlife. This small but significant designation was the beginning of the Refuge System.

One-hundred years later, the Refuge System has become the largest collection of lands in the world specifically managed for wildlife. It encompasses over 96 million acres within 547 refuges and over 3,000 small areas for waterfowl breeding and nesting. Today, there is at least one refuge in every state, including the territories of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

In 1997, the Improvement Act established a clear mission for the Refuge System.

The mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.

The Improvement Act states that each national wildlife refuge (that is, each unit of the Refuge System, which includes wetland management districts) shall be managed:

- to fulfill the mission of the Refuge System;
- to fulfill the individual purposes of each refuge and district;
- to consider the needs of fish and wildlife first;
- to fulfill the requirement of developing a CCP for each unit of the Refuge System, and fully involve the public in the preparation of these plans;
- to maintain the biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health of the Refuge System;
- to recognize that wildlife-dependent recreation activities including hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, and environmental education and interpretation, are legitimate and priority public uses; and
- to retain the authority of refuge managers to determine compatible public uses.

In addition to the mission for the Refuge System, the wildlife and habitat vision for each unit of the Refuge System stresses the following principles:

- Wildlife comes first.
- Ecosystems, biodiversity, and wilderness are vital concepts in refuge and district management.
- Habitats must be healthy.
- Growth of refuges and districts must be strategic.
- The Refuge System serves as a model for habitat management with broad participation from others.

Following passage of the Improvement Act, the Service immediately began to carry out the direction of the new legislation, including preparation of CCPs for all national wildlife refuges and wetland management districts. Consistent with the Improvement Act, the Service prepares all CCPs in conjunction with public involvement. Each refuge and each district is required to complete its CCP within a 15-year timeframe (by 2012).

PEOPLE AND THE REFUGE SYSTEM

The nation's fish and wildlife heritage contributes to the quality of American lives and is an integral part of the country's greatness. Wildlife and wild places have always given people special opportunities to have fun, relax, and appreciate the natural world.

Whether through bird watching, fishing, hunting, photography, or other wildlife pursuits, wildlife

recreation contributes millions of dollars to local economies. In 2002, approximately 35.5 million people visited the Refuge System, mostly to observe wildlife in their natural habitats. Visitors are most often accommodated through nature trails, auto tours, interpretive programs, and hunting and fishing opportunities. Significant economic benefits are generated for the local communities that surround refuges and wetland management districts. Economists report that Refuge System visitors contribute more than \$792 million annually to local economies.

1.3 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL MANDATES

Refuge System units are managed to achieve the mission and goals of the Refuge System, along with the designated purpose of the refuges and districts (as described in establishing legislation, executive orders, or other establishing documents). Key concepts and guidance of the Refuge System are in the Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (Administration Act), Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), “The Fish and Wildlife Service Manual,” and the Improvement Act.

The Improvement Act amends the Administration Act by providing a unifying mission for the Refuge System, a new process for determining compatible public uses on refuges and districts, and a requirement that each refuge and district be managed under a CCP. The Improvement Act states that wildlife conservation is the priority of Refuge System lands and that the Secretary of the Interior will ensure that the biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health of refuge lands are maintained. Each refuge and district must be managed to fulfill the Refuge System’s mission and the specific purposes for which it was established. The Improvement Act requires the Service to monitor the status and trends of fish, wildlife, and plants in each refuge and district.

A detailed description of these and other laws and executive orders that may affect the CCP or the Service’s implementation of the CCP is in appendix A. Service policies on planning and day-to-day management of refuges and districts are in the “Refuge System Manual” and “The Fish and Wildlife Service Manual.”

1.4 REFUGE CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PLANS

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve contributes to the conservation efforts described here.

FULLFILLING THE PROMISE

A 1999 report, “Fulfilling the Promise, The National Wildlife Refuge System” (USFWS 1999), is the culmination of a yearlong process by teams of Service employees to evaluate the Refuge System nationwide. This report was the focus of the first national Refuge System conference in 1998—attended by refuge managers, other Service employees, and representatives from leading conservation organizations.

The report contains 42 recommendations packaged with three vision statements dealing with wildlife and habitat, people, and leadership—this CCP deals with these three major topics. The planning team reviewed the recommendations in the report for guidance during CCP planning.

PARTNERS IN FLIGHT

The “Partners in Flight” program began in 1990 with the recognition of declining population levels of many migratory bird species. The challenge, according to the program, is managing human population growth while maintaining functional natural ecosystems. To meet this challenge, Partners in Flight worked to identify priority land bird species and habitat types. Partners in Flight activities have resulted in the development of 52 bird conservation plans covering the continental United States.

The primary goal of Partners in Flight is to provide for the long-term health of the bird life of this continent. The first priority is to prevent the rarest species from becoming extinct. The second priority is to prevent uncommon species from descending into threatened status. The third priority is to “keep common birds common.”

There are 58 physiographic areas, defined by similar physical geographic features, wholly or partially contained within the contiguous United States, and several others wholly or partially contained in Alaska. The Sullys Hill National Game Preserve lies within the physiographic area known as the northern mixed-grass prairie, area 37 (see figure 2, physiographic areas).

PHYSIOGRAPHIC AREA DESCRIPTION

The northern mixed-grass prairie physiographic area includes almost the entire eastern half of South Dakota and central North Dakota, from the Red River Valley on the east, to the Missouri River and Montana border on the south and west. In Canada, it includes a small portion of southern

Manitoba and a swath that crosses Saskatchewan and extends into Alberta. The southern edge of this physiographic area is the terminus of a glacial moraine parallel to the course of the nearby Missouri River. To the north, prairie gives way to aspen parkland.

Precipitation declines and evaporation rates increase from east to west across the northern mixed-grass prairie, resulting in differences in the height of dominant grasses. To the east, the mixed grass begins as topography rises out of the tall-grass prairie of the Red River Valley. Grass height gradually decreases toward the western boundary of this physiographic area.

Because of the glacial history of the northern mixed-grass prairie and the relationship between precipitation and evapotranspiration, the area is dotted with thousands of depressions that range from permanently- to periodically-wet. This area is known as the Prairie Pothole Region.

Priority bird species and habitats of the northern mixed-grass prairie include the following:

Grassland

- Baird’s sparrow
- greater prairie-chicken
- McCown’s longspur
- Sprague’s pipit
- Le Conte’s sparrow

Wetland

- yellow rail
- Nelson’s sharp-tailed sparrow
- marbled godwit

Riparian Woodland

- Bell’s vireo

River Sandbars

- piping plover
- waterfowl
- shorebirds

Maintenance of large, unfragmented grassland ecosystems is the conservation objective for areas where agriculture is not dominant. On the drift prairie and other agricultural areas, conservation of discrete blocks of grassland-wetland complexes is recommended.

NORTH AMERICAN WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Written in 1986, the “North American Waterfowl Management Plan” (NAWMP) envisioned a 15-year effort to achieve landscape conditions that could sustain waterfowl populations. Specific NAWMP objectives are to increase and restore duck populations to the average levels of the 1970s—62 million breeding ducks and a fall flight of 100 million birds.




Figure 2. Physiographic areas of the United States.
(Source: *Partners in Flight*)

By 1985 waterfowl populations had plummeted to record lows. Habitat that waterfowl depend on was disappearing at a rate of 60 acres per hour. Recognizing the importance of waterfowl and wetlands to North Americans and the need for international cooperation to help in the recovery of a shared resource, the United States and Canadian governments developed a strategy to restore waterfowl populations through habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement. Mexico became a signatory to the plan in 1994.

The plan is innovative because of its international scope, plus its implementation at the regional level. Its success depends on the strength of partnerships called “joint ventures,” involving federal, state, provincial, tribal, and local governments; businesses; conservation organizations; and individual citizens.

Joint ventures are regional, self-directed partnerships that carry out science-based conservation projects through a wide array of community participation efforts. Joint ventures develop implementation plans focusing on areas of concern identified in the plan. Sullys Hill National Game Preserve is part of the “Prairie Pothole Joint Venture.”

STATE COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION WILDLIFE STRATEGY

Over the past several decades, documented declines of wildlife populations have occurred nationwide. Congress created the State Wildlife Grant (SWG) program in 2001. This program provides states and territories with federal dollars to support conservation aimed at protecting wildlife and preventing species from becoming endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The SWG program represents an ambitious endeavor to take an active hand in keeping species from becoming threatened or endangered in the future.

According to the SWG program, each state, territory, and the District of Columbia were required to complete a comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy (CWCS) by October 1, 2005, in order to receive future funding.

These strategies help define an integrated approach to the stewardship of all wildlife species, with additional emphasis on species of concern and habitats at risk. The goal is to shift focus from single-species management and highly specialized individual efforts to a geographically based, ecosystems and landscape-oriented, fish and wildlife conservation effort. The Service approves CWCSs and administers SWG program funding.

The CWCS for the state of North Dakota was reviewed and information was used during development of this CCP. Implementation of CCP habitat goals and objectives will support the goals and objectives of the CWCS.

1.5 ECOSYSTEM DESCRIPTION AND THREATS

MISSOURI MAIN STEM RIVER ECOSYSTEM

Sullys Hill National Game Preserve is located within the Hudson Bay watershed, which is part of the federally recognized “Missouri Main Stem River Ecosystem” (see figure 3, ecosystem map). This ecosystem includes portions of the Missouri River and Hudson Bay watersheds. An initial ecosystem management plan identified four focus areas needing the highest priority for protection and evaluation: wetlands, Missouri River, native prairie, and riparian areas. Priorities were based on significance in the ecosystem, species diversity, risk or threat to the entire focus area, public benefits, international values, and trust resources. Although a detailed analysis of habitats, threats, and priorities for this ecosystem has not been completed, a vision and set of goals and objectives have been developed for each focus area, as described in the following narrative.

Wetlands

Threats: The glaciated prairies on North Dakota, South Dakota, and northeastern Montana cover approximately 60 million acres. Once an abundance of prairie pothole wetlands in a sea of native prairie, the area is now the “breadbasket” of the country and intensively farmed. Drainage for agricultural purposes has reduced wetlands by over 40%—from 7.2 million acres to 3.9 million acres.

Vision: Diverse, wetland habitats and watersheds that provide an abundance and diversity of native flora and fauna in the ecosystem for the benefit of the American public.

Missouri River

Threats: Originating in the Rocky Mountains of southcentral Montana, the Missouri River is vastly different from the “untamed” floodplain system of even 50 years ago. The river flows 2,300 miles—traversing seven states and passing through seven main stem dams built and maintained by the federal government. Over 900 miles (nearly 60%) of the former upper river passing through Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska now lie under permanent




Figure 3. Missouri Main Stem River ecosystem map.

multipurpose reservoirs. As the Missouri River changed, so did the wildlife communities that depend on it. Currently, 8 species of fish, 15 species of birds, 6 species of mammals, 4 species of reptiles, 6 species of insects, 4 species of mollusks, and 7 species of plants native to the ecosystem are listed as either threatened or endangered, or are under status review for possible listing.

Vision: A healthy Missouri River capable of self-sustaining fish and wildlife resources.

Native Prairie

Threats: Native prairie in the Missouri Main Stem River Ecosystem consists of tall-grass, mid-grass, and short-grass prairies. Although the plant and wildlife species differ across the gradation from tall- to short-grass prairie, the threats and issues remain the same—conversion of prairie for other uses. The western river area of North Dakota has lost approximately 60% of the original 34 million acres of native prairie due to conversion to agricultural use.

Vision: Protect, restore, and maintain ecosystem native prairie and other grasslands ecosystems to ensure diversity and an abundance of native flora and fauna.

Riparian Areas

Threats: Riparian areas make up a small portion of the habitat in the Hudson Bay (Missouri Main Stem River) ecosystem. However, riparian and riverine wetland habitats are more important than other focus areas to fish and wildlife resources—migratory birds, threatened and

endangered species, native fish, rare and declining fisheries, amphibians, and many mammals. Riparian habitats provide for much of the biodiversity in the ecosystem. Many of the species occurring in the ecosystem would be eliminated without healthy riparian areas. Sedimentation, contamination, invasive species, and development threaten the health of this diverse habitat.

Vision: Healthy riparian and floodplain ecosystems that provide an abundance and diversity of indigenous flora and fauna.

Refuge Relationship

Native plant species found in the refuge’s mixed-grass prairie habitat is declining due to extensive infestation of invasive plants.

1.6 PLANNING PROCESS

This draft CCP and EA for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve are intended to comply with the Improvement Act, NEPA, and the implementing regulations of both acts. The Service issued its Refuge System planning policy in 2000, which established requirements and guidance for refuge and district plans—including CCPs and step-down management plans—to ensure that planning efforts comply with the Improvement Act. The planning policy identified several steps of the CCP and environmental analysis process (see figure 4, steps in the planning process).

Table 1 lists the specific steps in the planning process to date for the preparation of this draft CCP and EA.




Figure 4. Steps in the planning process.

Table 1. Planning process summary and timeline for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
June 23, 2005	Forest management review.	Forest management program review with the ND Forest Service, NRCS, and Service staff.
January 26, 2006	Kickoff meeting.	CCP overview developed; planning team list finalized; purposes identified; initial issues and qualities list developed; development of mailing list initiated.
January 26, 2006	Kickoff meeting.	Issues and qualities list updated; biological and mapping needs identified; public scoping planned.
May 1, 2006	Vision statement developed.	Worked with team members, including the NDGF, to develop first draft of vision statement for CCP.
May 23, 2006	NOI published.	NOI published in Federal Register initiating public scoping.
June 8, 2006	Planning update mailed.	First planning update sent to mailing list describing planning process and announcing upcoming public scoping meeting.
June 15, 2006	Focus group meeting (woodland birds).	Discussed woodland bird habitat needs and impacts of grazing by bison (Service nongame biologists).
June 17, 2006	Sullys Hill National Game Preserve Annual Birding Festival.	Presentations and displays reach over 1,200 attendees at the annual birding festival.
June 29, 2006	Public meeting, Sullys Hill National Game Preserve visitor center.	Public opportunity offered to learn about the CCP and provide comments.
August 1, 2006	Public scoping ends.	All public scoping comments were due. Comments were compiled for consideration by planning team.
August 1, 2006	Focus group meeting (disease control/grazing).	Discussed ungulate grazing and disease control (Service, NRCS, and UND researchers).
August 23, 2006	Focus group meeting (disease control).	Discussed fenced animal disease issues with North Dakota Board of Animal Health.
August 29, 2006	Meeting with Spirit Lake Nation tribal council.	Presented CCP process and potential partnership proposals to Spirit Lake Nation tribal council members and chairwoman.
August 30–31, 2006	Vision and goals workshop.	Fine-tuned initial vision statement and developed goals to support it.

Table 1. Planning process summary and timeline for Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
September 20, 2006	Focus group meeting (visitor services).	Visitor Services Program experts from the USFWS and tribal members reviewed the current refuge program.
September 21–22, 2006	Alternatives workshop.	Alternatives table developed.
January 17–18, 2007	Objectives and strategies workshop.	Finalized alternatives table and began writing objectives/strategies for the proposed action.
February 2007–June 2007	Prepare draft plan.	Planning team prepared draft CCP/draft EA.
March 18–April 2, 2008	Internal review.	Draft CCP reviewed by other Service divisions along with interested state and tribal agencies.

A notice of intent (NOI) to prepare the draft CCP and EA was published in the “Federal Register” on May 23, 2006; this date also initiated the public scoping process. Scoping was announced to the public through news releases, and a public scoping meeting was held on June 29, 2006. The public scoping period was closed August 1, 2006.

At this same time, the first planning update was distributed. Over the course of pre-planning and public scoping, the planning team collected available information about the resources of the refuge and the surrounding areas. Chapter 4 summarizes this information.



Scott Ralston/USFWS

Visitors enjoying one of several presentations given at the annual Birding and Nature Festival.

COORDINATION WITH THE PUBLIC

A mailing list was prepared during the preplanning phase. The list includes more than 320 names of private citizens; local, regional, and state government representatives and legislators; other federal agencies; and interested organizations. A summary of the nongovernmental, state, and federal organizations who participated in public involvement is in appendix C.

The first planning update issue was sent to everyone on the mailing list in June 2006. Information was provided on the history of the refuge and the CCP process, along with an invitation to the public scoping meeting. Each planning update included a comment form and postage-paid envelope to give the public an opportunity to provide written comments. Comments via email were also accepted at the refuge's email address.

Presentations about the CCP process were made during all public activities including the refuge annual birding festival, attended by over 1,200 individuals.

The public scoping meeting was held on June 29, 2006 at the refuge visitor center. There were 10 attendees including local citizens, local teachers, and members of the Spirit Lake Nation. After a presentation about the refuge and an overview of the CCP and NEPA process, attendees met with presenters to ask questions and offer comments. Each attendee was given a written comment form to submit additional thoughts or questions.

All written comments were due August 1, 2006. A total of 183 written comments were received throughout the scoping process. All comments were reviewed by the planning team and considered throughout the planning process.

STATE COORDINATION

The Service's region 6 director sent an invitation letter in April 2006 to the director of NDGF requesting the department's participation in the CCP process. Several representatives from the NDGF have participated in the planning process. Local NDGF wildlife managers and the refuge staff maintain excellent, ongoing working relations that preceded the start of the CCP process.

The NDGF's mission is to "protect, conserve, and enhance fish and wildlife populations and their habitats for sustained public consumptive and nonconsumptive uses." The NDGF is responsible for managing natural resource lands

owned by the state, in addition to enforcement responsibilities for the state's migratory birds and endangered species. The state manages over 78,000 acres in support of wildlife, recreation, and fisheries.

TRIBAL COORDINATION

The Spirit Lake Tribal Council was sent a written invitation in April 2006 to participate in the CCP planning process. The Spirit Lake Nation Reservation surrounds the refuge boundary on three sides. Although no initial response was received, tribal members did attend the public scoping meeting. At that time another meeting was proposed for the tribal council meeting in August.

On August 28, 2006, the tribal chairwoman and 11 other members of the tribe, including 3 council members and tribal planning staff, met with refuge staff and the planning team leader at the Sullys Hill National Game Preserve Education and Visitor Center (visitor center). A presentation on the CCP process and a separate presentation outlining common goals and interests between the refuge and the tribe were presented. The tribe also attended the visitor services workshop held the following month. Their insights were valuable and all comments were considered during development of alternatives. In particular, the refuge staff recognized several opportunities to further incorporate the tribe's history and culture into future visitor services programs.

RESULTS OF SCOPING

Table 1 and appendix C summarize all scoping activities. Comments collected from scoping meetings and correspondence, including comment forms, were used in the development of a final list of issues to be addressed in this draft CCP and EA.

The Service determined which alternatives could best address the issues. The planning process ensured that issues with the greatest potential effect on the refuge would be resolved or given priority over the life of the final CCP. These issues are summarized in chapter 2.

In addition, the Service considered suggested changes to current refuge management presented by the public and other groups.