Appendix L

Compatibility Determination for Prescribed Grazing

COMPATIBILITY DETERMINATION
for
Prescribed Grazing on
National Wildlife Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas
for Management Purposes

Use: Prescribed grazing on National Wildlife Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas in North and South Dakota.

Station Names:

South Dakota Refuges and Wetland Management Districts:

Lake Andes NWR and WMD, SD
Madison WMD, SD
Huron WMD, SD
Waubay NWR and WMD, SD
Sand Lake NWR and WMD, SD
LaCreek NWR and WMD, SD

North Dakota Refuges and Wetland Management Districts:

Tewaukon NWR and WMD, ND
Kulm WMD, ND
Arrowwood NWR and WMD, ND
Valley City WMD, ND
Chase Lake NWR and WMD, ND
Audubon NWR and WMD, ND
Long Lake NWR and WMD, ND
J Clark Salyer NWR and WMD, ND
Devils Lake WMD, ND
Lostwood NWR and WMD, ND
Crosby WMD, ND
Des Lacs NWR, ND
Upper Souris NWR, ND

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities:

Arrowwood NWR; Executive Order (E.O.) 7168, Sept. 4, 1935
Audubon NWR; 16 USC $664 (Fish and Wildlife Coord. Act)
Chase Lake NWR; E.O. 932, Aug. 28, 1908
Des Lacs NWR; E.O. 7154-A, Aug. 22, 1935
Florence Lake NWR; E.O. 8119, May 10, 1939

Kellys Slough NWR; E.O. 7320, Mar. 19, 1936
Lake Alice NWR; 16 USC $ 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Lake Ilo NWR; E.O. 8154, June 12, 1939
Lake Nettie NWR; E. O. 8155, June 12, 1939
Lake Zahl NWR; E. O. 8158, June 12, 1939
Long Lake NWR; E.O. 5808, Feb. 25, 1932
Lostwood NWR; E.O. 7171, Sept. 4, 1935
McLean NWR; 16 USC $ 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Slade NWR; 16 USC 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Sullys Hill NGP; E. O. 3596, Dec. 22, 1921
Tewaukon NWR; Public Land Order (PLO) 286, June 26, 1945
Upper Souris NWR; E.O. 7161, Aug. 27, 1935

LaCreek NWR; E.O. 7160, Aug. 26, 1935
Lake Andes NWR; E. O. 7292, Feb. 14, 1936
Sand Lake NWR; E. O. 7169, Sept. 4, 1935
Waubay NWR; E. O. 7245, Dec. 10, 1935

Waterfowl Production Areas, Wetland Easements, Grassland Easements - The Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act, March 16, 1934, (16 USC Sec. 718-718h, 48 Stat. 452) as amended August 1, 1958, (PL 85-585; 72 Stat. 486) for acquisition of "Waterfowl Production Areas"; the Wetlands Loan Act, October 4, 1961, as amended (16 USC 715k-3 - 715k-5, Stat. 813), funds appropriated under the Wetlands Loan Act are merged with duck stamp receipts in the fund and appropriated to the Secretary for the acquisition of migratory bird refuges under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, February 18, 1929, (16 USC Sec. 715, 715d - 715r, as amended.

Refuge Purpose(s):

The Executive Orders for most of the refuges state the purpose "as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife."

"...as Waterfowl Production Areas" subject to "...all of the provisions of such Act [Migratory Bird Conservation Act] ...except the inviolate sanctuary provisions..." 16 USC 718(c) (Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp)

"...for any other management purpose, for migratory birds." 16 USC 715d (Migratory Bird Conservation Act)

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission:

"The Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System is to administer a national network

"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" (National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended) [16 USC 668(dd)-668(ee)].

Description of Use:

Prescribed grazing is the use of livestock, usually cattle, to remove standing vegetation, reduce vegetative litter, suppress woody vegetation or noxious weeds, open up vegetation-choked wetlands, or open up areas to sunlight and encourage native grass seedlings and growth. Prescribed grazing is carefully timed, and usually of short duration (usually 2-4 weeks), to target certain species for grazing impacts in order to benefit other species for growth after the competing vegetation has been removed.

The prescribed grazing period generally will take place between April and September. Early spring grazing (mid-April through late May) is targeted at cool season exotic species and encourages warm season native grasses and forbs. Mid-season grazing (June and July), especially on non-native grasslands, stimulates fall regrowth. Late-season grazing (August and September) removes litter and encourages spring growth of cool season natives or other cool season species.

Fence construction and maintenance, often temporary electric fence, and control and rotation of the livestock, are the responsibility of cooperating private party. Market rate grazing fees are determined by the Regional Office, but may include standard deductions for fence construction and maintenance, frequent livestock rotations, construction of water gaps, or hauling/providing additional water in dry pastures.

The frequency and duration of prescribed grazing on any Refuge or WPA will be based on site-specific evaluations of the grassland being managed.

Availability of Resources:

Developing grazing plans and Special Use Permits (SUPs) and monitoring compliance and biological effects requires some Service resources. Most grazing management costs; fencing labor, monitoring and moving the livestock, hauling water; are provided by the cooperator or permittee. Evaluating the grasslands for grazing prescriptions and grassland response is already a part of the stations grassland management responsibilities. Some alternative form of grassland management, prescribed burning or haying, may be used if the areas are not treated with prescribed grazing. Managing grasslands through permitted haying has comparable costs to managing a prescribed grazing program. Managed mowing is more expensive since all the labor costs are assumed by the Service. Prescribed burning can be an effective grassland management tool, but there are personnel and weather

limitations on a burning program, as well the fact the some tracts are just not suited to burning management. In addition, there is an ecological benefit to rotating grassland management techniques, such as grazing, burning, and haying, at different seasons, rather than just relying on one technique.

Anticipated Impacts of the Use:

Grazing by domestic livestock has the short-term effect of removing some or much of the standing vegetation from a tract of grassland. Properly prescribed, the effect of this removal of vegetation increases the vigor of the grassland, stimulates the growth of desired species of grass and forbs, and reduces the abundance of targeted species such as cool season exotics, woody species, noxious weeds or invasive species, or cattails. Grazing in the spring may cause the loss of some bird nests due to trampling, and may cause some birds not to nest in areas being grazed. Grazing on public wildlife lands can create an aesthetic issue of concern for some people or visitors who do not understand grassland management. Prescribed grazing is usually of short duration and enhanced, most diverse and vigorous grassland habitats are the end result. Grazing livestock may create a minor and temporary disturbance to wildlife but generally do no harm. There is a slight potential for conflict between the visiting public and the livestock or the permittee, particularly during fall hunting seasons. These situations can be limited by having the livestock removed by the anticipated beginning of fall hunting seasons.

In 2004, prescribed grazing occurred on approximately 17,500 acres of Refuges and WPAs in South Dakota (202,000 fee acres). During the 1996-2000 period, approximately 39,700 acres of grasslands on North Dakota Refuges and WPAs (470,000 fee acres) were treated annually by prescribed grazing treatments.

To eliminate any appearance of favoritism or impropriety, managers should follow Refuge Manual procedures for cooperator or permittee selection.

Public Review and Comment:

The period of public review and comment began May 1, 2005 and ended on May 14, 2005.

Notices were posted in public places at each of the field stations listed on this Compatibility Determination. This method was selected because the proposed activity is considered minor, incidental, infrequent, with only short-term disturbance.

Determination:

Compatibility Threshold: As this activity is an economic use, it must meet the compatibility threshold of "contributing to the Mission and Purposes" of the Refuge System and the Refuge Area. Prescribed grazing is used to improve and manage grassland habitats

on Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas and the migratory birds and other wildlife that use these habitats.

_____ Use is Not Compatible

__XXX____Use is Compatible with the Following Stipulations

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility:

1. SUPs will specify the stocking rate, dates of use, and timing for each unit or grazing cell on the Refuge or WPA.

2. The standard grazing fee, as determined for each state by the Regional Office. and any standard deductions for any labor or work done on the Service lands will be included on the SUP.

3. Grazing permittees must comply with all applicable State Livestock Health laws.

4. No supplemental feeding will be allowed without authorization from the Project Leader/Manager.

5. Control and confinement of livestock will be the responsibility of the permittee.

6. The permit is issued subject to the revocation and appeals procedure contained in Title 50, Part 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Justification:

Controlled grazing by domestic livestock will not materially interfere or detract from the purposes for which these NWRS lands were acquired or established. Prescribed livestock grazing creates temporary disturbances to vegetation. Many of these disturbances are desirable for grassland management. Grazing produces an undesirable but short-term impact to grassland nesting birds and site aesthetics. In the long-term, prescribed grazing increases grassland vigor, species diversity, and habitat quality. Prescribed grazing is an alternative management tool that can be used to replace or complement prescribed burning, mowing, or haying of Service grasslands. Without periodic disturbance caused by haying, burning, or grazing, the health of the grassland community would decline, as would an areas potential for waterfowl and other migratory bird nesting.

Mandatory 10-Year Reevaluation Date: 10 years from the date of APPROVAL signature

Signatures:

Submitted:

Michael Bryant, Project Leader — Date: 4/26/05
Lake Andes Complex

Tom Tornow, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
Madison WMD

Harris Hoistad, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
Huron WMD

Larry Martin, Project Leader — Date: 26 april 2005
Waubay Complex

Gene Williams, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
Sand Lake Complex

Tom Koerner, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
LaCreek Complex

Jack Lalor, Acting Project Leader — Date: 4/26/05
Tewaukon Complex

Dave Azure, Acting Project Leader — Date: 4/26/05
Kulm WMD

Kim D. Hanson, Project Leader — Date: 4/26/05
Arrowwood NWR
Chase Lake WMD
Valley City WMD

Gary Williams, Acting Project Leader — Date 4/26/05
Audubon Complex

Paul Van Ningen, Project Leader — Date 4/26/05
Long Lake Complex

Tedd Gutzke, Project Leader — Date April 26, 2005
J Clark Salyer Complex

Roger Hollevoet, Project Leader — Date 4/26/05
Devils Lake Complex

Fred G. Giese, Project Leader — Date 04/26/05
Des Lacs NWR
Lostwood WMD
Crosby WMD

Dean Knauer, Project Leader — Date 4-27-05
Upper Souris NWR

Review:

Lloyd Jones — Date 4.27.05
Regional Compatibility Coordinator

Rod Krey — Date 4/28/05
Refuge Supervisor, ND-SD

Approval: _____ Date May 15, 2005

Ronald D. Shupe, Region 6
Acting Chief of Refuges

Appendix M

Compatibility Determination for Prescribed Haying

COMPATIBILITY DETERMINATION
for
Prescribed Haying of Grasslands
on National Wildlife Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas
for Management Purposes

Use: Prescribed Haying of Grasslands on National Wildlife Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas in North and South Dakota.

Station Names:

South Dakota Refuges and Wetland Management Districts:

Lake Andes NWR and WMD, SD
Madison WMD, SD
Huron WMD, SD
Waubay NWR and WMD, SD
Sand Lake NWR and WMD, SD
LaCreek NWR and WMD, SD

North Dakota Refuges and Wetland Management Districts:

Tewaukon NWR and WMD, ND
Kulm WMD, ND
Arrowwood NWR and WMD, ND
Valley City WMD, ND
Chase Lake NWR and WMD, ND
Audubon NWR and WMD, ND
Long Lake NWR and WMD, ND
J Clark Salyer NWR and WMD, ND
Devils Lake WMD, ND
Lostwood NWR and WMD, ND
Crosby WMD, ND
Des Lacs NWR, ND
Upper Souris NWR, ND

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities:

Arrowwood NWR; Executive Order (E.O.) 7168, Sept. 4, 1935
Audubon NWR; 16 USC $664 (Fish and Wildlife Coord. Act)
Chase Lake NWR; E.O. 932, Aug. 28, 1908
Des Lacs NWR; E.O. 7154-A, Aug. 22, 1935
Florence Lake NWR; E.O. 8119, May 10, 1939

J. Clark Salyer NWR; E.O. 7170, Sept. 4, 1935
Kellys Slough NWR; E.O. 7320, Mar. 19, 1936
Lake Alice NWR; 16 USC $ 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Lake Ilo NWR; E.O. 8154, June 12, 1939
Lake Nettie NWR; E. O. 8155, June 12, 1939
Lake Zahl NWR; E. O. 8158, June 12, 1939
Long Lake NWR; E.O. 5808, Feb. 25, 1932
Lostwood NWR; E.O. 7171, Sept. 4, 1935
McLean NWR; 16 USC $ 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Slade NWR; 16 USC 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Sullys Hill NGP; E. O. 3596, Dec. 22, 1921
Tewaukon NWR; Public Land Order (PLO) 286, June 26, 1945
Upper Souris NWR; E.O. 7161, Aug. 27, 1935

LaCreek NWR; E.O. 7160, Aug. 26, 1935
Lake Andes NWR; E. O. 7292, Feb. 14, 1936
Sand Lake NWR; E. O. 7169, Sept. 4, 1935
Waubay NWR; E. O. 7245, Dec. 10, 1935

Waterfowl Production Areas, Wetland Easements, Grassland Easements - The Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act, March 16, 1934, (16 USC Sec. 718-718h, 48 Stat. 452) as amended August 1, 1958, (PL 85-585; 72 Stat. 486) for acquisition of "Waterfowl Production Areas"; the Wetlands Loan Act, October 4, 1961, as amended (16 USC 715k-3 - 715k-5, Stat. 813), funds appropriated under the Wetlands Loan Act are merged with duck stamp receipts in the fund and appropriated to the Secretary for the acquisition of migratory bird refuges under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, February 18, 1929, (16 USC Sec. 715, 715d - 715r, as amended.

Refuge Purpose(s):

The Executive Orders for most of the refuges state the purpose "as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife."

"...as Waterfowl Production Areas" subject to "...all of the provisions of such Act [Migratory Bird Conservation Act] ...except the inviolate sanctuary provisions..." 16 USC 718(c) (Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp)

"...for any other management purpose, for migratory birds." 16 USC 715d (Migratory Bird Conservation Act)

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission:

"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" (National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended) [16 USC 668(dd)-668(ee)].

Description of Use:

Haying is the cutting and removal, by baling and transport to an off-site location, of grass or other upland vegetation for the production of livestock forage. Haying for this purpose is typically done by a cooperating farmer acting under authority of a Cooperative Farming Agreement or Special Use Permit (SUP) issued by the Project Leader, Refuge Manager or Wetland District Manager.

Haying is an effective management tool as part of an overall grassland management plan to improve and maintain Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)-managed grasslands for the benefit of migratory birds and other wildlife. Grasslands require periodic renovation to maintain vigor, diversity, and the structure necessary for migratory bird nesting. Haying can be an alternative to prescribed burning or grazing, which are the two other methods used to manage grassland habitats. If local conditions preclude the use of prescribed fire, or livestock numbers are not available, removal of biomass through haying serves to reduce unwanted overstory, reduce woody plant invasion, and open the soil surface up to sunlight. Such removal of vegetation allows for more vigorous regrowth of desirable species following the haying although results are neither as dramatic nor positive as with fire or grazing.

Haying may also be used as part of a native grass seeding strategy on newly acquired lands or on tame grass stands on older lands needing renovation. To reduce weed or undesirable species competition and minimize herbicide applications, a cooperating farmer may be used to seed the native grass seed mix and interseed with a cover crop. As a requirement of the SUP, the cooperator would be required to cut. bale, and remove the cover crop before it matures and goes to seed. The resultant hay can be used for livestock feed and haying serves the biological purpose of releasing young native grass and forb seedlings for growth with minimal competition.

A third possible use of haying on FWS-managed grasslands involves the initial steps of removing unwanted vegetation prior to seeding the tract to native grasses. Haying of a nonnative cool season stand of grass is an effective step in advance of spraying the field with herbicide to kill all existing vegetation. Removal of the heavy grass overstory by haying allows the herbicide to more effectively reach and treat the remaining target plants. Better removal of the unwanted grasses will in turn ensure better success of the planted grasses and forbs whether they are interseeded into the sod or into the soil turned over and leveled prior to seeding.

Haying is sometimes used prior to a noxious weed treatment; the tract is hayed and after a period of time, the "flush" of noxious weeds is treated with a herbicide application. Removing the vegetation through haying allows the herbicide to more effectively reach and treat the target weeds.

A more limited application of haying on FWS-managed lands involves its use for establishing fire breaks for prescribed burning. A cooperative farmer would be permitted to hay the firebreak strips in the fall. That area would then have little standing dead vegetation in the early spring, or would green up earlier in the spring and allow use as a fire break.

Prescribed haying in North Dakota averaged about 13,500 acres per year (1996-2000). In South Dakota, FWS managers use prescribed haying on about 2450 acres annually (2004 estimates).

Availability of Resources:

Financial and staff resources are determined to be sufficient at each field station to administer these requests. Staff time will be needed to evaluate the proposed use, to prepare the site-specific SUPs, and to insure compliance with the permit authorization and stipulations necessary to insure compatibility.

To lessen any appearance of favoritism or impropriety, managers should follow Refuge Manual procedures for establishing rental rates and cooperator selection.

Anticipated Impacts of the Use:

Haying will result in short-term disturbances to wildlife and long-term benefits to grasslands and the wildlife species that use these grasslands. Short-term impacts will include disturbance and displacement of wildlife typical of any noisy heavy equipment operation. Cutting and removal of standing grass will result in the short-term loss (late-summer to mid-summer the following year of habitat for those species requiring taller grass for feeding and perching. Prescribed haying will typically be scheduled after July 31 to avoid impacts to most nesting birds. Long-term benefits will accrue due to the increased vigor of the regrown grasses or the establishment of highly desirable native grass and forb species, which will improve habitat conditions for the same species affected by the short-term removal of the cover. Longer-term negative impacts may occur to some resident wildlife species such as pheasant that may lose overwinter habitat in hayed areas. Strict time constraints, and limiting grass stands to no more than 50 percent being hayed at any one time will limit the anticipated impacts to these areas.

Public Review and Comment:

The period of public review and comment began May 1, 2005 and ended on May 14, 2005.

Notices were posted in public places at each of the field stations listed on this Compatibility Determination. This method was selected because the proposed activity is considered minor, incidental, infrequent, with only short-term disturbance.

Determination:

Compatibility Threshold: As this activity is an economic use, it must meet the compatibility threshold of "contributing to the Mission and Purposes" of the Refuge System and the Refuge Area. Prescribed haying is used to benefit Refuge and Waterfowl Production Area grasslands and the migratory birds and other wildlife that use these grasslands.

_____ Use is Not Compatible

__XXX____Use is Compatible with the Following Stipulations

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility:

1. Prescribed haying will generally not take place before August 1 in any given year, unless there are documented management reasons for prescribing an earlier hay date.

2. The permit is issued subject to the revocation and appeals procedure contained in Title 50, Part 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

3. Generally, not more than 50 percent of a tract may be hayed in any one year, unless size restrictions or habitat conditions warrant haying of more than half of the area.

4. Prescribed haying can be coupled with a light discing or dragging operation, or an interseeding of desirable species of grass or legumes to further increase the vigor of the grass stand.

5. Bales or stacks must be removed from the area by September 10.

Justification:

Haying will not materially interfere with or detract from the purposes for which these NWRS lands were acquired or established. Haying creates temporary disturbance to vegetation. This disturbance is desirable for grassland management. Haying produces an undesirable but short-term impact to grassland nesting birds and site aesthetics. In the long-term, haying increases grassland vigor, species diversity, and habitat quality. Haying is an alternative management tool that can be used to replace or compliment prescribed burning, mowing, or grazing of Service grasslands. Without periodic disturbance caused by haying, burning, or grazing, the health of the grassland community would decline, as would an areas potential for waterfowl and other migratory bird nesting.

Mandatory 10-Year Reevaluation Date: 10 years from the date of APPROVAL signature

Signatures:

Submitted:

Michael Bryant, Project Leader — Date: 4/26/05
Lake Andes Complex

Tom Tornow, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
Madison WMD

Harris Hoistad, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
Huron WMD

Larry Martin, Project Leader — Date: 26 April 2005
Waubay Complex

Gene Williams, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
Sand Lake Complex

Tom Koerner, Project Leader — Date: 4-26-05
LaCreek Complex

Jack Lalor, Acting Project Leader — 4/26/05 Date
Tewaukon Complex

Dave Azure, Acting Project Leader — 4/26/05 Date
Kulm WMD

Kim D. Hanson, Project Leader — 4/26/05 Date
Arrowwood Complex
Chase Lake WMD
Valley City WMD

Gary Williams, Acting Project Leader — 4/26/05 Date
Audubon Complex

Paul Van Ningen, Project Leader — 4/26/05 Date
Long Lake Complex

Tedd Gutzke, Project Leader — April 26, 2005 Date
J Clark Salyer Complex

Roger Hollevoet, Project Leader — 4/26/05 Date
Devils Lake Complex

Fred G. Giese, Project Leader — 04/26/05 Date
Des Lacs NWR
Lostwood WMD
Crosby WMD

Dean Knauer, Project Leader — 04-27-05 Date
Upper Souris NWR

Review:

Lloyd Jones
Regional Compatibility Coordinator

4-27-05
Date

Rod Krey
Refuge Supervisor, ND-SD

4/28/05
Date

Approval:

Ronald D. Shupe, Region 6
Acting Chief of Refuges

May 15, 2005
Date

Appendix N

Compatibility Determination for the Cooperative Farming Program

COMPATIBILITY DETERMINATION
for
the Cooperative Farming Program on
National Wildlife Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas
for Management Purposes

Use: Cooperative farming on National Wildlife Refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas in North and South Dakota.

Station Names:

South Dakota Wetland Management Districts:

Lake Andes NWR and WMD, SD
Madison WMD, SD
Huron WMD, SD
Waubay NWR and WMD, SD
Sand Lake NWR and WMD, SD
LaCreek NWR and WMD, SD

North Dakota Wetland Management Districts:

Tewaukon NWR and WMD, ND
Kulm WMD, ND
Arrowwood NWR and WMD, ND
Valley City WMD, ND
Chase Lake NWR and WMD, ND
Audubon NWR and WMD, ND
Long Lake NWR and WMD, ND
J Clark Salyer NWR and WMD, ND
Devils Lake WMD, ND
Lostwood NWR and WMD, ND
Crosby WMD, ND
Des Lacs NWR, ND
Upper Souris NWR, ND

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities:

Arrowwood NWR; Executive Order (E.O.) 7168, Sept. 4, 1935
Audubon NWR; 16 USC $664 (Fish and Wildlife Coord. Act)
Chase Lake NWR; E.O. 932, Aug. 28, 1908
Des Lacs NWR; E.O. 7154-A, Aug. 22, 1935
Florence Lake NWR; E.O. 8119, May 10, 1939
J. Clark Salyer NWR; E.O. 7170, Sept. 4, 1935

Kellys Slough NWR; E.O. 7320, Mar. 19, 1936
Lake Alice NWR; 16 USC $ 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Lake Ilo NWR; E.O. 8154, June 12, 1939
Lake Nettie NWR; E. O. 8155, June 12, 1939
Lake Zahl NWR; E. O. 8158, June 12, 1939
Long Lake NWR; E.O. 5808, Feb. 25, 1932
Lostwood NWR; E.O. 7171, Sept. 4, 1935
McLean NWR; 16 USC $ 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Slade NWR; 16 USC 715d (Mig. Bird Cons. Act)
Sullys Hill NGP; E. O. 3596, Dec. 22, 1921
Tewaukon NWR; Public Land Order (PLO) 286, June 26, 1945
Upper Souris NWR; E.O. 7161, Aug. 27, 1935

LaCreek NWR; E.O. 7160, Aug. 26, 1935
Lake Andes NWR; E. O. 7292, Feb. 14, 1936
Sand Lake NWR; E. O. 7169, Sept. 4, 1935
Waubay NWR; E. O. 7245, Dec. 10, 1935

Waterfowl Production Areas, Wetland Easements, Grassland Easements - The Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act, March 16, 1934, (16 USC Sec. 718-718h, 48 Stat. 452) as amended August 1, 1958, (PL 85-585; 72 Stat. 486) for acquisition of "Waterfowl Production Areas"; the Wetlands Loan Act, October 4, 1961, as amended (16 USC 715k-3 - 715k-5, Stat. 813), funds appropriated under the Wetlands Loan Act are merged with duck stamp receipts in the fund and appropriated to the Secretary for the acquisition of migratory bird refuges under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, February 18, 1929, (16 USC Sec. 715, 715d - 715r, as amended.

Refuge Purpose(s):

The Executive Orders for most of the refuges state the purpose "as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife."

"...as Waterfowl Production Areas" subject to "...all of the provisions of such Act [Migratory Bird Conservation Act] ...except the inviolate sanctuary provisions..." 16 USC 718(c) (Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp)

"...for any other management purpose, for migratory birds." 16 USC 715d (Migratory Bird Conservation Act)

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission:

"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" (National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended) [16 USC 668(dd)-668(ee)].

Description of Use:

Cooperative farming is the term used for cropping activities done by a third party on lands that are owned in fee-title by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) or controlled by the Service through a conservation easement (wetland, grassland, or FmHA). This activity is usually done on a short-term basis (3-4 years or less) to provide an optimum seed bed for the establishment of native grasses and forbs or other more desirable planted cover for wildlife. Cooperative farming may also be used on certain tracts to provide a fall food source for migratory waterfowl or a winter food source for resident wildlife.

The farming is done under the terms and conditions of a Cooperative Farming Agreement or Special Use Permit (SUP) issued by the Project Leader, Refuge Manager, or Wetland District Manager. Terms of the agreement insure that all current Service and District restrictions are followed.

Cooperative farming activities are generally limited to areas of former cropland or poor quality stands of tame or cool season exotic grasses. Service policies do not allow highly erodible soils to be tilled or cropped without an approved NRCS Conservation Plan. Waterfowl Production Areas (WPAs) in the Dakotas average about 200 acres in size. Generally, areas to be cooperatively farmed at one time prior to reseeding to more desirable plant species will not be more than 50 percent of the tract. Areas on WPAs and Refuges planted for food plots will be limited to the size needed to provide sufficient food for the targeted wildlife species.

Availability of Resources:

Staff time for development and administration of Cooperative Farming Agreements is already available. Most of the needed field work to prepare and plan for this use would be done as part of routine grassland management duties. The decision to use a cooperating farmer would occur as part of the overall strategy for managing lands on the Refuge or within the WMD. The additional time needed to coordinate issuance of the SUP or Cooperative Farming Agreement and oversight of the permit is relatively minor and within Refuge or WMD resources. In addition, the use of a cooperating farmer frees up other staff time from conducting the farming operation through force account.

Cooperative farming of Service lands in most cases is done on a share basis rather than for a fee. The Service typically receives its share as harvested grain used for other management purposes, as standing grain left for wildlife food, or as additional work such as

weed control, cultivation, or additional seed bed preparation, or for supplies such as herbicide or grass seed to be used on the same tract of land. Any fees or cash income received by the Service would be deposited in the Refuge Revenue Sharing Account. The Service will receive fair market value consideration from cooperating farmers, but the generation of income is a secondary consideration when developing the terms and conditions of a cooperative farming agreement or SUP.

To lessen any appearance of favoritism or impropriety, managers should follow Refuge Manual procedures for establishing rental rates and cooperator selection.

Anticipated Impacts of the Use:

Cooperative farming to prepare suitable seed beds for planting better cover and habitat will result in short-term disturbances and long-term benefits to both resident and migratory wildlife using the Refuges, WPAs, and easements. Short-term impacts include disturbance and displacement of wildlife typical of any noisy heavy equipment operation, and the loss of poor quality cover while the tract is farmed. Wildlife may also use the farmed area as an additional food source for the period which it is farmed. Long-term benefits are extremely positive due to the establishment of diverse or more desirable habitat for nesting, escape cover, perching, or non-crop feeding activities. The resulting habitat will generally improve conditions for most of the species negatively affected by the short period of farming activity.

In 2004, approximately 2900 acres of Service lands were farmed under SUPs in South Dakota. North Dakota refuges and WPAs permitted an average of 6,400 acres of cooperative farming during the 1996-2000 period.

Public Review and Comment:

The period of public review and comment began May 1, 2005 and ended on May 14, 2005.

Notices were posted in public places at each of the field stations listed on this Compatibility Determination. This method was selected because the proposed activity is considered minor, incidental, infrequent, with only short-term disturbance.

Determination:

Compatibility Threshold: As this activity is an economic use, it must meet the compatibility threshold of "contributing to the Mission and Purposes" of the Refuge System and the Refuge Area. Cooperative farming is used to benefit Refuge and Waterfowl Production Area uplands and the migratory birds and other wildlife that use these lands.

_____ Use is Not Compatible

__XXX____Use is Compatible with the Following Stipulations

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility:

1. SUPs or Cooperative Farming Agreements will specify the type of crop to be planted and describe the refuges' share.

2. The SUP may specify any herbicide or agricultural restrictions of the tract.

3. The SUP may specify timing constraints to insure that the proper field work is completed at the appropriate time.

4. The permit is issued subject to the revocation and appeals procedure contained in Title 50, Part 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Justification:

The cooperative farming of Service lands or easements is done to develop or reseed better wildlife cover and habitat than was previously on the area. Only areas that have been previously cropped, or are seeded to decadent stands of cool season grasses (brome or crested wheatgrass), or decadent tame grass-legume mixes will be included in a cooperative farming plan. Cooperative farming in most cases provides the fastest, most cost effective means to establish native grasses or re-seeded cover on the Service property. In many cases, tracts are located many miles away from the Refuge or WMD headquarters, making force account labor a very time-consuming effort. The long-term benefits of managed, quality cover offset the short-term impacts and disturbance while the tract is farmed prior to seeding or re-seeding.

Mandatory 10-Year Reevaluation Date: 10 years from the date of APPROVAL signature

Signatures:

Submitted:

Michael Bryant, Project Leader
Lake Andes Complex

4/26/05
Date

-5-

Thomas R. Tornow — 4-26-05
Tom Tornow, Project Leader — Date
Madison WMD

Harris J. Hoistad — 4-26-05
Harris Hoistad, Project Leader — Date
Huron WMD

Larry D. Martin — 26 April 2005
Larry Martin, Project Leader — Date
Waubay Complex

Eugene Williams — 4-26-05
Gene Williams, Project Leader — Date
Sand Lake Complex

Tom Koerner — 4-26-05
Tom Koerner, Project Leader — Date
LaCreek Complex

Jack Lalor — 4/26/05
Jack Lalor, Acting Project Leader — Date
Tewaukon Complex

David A. Azure — 4/26/05
Dave Azure, Acting Project Leader — Date
Kulm WMD

Kim Hanson — 4/26/05
Kim D. Hanson, Project Leader — Date
Arrowwood Complex
Chase Lake WMD
Valley City WMD

Gary Williams — 4/26/05
Gary Williams, Acting Project Leader — Date
Audubon Complex

Paul C. Van Ningen — 4/26/05
Paul Van Ningen, Project Leader — Date
Long Lake Complex

Tedd Gutzke, Project Leader — Date: April 26, 2005
J Clark Salyer Complex

Roger Hollevoet, Project Leader — Date: 4/26/05
Devils Lake Complex

Fred G. Giese, Project Leader — Date: 04/26/05
Des Lacs Complex

Dean Knauer, Project Leader — Date: 4-27-05
Upper Souris NWR

Review:

Lloyd Jones — Date: 4.27.05
Regional Compatibility Coordinator

Rod Krey — Date: 4/28/05
Refuge Supervisor, ND-SD

Approval:

Ronald D. Shupe, Region 6 — Date: May 15, 2005
Acting Chief of Refuges

Appendix O
Fire Management Program

The Service has administrative responsibility including fire management for the Souris River basin refuges, which cover approximately 110,292 acres in North Dakota.

Fire: A Critical Natural Process

In ecosystems in the prairie of the Great Plains, vegetation has evolved under periodic disturbance and defoliation from bison, fire, and drought. This periodic disturbance is what kept the ecosystem diverse and healthy while maintaining significant biodiversity for thousands of years.

Historically, natural fire and including Native American ignitions, have played an important disturbance role in many ecosystems by removing fuel accumulations, decreasing the impacts of insects and diseases, stimulating regeneration, cycling critical nutrients, and providing a diversity of habitats for plant species and wildlife.

When fire is excluded on a broad scale (over several decades) as it has been in many areas, the unnatural accumulation of living and dead fuel can contribute to degraded plant communities and wildlife habitats. These fuel accumulations often change fire regime characteristics. This has created a potential in many areas across the country for uncharacteristically severe wildland fires. These catastrophic wildland fires often pose risks to public and firefighter safety. In addition, they threaten property and resource values such as wildlife habitat, grazing opportunities, timber, soils, water quality, and cultural resources.

Return of fire is essential for healthy vegetation and wildlife habitat in most ecosystems including grassland, wetland, woodland, and forest. When integrated back into an ecosystem, fire can help restore and maintain healthy systems and reduce the risk of wildland fires. To facilitate fire's natural role in the environment, fire must first be integrated into land and resource management plans and activities on a broad scale.

Reintroduced fire

- can improve waterfowl habitat, wetlands, and riparian areas by reducing the density of vegetation or by modifying the plant species;
- can improve deer and elk habitat, especially in areas with shortages such as winter habitat and on spring and fall transitional ranges;
- can sustain biological diversity;
- can improve access in woodland and shrubland;
- can improve soil fertility;
- can improve the quality and amount of livestock forage;
- can improve growth in immature woodland by reducing density;
- can remove excessive buildup of fuels;
- can reduce susceptibility of plants to insects and disease caused by moisture and nutrient stress;
- can improve water yield for off-site activities and communities dependent on wildlands for their water supply.

Wildland Fire Management Policy and Guidance

In 2001, an update of the 1995 "Federal Fire Policy" was completed and approved by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. The 2001 "Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy" directs federal agencies to achieve a balance between fire suppression to protect life, property, and resources and fire use to regulate fuels and maintain healthy ecosystems. In addition, it directs agencies to use the appropriate management response for all wildland fires regardless of the ignition source. This policy provides eight guiding principles that are fundamental to the success of the fire management program:

- Firefighter and public safety is the first priority in every fire management activity.
- The role of wildland fires as an essential ecological process and natural change agent will be incorporated into the planning process.
- Fire management plans (FMPs), programs, and activities support land and resource management plans and their implementation.
- Sound risk management is a foundation for all fire management activities.
- Fire management programs and activities are economically viable, based on values to be protected, costs, and land and resource management objectives.
- FMPs and activities are based on the best available science.
- FMPs and activities incorporate public health and environmental quality consideration—

federal, state, tribal, local, interagency, and international coordination and cooperation are essential.

- Standardization of policies and procedures among federal agencies is an ongoing objective.

The fire management considerations, guidance, and direction should be addressed in the land use resource management plans (for example, the CCP). FMPs are step-down processes from the land use plans and habitat plans, with more detail on fire suppression, fire use, and fire management activities.

Management Direction

The Souris River basin refuges will protect life, property, and other resources from wildland fire by safely suppressing all wildland fires. Prescribed fire and manual and mechanical fuel treatments will be used in an ecosystem management context for habitat management, and to protect both federal and private property. Fuel reduction activities will be applied where needed, especially in areas with a higher proportion of residences that may be considered "wildland–urban interface" (WUI) areas.

All aspects of the fire management program would be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable laws, policies, and regulations. The Souris River basin refuge stations will maintain an FMP and carry out the plan to accomplish resource management objectives. Prescribed fire and manual and mechanical fuels treatments will be applied in a scientific way under selected weather and environmental conditions. These activities will occur on approximately 500–2,500 acres, over a 5-year average, for native and restored prairie habitat to accomplish habitat management objectives.

Fire Management Goal

Restore and enhance fire as an ecosystem process within prairie habitats. The return and maintenance of fire is essential for wildlife habitat in these ecosystems.

Fire Management Objective

Fire is an important management tool that can be used to accomplish habitat management objectives. If not used properly, fire is also a tool that can quickly damage or destroy natural resources, equipment, buildings, and property; and can hurt or kill those that work with it. Prescribed fire and manual and mechanical fuels treatments will be used to reduce hazardous fuels and on refuge lands to reduce the intensity and severity of wildland fires. Special attention will be given to WUI areas, both on Service-owned and adjacent lands to reduce the risk of wildland fires to communities and improvements.

Strategies

Strategies and tactics that consider public and firefighter safety as well as resource values at risk will be used. Wildland fire suppression, prescribed fire methods, manual and mechanical means, timing, and monitoring are all found in a more detailed list in a step-down FMP.

All management actions would use prescribed fire and manual and/or mechanical means to restore and maintain desired habitat conditions and control nonnative vegetation and the spread of woody vegetation within the diverse ecosystem habitats. The prescribed fire program will be outlined in the FMP for the refuges. Detailed prescribed burn plans will be developed, which describe the following:

- burn units and their predominant vegetation
- primary objectives for burn units
- acceptable range of results
- site preparation requirements
- weather requirements
- safety considerations and measures to protect sensitive features
- burn day activities
- communications and coordination for burns
- ignition techniques
- smoke management procedures
- postburn monitoring

Prescribed fire temporarily reduces air quality by reducing visibility and releasing several components through combustion. The four major components are carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, hydrocarbons, and particulates. Varying amounts of particulate content are generated in different types of fuels (for example, wildlife habitat improvement burns versus fuel reduction burns). The refuges will meet the Clean Air Act emission standards by adhering to the "North Dakota State Implementation Plan" requirements during all prescribed fire activities.

Fire Management Organization, Contacts, and Cooperation

Qualified fire management technical oversight and support for the refuges will be established by region 6 of the Service, using the fire management district approach. Under this approach, an appropriate fire management staffing organization will be determined by established modeling systems based on the fire management workload of a group of refuges, and possibly that of interagency partners. The fire management workload consists of historical wildland fire suppression activities and historical and planned fuels treatments.

Depending on budgets, fire management staffing and support equipment may be located at the station or at other refuges in the district and shared between all units. Wherever possible, fire management activities will be conducted in a coordinated and collaborative manner with federal and nonfederal partners.

On approval of the CCP, a new FMP would be developed for the Souris River basin national wildlife refuges as (1) a stand-alone FMP, (2) a FMP with two or three refuges (the three refuges in the fire management district), or (3) as an interagency FMP.

Appendix P

Draft Compatibility Determination for Recreational Hunting

Use: Recreational Hunting

Refuge Names: Des Lacs National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)

J. Clark Salyer NWR

Upper Souris NWR

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities

- Migratory Bird Conservation Act
- Executive Orders 7154-A, 7161, and 7170

Refuge Purposes

"As a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wild life."
[Executive Orders 7154-A, 7161, and 7170]

"For use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds."
[16 U.S.C. § 715d (Migratory Bird Conservation Act)]

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission

The mission of the 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.

Description of Proposed Use:

Recreational Hunting

All three refuges are open to recreational public hunting in accordance with state of North Dakota seasons and regulations established for each area. Visitation during 2004 for this activity was estimated at Des Lacs NWR (big game 800, upland game 175); at J. Clark Salyer NWR (big game 2,000; upland game 600); and at Upper Souris NWR (big game 2,200; upland game 50). Currently hunted or additional animals that may be hunted are listed below.

Des Lacs NWR

deer	sharp-tailed grouse
fox	ring-necked pheasant
moose	Hungarian partridge
rabbit	turkey

J. Clark Salyer NWR

deer	sharp-tailed grouse
fox	ring-necked pheasant
waterfowl	Hungarian partridge
turkey	

Upper Souris NWR

deer	sharp-tailed grouse
fox	ring-necked pheasant
moose	Hungarian partridge
turkey	

Specific areas are open to hunting during early seasons. Other areas at the refuges, with the exception of administrative areas, may open later in the season. Additional hunting information, regulations, and maps are found in hunting brochures specific to J. Clark Salyer NWR and Upper Souris NWR (available at information kiosks and administrative areas).

Hunting is a designated priority public use established for the Refuge System. The harvest of these species would be compensatory mortality, with minimal impact to the overall health of their populations.

Availability of Resources

Currently, sufficient resources are available to continue the existing recreational hunting programs. Implementing improvements or expanding hunting opportunities would be described in step-down management plans and addressed through future funding requests. The refuges would provide special accommodations for people with disabilities.

Anticipated Impacts of Use

The draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) recommends an annual review of the hunting program. This evaluation would determine what effect diverting funding and staff would have on the ability of the refuges to implement habitat management. Limited staff and funding would be directed toward habitat management first. Lack of funding and personnel may result in decreased opportunities and/or facilities.

Temporary disturbance would exist to wildlife in the vicinity of the activity. Animals surplus to populations would be removed by hunting. A temporary decrease in populations of wild animals would be experienced which may help ensure that carrying capacity (especially for big-game species) is not exceeded. Closed areas would provide some sanctuary

for game and nongame species and minimize conflicts between hunters and other visitors and provide a safety zone around communities and administrative areas.

Public Review and Comment

Public review and comment will be solicited through public posting of notices at each refuge, notices in local newspapers, and public meetings held during the CCP process.

Determination

Recreational hunting is compatible.

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility

Current hunting regulations would be retained. The following stipulations would apply to all three refuges:

- Hunting would be permitted in accordance with state regulations.
- Overnight camping and open fires would not be allowed.
- The areas around refuge offices, visitor centers, and residences would be posted closed to hunting. State law prohibits hunting within one-quarter mile of an occupied building.
- It would be unlawful to carry a loaded firearm in any vehicle on refuge lands or roads.
- Nontoxic shot would be required for hunting upland game and waterfowl. No other type of shot may be possessed while in the field.
- Collecting, injuring, disturbing, destroying, or harming any animal or plant except legally taken game animals would be prohibited.
- Searching for, disturbing, or collecting prehistoric or historic artifacts would be prohibited.
- Archery and gun seasons for deer hunting would coincide with state hunting seasons.
- A deer hunter would need a special state permit to hunt on a refuge during rifle season. A hunter with a state muzzleloader deer permit would be allowed to hunt without a refuge permit.
- Trash, including shell casings, would be required to be packed out so the areas would remain clean, natural, and enjoyable.
- Possession of fireworks would be prohibited.
- Possessing alcohol would be prohibited. Intoxicated and disorderly conduct would not be permitted. Open container of alcoholic beverage in a vehicle would be prohibited.

The following stipulations would apply only to J. Clark Salyer NWR:

- Nine designated areas would be open for hunting waterfowl, sharp-tailed grouse, partridge, pheasant, and deer.
- The entire refuge would be open for late-season sharp-tailed grouse, partridge, pheasant, and fox hunting following the close of firearm deer season, in accordance with state hunting seasons.
- Entry without a firearm to retrieve legally taken waterfowl would be permitted within 100 yards of exterior refuge boundaries and interior boundaries of designated public hunting areas.

The following stipulations would apply only to Upper Souris NWR:

- Vehicle travel would be restricted to public roads and recreation area parking lots. The use of all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles, and other off-road vehicles would not be allowed.
- Horses would not be permitted.
- Weapons would not be allowed in boats and canoes.
- Preseason scouting for deer would be allowed only in open public use areas and areas marked “foot traffic only.”
- Baiting for deer would not be allowed.
- Portable tree stands during deer hunting would be allowed, but daily removal would be required. Only strap-on steps or removable climbing ladders would be allowed.
- Hunters would be allowed to carry, drag, or use carts to remove their deer.
- Once hunters filled their deer tags, they would not be allowed to return to the refuge with weapons. However, they would be allowed to carry shotguns while hunting upland game birds in open bird-hunting areas.
- Land south of Lake Darling Dam would be closed to all upland game bird-hunting.
- Wearing of a blaze orange vest and cap would be required when hunting game birds during the deer firearm season.
- Dogs would be allowed during hunting of grouse, partridge, and pheasant.

Justification

Recreational public hunting is an historical wildlife-dependent use of the refuges, and is designated as one of the priority public uses in the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997. Infrastructure is in place to support hunting programs, while current staffing levels and funding

are adequate. Special regulations are in place to minimize negative impacts to the refuges and associated wildlife, and state of North Dakota law further controls hunter activities.

Hunting is a legitimate wildlife management tool that can be used to control wildlife populations.

Hunting harvests a small percentage of the renewable resources, which is in accordance with wildlife management objectives and principals.

Mandatory 15-Year Reevaluation Date:

2021

Signature

Dan Severson
Refuge Manager
Des Lacs NWR
Kenmare, ND

Date

Gary Erickson
Refuge Manager,
J. Clark Salyer NWR
Upham, ND

Date

Tom Pabian
Refuge Manager,
Upper Souris NWR
Berthold, ND

Date

Review

Tedd Gutzke
Project Leader
Souris River Basin Complex
Upham, ND

Date

Lloyd Jones
Regional Compatibility Coordinator
NWRS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Region 6, Coleharbor, ND

Date

Rod Krey
Refuge Supervisor (ND, SD,)
NWRS
Lakewood, CO

Date

Concurrence

Richard A. Coleman, Ph.D.
Assistant Regional Director, NWRS
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
Lakewood, CO

Date

Appendix Q

Draft Compatibility Determination for Wildlife Observation, Wildlife Photography, Environmental Education, and Interpretation

Uses: Wildlife Observation, Wildlife Photography, Environmental Education, and Interpretation

Refuge Names: Des Lacs National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)

J. Clark Salyer NWR

Upper Souris NWR

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities

- Migratory Bird Conservation Act
- Executive Orders 7154-A, 7161, and 7170

Refuge Purposes

"As a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wild life."
[Executive Orders 7154-A, 7161, and 7170]

"For use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds."
[16 U.S.C. § 715d (Migratory Bird Conservation Act)]

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission

The mission of the 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.

Description of Proposed Uses:

Wildlife Observation, Wildlife Photography, Environmental Education, and Interpretation

All three refuges are currently open to public use in accordance with special refuge regulations developed for each refuge. Total estimated visits during 2004 for these activities were 10,675 visits for Des Lacs NWR, 14,830 visits for J. Clark Salyer NWR, and 67,712 visits for Upper Souris NWR. Entry into closed areas may be permitted by special use permit and special conditions; these would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

These activities may take place by foot, bicycle, automobile, boat, canoe, horse, cross-county skis, and snowshoes. Refuge staff would assist in activities when available. Organized groups such as school, scouts, 4-H, and others may have instructors or leaders who would use the refuges' habitats and facilities to conduct compatible programs. Ages of participants range from preschool to college and beyond.

Current activities for the refuges are listed below.

Des Lacs NWR

- 1 auto tour route (scenic backway)
- 4 hiking trails (1 national recreation trail)
- 1 canoe route
- 1 observation blind
- 3 annual environmental education events
- 1 interpretive kiosk
- 1 visitor contact station in headquarters building

The auto tour route is open daily from 5:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Informational brochures are available at the kiosk located beside the refuge headquarters, which is open Monday–Friday (except on federal holidays) from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

J. Clark Salyer NWR

- 2 auto tour routes (both interpreted)
- 1 hiking trail
- 1 canoe route (national recreation trail)
- 1 observation blind
- 1 kiosk
- 1 visitor contact station in headquarters building

Specific areas are open daily to the public, from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Office hours are Monday–Friday (except on federal holidays) from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Regulations are available at information kiosks and administrative areas. In addition, a bird list is available.

Upper Souris NWR

- 1 auto tour route
- 5 hiking trails (1 is interpreted)
- 2 canoe routes
- 4 observation blinds
- 2 interpretive kiosks (2 additional kiosks are planned for 2006 construction)
- 1 visitor contact station in headquarters building

Specific areas are open to public, from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., year-round. Visitor center hours are Monday–Friday (except on federal holidays) from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Regulations are available at information kiosks and administrative areas. In addition, lists for wildlife including birds and mammals are available.

Availability of Resources

Currently, sufficient resources are available to continue the existing public use programs. The refuges would provide special accommodations for people with disabilities.

The draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) recommends (1) expanding interpretation and environmental education, and (2) maintaining or decreasing development of wildlife observation programs and facilities. The interpretation and environmental education programs would emphasize the principles of natural plant and animal communities and ecological processes and restoration.

Implementing improvements or expanding public use opportunities would be addressed in future step-down management plans and through future funding requests. Program expansion would require increased funding for operations and maintenance. When funding is not adequate to operate and maintain programs, the public use would be reduced in scope or discontinued. Informational kiosks, interpretive signs, and other infrastructure are in place for the present level of public use.

Anticipated Impacts of Uses

No detrimental impacts are anticipated with the public use programs. Temporary disturbance would exist to wildlife in the vicinity of the activity. Closed areas would provide sanctuary for wildlife.

Public Review and Comment

Public review and comment will be solicited through public posting of notices at each refuge, notices in local newspapers, and public meetings held during the CCP process.

Determination

Wildlife observation, wildlife photography, environmental education, and interpretation are compatible.

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility

Current regulations related to these wildlife-dependent uses would be retained. The following stipulations would apply to all three refuges:

- Collecting, injuring, disturbing, destroying, or harming any animal or plant would be prohibited.
- Searching for, disturbing, or collecting prehistoric or historic artifacts would be prohibited.
- Vehicles would be required to stay on designated roads.
- Trespassing in closed areas would not be permitted.
- Overnight camping and open fires would not be allowed.
- Trash would be required to be packed out so the areas would remain clean, natural, and enjoyable.
- Pets would be required to be leashed, except dogs used while hunting.
- Firearms would be prohibited except during appropriate hunting seasons.
- Possession of fireworks would be prohibited.
- Possessing alcohol would be prohibited. Intoxicated and disorderly conduct would not be permitted. Open container of alcoholic beverage in a vehicle would be prohibited.

The following stipulation would apply only to Des Lacs NWR:

- Swimming and motorized boating would be prohibited.

The following stipulations would apply only to Upper Souris NWR:

- Wildlife observation would be permitted year-round in all open areas, on nature trails, on the auto tour route, and in areas marked with “Foot Traffic Only” signs.
- Permission would be required to enter closed areas.
- Photo blinds for observing sharp-tailed grouse on their dancing grounds would be available in April by phone reservation.

- Two canoe trails would be available from May 1 to September. No swimming would be permitted on either the Beaver Lodge or Mouse River canoe trails.
- Swimming, water skiing, and sailing would not be allowed. Recreational boating and the use of jet boats or personal watercraft would not be allowed.
- The use of all-terrain vehicles, snowmobiles, and other off-road vehicles would not be allowed.
- The use of horses for wildlife viewing would be allowed with advanced permission from the refuge manager.
- Dog training would not be allowed.
- Guiding would be prohibited.
- Geocaching or similar activity would be prohibited.

Justification

Wildlife observation, wildlife photography, environmental education, and interpretation are historical wildlife-dependent uses of the refuges, and are designated as priority public uses in the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997. Infrastructure is in place to support public use programs, while current staffing levels and funding are adequate. Special regulations are in place to minimize negative impacts to the refuges and associated wildlife.

Mandatory 15-Year Reevaluation Date:

2021

Signature

Dan Severson Refuge Manager Des Lacs NWR Kenmare, ND	Date
Gary Erickson Refuge Manager, J. Clark Salyer NWR Upham, ND	Date
Tom Pabian Refuge Manager, Upper Souris NWR Berthold, ND	Date

Review

Tedd Gutzke Project Leader Souris River Basin Complex Upham, ND	Date
Lloyd Jones Regional Compatibility Coordinator NWRS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6, Coleharbor, ND	Date
Rod Krey Refuge Supervisor (ND, SD,) NWRS Lakewood, CO	Date

Concurrence

Richard A. Coleman, Ph.D. Assistant Regional Director, NWRS U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6 Lakewood, CO	Date

Appendix R

Draft Compatibility Determination for Recreational Fishing

Use: Recreational Fishing

Refuge Names: J. Clark Salyer National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)

Upper Souris NWR

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities

- Migratory Bird Conservation Act
- Executive Orders 7154-A, 7161, and 7170

Refuge Purposes

"As a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wild life."
[Executive Orders 7154-A, 7161, and 7170]

"For use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds."
[16 U.S.C. § 715d (Migratory Bird Conservation Act)]

National Wildlife Refuge System Mission

The mission of the 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.

Description of Proposed Use:

Continued Historical Public Use Activity of Noncommercial Fishing

Public use areas such as parking areas, fishing areas, boat ramps, docks, jetties, piers, interpretive panels and signs, informational kiosks, and other structures would need to be maintained to facilitate this program. Seasonally sensitive areas at the refuge would remain closed to the the public. Public visitation at Upper Souris NWR may range from 30,000 to 150,000 visits annually for fishing, while at J. Clark Salyer annual visitation may range from 3,000 to 5,000 visits.

Only selected areas of each refuge would be open to fishing and would be posted accordingly. Special refuge regulations for fishing would be available in brochures at the refuge.

J. Clark Salyer NWR

At J. Clark Salyer NWR, there are 14 public fishing areas and each is posted with "Public Fishing Area" signs. Fishing is open year-round. The refuge is open daily from 5:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. Anglers are required to follow North Dakota state law and refuge regulations.

- Bank fishing at designated sites is allowed whenever there is open water.
- Boat fishing, without motors, is allowed in designated areas from May 1 through September 30.
- Ice fishing at designated areas is allowed when the ice is thick enough to support anglers. Only insured and licensed automobiles are allowed on the ice. The use of ice fishing shelters would be allowed in accordance with state law and special refuge regulations.

Upper Souris NWR

Fishing at Upper Souris NWR is allowed year-round from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. daily. Anglers are required to follow North Dakota state law and refuge regulations. There are four developed boat ramps with associated parking areas, boat docks, and restroom facilities to support the summer boat fishing program.

- Bank fishing at designated sites is allowed whenever there is open water. Thirteen areas are open for bank fishing. Parking areas and several restroom facilities are available to bank anglers.
- Boat fishing is allowed from May 1 through September 30 at two designated areas of Lake Darling.
- Ice fishing is allowed when the ice is thick enough to support anglers. Several areas are designated for ice fishing access. Only properly insured and registered automobiles and pickups would be allowed to drive on the ice of Lake Darling. The use of ice fishing shelters would be allowed in accordance with state law and special refuge regulations.

- Fishing derbies may be allowed by issuing special use permits and special conditions. Permits would only be issued to nonprofit organizations. Ten percent of the entry fees would be returned to the refuge to maintain or replace fishing facilities. Typical special conditions governing fishing derbies are attached.

Availability of Resources

Currently, both refuges have adequate administrative and management staff to maintain their fishing programs. Implementing improvements or expanding fishing opportunities would be described in step-down management plans and addressed through future funding requests. The refuges would provide special accommodations for people with disabilities.

At Upper Souris NWR, boat ramps and docks are in place and all have been replaced within the last 5 years. Condition of these facilities is currently good to excellent.

Annual funding is needed for seasonal workforce salary and for supplies to maintain fishing facilities (including mowing, painting, repair, litter pickup, restroom cleaning, and periodic pumping costs of vaulted toilets). Funding is needed for a maintenance worker salary and equipment to maintain fishing areas and facilities.

Funding is needed for law enforcement staff salary, fuel costs, repair and maintenance of patrol vehicles, and associated costs to support the law enforcement program. Routine law enforcement patrols occur year-round. J. Clark Salyer NWR has two collateral duty law enforcement officers. Upper Souris NWR has one full-time law enforcement officer and two "collateral duty" law enforcement officers. Both refuges also receive assistance from local North Dakota state district wardens.

Anticipated Impacts of Use

The draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) recommends an annual review of the fishing program. This evaluation would determine what effect diverting funding and staff would have on the ability of the refuges to implement habitat management. Limited staff and funding would be directed toward habitat management first. Lack of funding and personnel may result in decreased opportunities, or facilities, or both.

Temporary disturbance of wildlife may occur in the vicinity of fishing activity. Fishing would temporarily decrease the fish population until natural reproduction or stocking replenishes the population. Frequency of use would be directly dependent on fish populations and their feeding activity. When fish populations are high and active, public use would climb and vice versa. No long-term negative impacts to the refuge or its resources are anticipated.

Public Review and Comment

Public review and comment will be solicited through public posting of notices at each refuge, notices in local newspapers, and public meetings held during the CCP process.

Determination

Recreational fishing is compatible.

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility

Current fishing regulations would be retained. The following stipulations would apply to both refuges:

- Fishing would be permitted in accordance with state regulations.
- Use or possession of bait fish other than those listed in the North Dakota Fishing Guide would be prohibited.
- Collecting, injuring, disturbing, destroying, or harming any plant or animal (including minnows, frogs, crawfish, and worms) would be prohibited.
- Searching for, disturbing, or collecting prehistoric or historic artifacts would be prohibited.
- Overnight camping and open fires would not be allowed.
- Vehicles would be required to stay on designated roads.
- Trespassing in closed areas would not be permitted.
- Overnight camping and open fires would not be allowed.
- Trash would be required to be packed out so the areas would remain clean, natural, and enjoyable.
- Pets would be required to be leashed.
- Firearms would be prohibited except during appropriate hunting seasons.
- Possession of fireworks would be prohibited.
- Possessing alcohol would be prohibited. Intoxicated and disorderly conduct would not be permitted. Open container of alcoholic beverage in a vehicle would be prohibited.

The following stipulation would apply only to J. Clark Salyer NWR:

- Ice fishing would be permitted on all refuge waters between December 15 and the end of the state fishing season.

The following stipulations would apply only to Upper Souris NWR:

- Fishing boats and canoes would be permitted on Lake Darling from May 1 to September 30 in designated fishing areas.
- Float tube fishing would be allowed where boat fishing is permitted.
- Releasing bait fish into any refuge or state waters would be prohibited.
- Operation of a boat in excess of idle speed in the Grano Boat Ramp Bay would be prohibited.
- Fishing would not be permitted on the Beaver Lodge Canoe Trail.
- Bow and spear fishing, including underwater spear fishing, would be prohibited.
- Use of designated spring, summer, and fall fishing areas would follow area-specific regulations described in the fishing brochure available at the refuge.
- The use of all-terrain vehicles and snowmobiles would not be allowed.
- Access to ice for ice-fishing would be permitted only at designated sites.
- Only cars and pickups would be allowed on the ice from Lake Darling Dam north to Carter Dam for ice-fishing purposes.
- At designated winter-fishing areas, ice-fishing shelters would be permitted and would be required to be removed on the date set by the state for ice-fishing shelter removal. Following the date for removal of permanent shelters, portable ones would be permitted but would need to be removed daily.
- At the remainder of the refuge, portable ice-fishing shelters would be permitted but would need to be removed daily.
- Fishing derbies would conform to event-specific conditions such as those specified in the attachment.

Justification

Recreational fishing is an historical wildlife-dependent use of each refuge, and is designated as one of the priority public uses in the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997. Current staffing levels and funding resources are adequate. Special regulations are in place to minimize negative impacts to the refuges' habitats and associated wildlife.

Mandatory 15-Year Reevaluation Date:

2021

Signature

Dan Severson Refuge Manager Des Lacs NWR Kenmare, ND	Date	Tom Pabian Refuge Manager, Upper Souris NWR Berthold, ND	Date
Gary Erickson Refuge Manager, J. Clark Salyer NWR Upham, ND	Date		

Review

Tedd Gutzke
Project Leader
Souris River Basin Complex
Upham, ND

Date

Lloyd Jones
Regional Compatibility Coordinator
NWRS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Region 6, Coleharbor, ND

Date

Rod Krey
Refuge Supervisor (ND, SD,)
NWRS
Lakewood, CO

Date

Concurrence

Richard A. Coleman, Ph.D.
Assistant Regional Director, NWRS
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
Lakewood, CO

Date

Attachment—Typical Special Conditions

Upper Souris NWR

Ice Fishing and Open-water Fishing Derbies

1. This permit will only be valid after a North Dakota Game and Fish Department (NDGF) fishing contest permit has been issued.
2. The permittee shall conduct and supervise this event by following the refuge and NDGF fishing contest rules and regulations and by following all required self-imposed tournament rules.
3. The permittee shall submit a report within 30 days after completion of the fishing contest to the refuge manager and to NDGF. The report should include the following: (1) number of contest participants; (2) quantity (number, total length, and weight) and species of fish taken in the contest; (3) gross and net proceeds for the tournament; (4) percentage of entry fees paid to participants as prizes; and (5) identification of the intended fishery conservation project to be accomplished at Upper Souris NWR. Failure to submit this report shall be justification for denial of future fishing contest permits.
4. The permittee shall provide readily visible and marked patrol vehicles staffed with volunteers to assist contestants having problems and to check for compliance with ice-fishing derby rules. One patrol vehicle per 50 teams is required during ice-fishing derbies.

   The permittee shall provide readily visible and marked patrol boats staffed with volunteers to assist contestants having problems and to check for compliance with open water fishing derby rules. The ratio of derby patrol boats to participant boats shall be at no time less than 1:20 in fishing contests involving 100 or fewer boats, and 1: 25 for contests involving more than 100 boats.
5. All areas where the derby is held shall be cleaned of litter before leaving for the day. All trash must be packed out. There are no fish cleaning facilities available.
6. Participants shall not interfere with other refuge visitor activities.
7. No entry or participation fees or prize winnings may be collected or distributed on federal property. No commercial products may be sold or distributed on federal property.
8. All fish brought to the check station to be measured or weighed shall be marked by cutting off one-half of the tailfin and the fish returned to the contestant. All fish must remain in the possession of the team that caught them.
9. Participants may use only one-half of the “Landing 1” parking lot during open water fishing derbies. The remainder of the parking lot is reserved for refuge visitors not fishing in the derby. Non-derby anglers should not have to wait in line to launch their boat. Derby sponsors shall provide volunteers to direct parking of participants and non-derby anglers. The overflow parking lot west of the township road may be used for derby vehicle and trailer parking.

Appendix S

RONS and SAMMS Projects, Des Lacs NWR

Refuge Operations Needs System

RONS amounts shown for Des Lacs NWR include a startup cost to carry out each program, with successive yearly costs that are significantly less.

RONS[1] Number	*Project Description*	*First-Year Need ($1,000s)*	*Recurring Annual Need ($1,000s)*	*Personnel (FTE[2])*
R–94009	Implement the geographic information system (computer specialist)	151	74	1.0
R–99009	Increase resource protection and security (law enforcement officer)	140	60	1.0
R–99013	Increase biological monitoring for adaptive resource management (biologist)	151	74	1.0
R–93007	Increase habitat management (refuge manager)	151	74	1.0
R–94001	Increase the integrated pest management program (biological technician)	106	50	1.0
R-93014	Protect and manage water rights	126	0	0
R–94005	Construct an equipment storage building	200	0	0
R–01002	Construct refuge housing for the law enforcement officer	228	0	0
R-99003	Construct water development to expand the grassland grazing program	155	0	0
R-99001	Conduct a cultural resource inventory	55	0	0

[1] *RONS=Refuge Operations Needs System.*
[2] *FTE=full-time equivalent.*

Service Asset Maintenance Management System

SAMMS Number*	*Description*	*Cost ($1,000s)*
Deferred Maintenance		
93106800	Replace the unit 4 water control structure	215
93106830	Replace the unit 5 water control structure	235
93106834	Replace the unit 6 water control structure and emergency spillway	280
01116014	Replace the unit 3 water control structure spillway/weir	250
01115455	Replace residence Q-4	280
Large Construction		
	Construct the fire equipment storage and cache	450
Road Rehabilitation		
03126148	Do preliminary engineering of auto tour route (routes 011, 012,103;12.3 miles)	313
03126149	Construct and asphalt the auto tour route (routes 011, 012,103;12.3 miles)	1,500
03126152	Do preliminary engineering of the Canada Goose Trail (route 102, 11.0 miles)	282
03126153	Construct the Canada Goose Trail (route 102, 11.0 miles)	2,700
Heavy Equipment		
97106791	Replace the 1978 Ford backhoe	110
99106837	Replace the 1978 JD 544 B front-end loader	181
01114123	Replace the 1979 IHC tractor	95
Small Equipment		
00106802	Replace the 1992 Dodge Dakota 4x4 pickup	30
01111766	Replace the 1990 Polaris 4x4 ATV	10
01111763	Replace the 1989 Dodge 4x4 pickup	30
01111766	Replace the 1989 Chevrolet 4x4 pickup	30
01114123	Replace the 1997 Ford 4x4 pickup	30
00106859	Replace the 1984 Type 4X fire engine	98

**SAMMS=Service Asset Maintenance Management System.*

Appendix T

RONS and SAMMS Projects, J. Clark Salyer NWR

Refuge Operations Needs System

RONS amounts shown for J. Clark Salyer NWR include a startup cost to carry out each program, with successive yearly costs that are significantly less.

RONS[1] Number	*Project Description*	*First-Year Need ($1,000s)*	*Recurring Annual Need ($1,000s)*	*Personnel (FTE[2])*
R-00001	Restore and enhance the prairie grassland and forest habitat (resource specialist)	125	75	1.0
R-99012	Improve marsh habitat management (refuge operations specialist)	139	75	1.0
R-99010	Improve habitat management, and population and habitat monitoring (biologist)	139	75	1.0
R-00002	Improve visitor services and outreach programs (administrative receptionist/clerk)	110	55	1.0
R-03001	Improve the resource protection capability (law enforcement officer)	136	55	1.0
R-97010	Enhance streamflow monitoring and the water management capability (refuge operations specialist)	97	55	1.0
R-97038	Develop a new area-capacity table for marsh impoundments	324	0	—

[1] *RONS=Refuge Operations Needs System.*
[2] *FTE=full-time equivalent.*

Service Asset Maintenance Management System

SAMMS Number*	*Description*	*Cost ($1,000s)*
Deferred Maintenance		
90106948	Replace the boundary fence	118
02121135	Repair the pool 320 dike and nesting islands	201
89106942	Rehabilitate the 6-stall storage building	28
99106956	Repair and rehabilitate quarters 40	223
01117727	Rehabilitate the office visitor area	34
Large Construction		
97109872	Construct a vehicle and equipment storage building	1,460
99109875	Improve water level management in pool 341	1,298
Small Construction		
99112488	Construct a wildfire response storage building	449
97123485	Construct an equipment storage yard	54
Road Rehabilitation		
88106960	Do preliminary engineering for the headquarters and a scenic trail	408
02121139	Construct a scenic trail	1,400
02121147	Construct the headquarters road and parking areas	396
10028965	Replace the Johnson Bridge	689
Heavy Equipment		
00106973	Replace the 1972 Caterpillar Grader	116
01115317	Replace the 1968 5-ton 6x6 fire truck	95
01117349	Replace the Case 680E loader/backhoe	95
01116659	Replace the 1972 White semi-tractor	105
01117375	Replace the 1972 John Deere 8630 tractor	126
01116987	Replace the 1982 dump truck	95
Small Equipment		
01113840	Replace the 1996 Honda ATV	7
01115730	Replace the 1991 Chevrolet Service truck	33
01113900	Replace the John Deere loader tractor	90
01116659	Replace the John Deere rotary mower	9
01116659	Replace the 1988 pickup	29

**SAMMS=Service Asset Maintenance Management System.*

Appendix U

RONS and SAMMS Projects, Upper Souris NWR

Refuge Operations Needs System

RONS amounts shown for Upper Souris NWR include a startup cost to carry out each program, with successive yearly costs that are significantly less.

RONS[1] Number	*Project Description*	*First-Year Need ($1,000s)*	*Recurring Annual Need ($1,000s)*	*Personnel (FTE[2])*
R-97008	Monitor adaptive management (biologist)	151.0	86	1.0
R-97001	Increase the environmental education and outreach efforts (public use specialist)	151.0	86	1.0
R-00002	Support the visitor service, educational, biological, and law enforcement functions (receptionist/typist)	63.5	26	0.5
R-98002	Initiate a comprehensive biological inventory (biological technician)	74.5	37	0.5
R-02001	Manage invasive species (range technician)	83.0	39	0.5
R-97005	Develop a fire management program	130.5	78	1.0
R-97004	Protect water rights and monitor water quality	193.0	140	0
R-01001	Compile and analyze the existing Souris River water quality data and its affect on the refuge	358.0	48	0.6
R-01004	Construct a shelter for environmental education activities	185.0	43	0.6
R-97019	Survey for archeological and historical sites	181.0	10	0

[1] *RONS=Refuge Operations Needs System.*
[2] *FTE=full-time equivalent.*

Service Asset Maintenance Management System

SAMMS Number*	*Description*	*Cost ($1,000s)*
Deferred Maintenance		
05139174	Expand quarters 7	118
01117654	Deepen the landing 1 boat channel	160
89106755	Rehabilitate the deteriorating dam 41 Oxbow Marshes	136
05139281	Replace unsafe bridges (1st, 2nd, and 3rd north of Highway 5 East)	129
05139389	Replace three unsafe bridges north of Highway 5 West	129
93106756	Replace a deteriorated bridge (1st north of dam 41 east)	43
05139360	Replace unsafe bridges (1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th north of Greene, West)	172
00106777	Replace 12 miles of boundary fence (Highway 28 to dam 41 west)	257
89106776	Replace 11 miles of boundary fence (Highway 28 to dam 41 east)	237
89106775	Replace 7 miles of boundary fence (Grano to Highway 28 West)	151
Small Construction		
97109865	Build a new equipment storage building	725
97123624	Construct two interpreted observation towers	164
98109866	Expand the refuge office's interpretive, educational, and office space	447
97123510	Create prairie wetlands and restore riparian wetlands	135
02121177	Replace two deteriorated mobile home trailers	354
Heavy Equipment		
01117777	Replace the 1979 Case backhoe	79
96106738	Replace the aging 1986 5-ton, White Freightliner truck tractor	182
01117780	Replace the 1981 GMC dump truck	116
Small Equipment		
01117696	Replace the worn-out 1985 blue Dodge pickup	32
97106744	Replace the aging 1990 Chevy 4x4 extended-cab pickup	29
97106745	Replace the aging 1991 Chevy 4x4 pickup	34
01117706	Replace the 1999 John Deere F911 riding lawn mower	14
01117711	Replace the 1991 Chevrolet fire engine	37
01117784	Replace the 1990 Wajax Pacific BB-4 fire pumper unit	13

SAMMS Number*	*Description*	*Cost ($1,000s)*
Road Rehabilitation		
02121052	Construct the landing 1 parking lot (916)	156
98106752	Construct the Outlet Fishing Area road and parking (route 101, parking lot 908-9; 0.5 mile)	272
98106750	Do the preliminary engineering for landings 2 and 3 roads, parking, and spillway road and parking (routes 12, 102; 1.72 miles; parking lots 900 and 908-917)	136
98106768	Construct landings 2 and 3 roads, parking, and the spillway road and parking (routes 12, 102; 1.72 miles; parking lots 900 and 908-917)	1,100
02121048 02121049	Pave the Overlook Viewing Trail parking lot (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] Route 910); regravel the Lake Darling Interpretive Overlook (FHWA Route 913); and pave the Lake Darling Dam pullout (FHWA 911)	108

**SAMMS=Service Asset Maintenance Management System.*

References

Anderson, Oscar. 1955. A brief history of Velva, North Dakota. Velva, ND: Hauff Printing. 26 p.

Anonymous. 1962. Objectives of marsh vegetation control. Documentation files at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Aufforth, A.D.; Goetz, H.; Higgins K.F. 1990. Duck nesting on islands at J. Clark Salyer refuge in North Dakota, 1983–1984. Prairie Naturalist. 22: 1–12.

Bailey, V. 1913. Field notes, Kenmare, ND. *In:* U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1860–1961 field reports. Smithsonian Institute Archives, record unit 7176.

Beachy, Christopher. Unpublished data. Minot, ND: Minot State University, Biology Department.

Berger, R.P.; Baydack, R.K. 1992. Effects of aspen succession on sharp-tailed grouse, *Tympanuchus phasianellus*, in the Interlake Region of Manitoba. Canadian Field-Naturalist. 106: 185–191.

Bildstein, K.L.; Gollop, J.B. 1988. Northern harrier. *In:* Palmer, Ralph S. Handbook of North American birds. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 251–303.

Billeck, William T. 1990. Alexander Henry's 1806 route between the Assiniboine and Missouri rivers. Journal of the North Dakota Archaeological Association. Vol. 4. [Pages unknown].

Blankespoor, G.W. 1987. The effects of prescribed burning on a tall-grass prairie remnant in eastern South Dakota. Prairie Naturalist. 19: 177–88.

Bluemle, J.P. 1991. The face of North Dakota (rev.). North Dakota Geological Survey Education Series 21. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 177 p.

Boller, Henry A.; Quaife, Milo Milton, ed. 1972. Among the Indians, four years on the upper Missouri, 1858–1862. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. 372 p.

Bragg, T.B. 1995. The physical environment of Great Plains grasslands. *In:* Keeler, K.; Joern, A.; eds. The changing prairie. New York: Oxford University Press. 49–81.

Bragg, T.B.; Steuter, A.A. 1995. Mixed prairie of the North American Great Plains. *In:* Transactions of the North American wildlife and natural resources conference; [Dates of conference unknown]; [Place of conference unknown]; [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 60: 1–14.

Buell, M.F.; Buell, H.F. 1959. Aspen invasion of prairie. Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club. 86: 264–265.

Caudill, J.; Henderson, E. 2003. Banking on nature 2002: the economic benefits to local communities of national wildlife refuge visitation. Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, division of economics. [Pages unknown].

Christian, J.M.; Wilson, S.D. 1999. Long-term ecosystem impacts of an introduced grass in the northern Great Plains. Ecology. 80: 2397–2407.

Coues, E. 1878. Field notes on birds observed in North Dakota and Montana along the 49th parallel during the seasons of 1873 and 1874. Bulletin, U.S. Geological Survey Territories. 4: 545–661.

Coues, Elliot. 1897. New light on the early history of the great Northwest: the manuscript journals of Alexander Henry and of David Thompson 1799–1814. New York: F.P. Harper. 446 p. Vol. 1, The Red River of the North.

Coupland, R.T. 1961. A reconsideration of grassland classification in the northern Great Plains of North America. Journal of Ecology. 49: 135–167.

Coupland, R.T. 1992. Mixed prairie. *In:* Coupland, R.T., ed. Ecosystems of the world: natural grasslands. New York: Elsevier Press. 151–182.

Cowardin, L.M.; Carter, V.; Golet, F.C.; LaRoe, E.T. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. [Pages unknown.]

Cowardin, L.M.; Gilmer, D.S.; Shaiffer, C.W. 1985. Mallard recruitment in the agricultural environment of North Dakota. Wildlife Monograph 92. Washington DC: The Wildlife Society. 37 p.

Dahlberg, James C.; Whitehurst, John C. 1990. An overview of Souris River basin prehistory in North Dakota. Journal of the North Dakota Archaeological Association. 4: 76–110.

Duebbert, H.F. 1966. Island nesting of the gadwall in North Dakota. Wilson Bulletin. 78: 12–25.

Duebbert, H.F.; Higgins, K.F.; Jacobson, E.T.; Podoll, E.B. 1981. Establishment of seeded grasslands for wildlife habitat in the prairie pothole region. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Special Science Report, Wildlife No. 234. [Place of publication unknown]: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. [Number of pages unknown].

Eddingsaas, Aren; Kadrmas, Neil; Grant, Todd; Murphy, Robert; Rubin, Cory. Unpublished data. On file at Des Lacs NWR (Kenmare, ND), J. Clark Salyer NWR (Upham, ND), and Upper Souris NWR (Carpio, ND).

Euliss, N.H.; Mushet, D.M.; Wrubleski, D.A. 2003. [Draft] Invertebrates in wetlands in the prairie pothole region. Jamestown, ND: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center. 22 p.

Ewing, J. 1924. Plant succession of the brush-prairie in north-western Minnesota. Journal of Ecology. 12: 238–266.

Fredrickson, L.H. 1979. Impact of water management on the resources of lowland hardwood forests. *In:* Chabreck, R.A.; Mills, R.H.; eds. Proceedings of the 29th annual forest symposium; [Dates of symposium unknown]; [Place of symposium unknown]. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University. 51–64.

Fredrickson, L.H.; Batema, D.L. 1992. Greentree reservoir management handbook. Gaylord Memorial Laboratory, Wetland Management Series No. 1. Puxico, MO: Gaylord Laboratory.

Gates, C.M. 1933. Five fur traders of the Northwest. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. [Number of pages unknown].

Gleason, R.A.; Euliss, N.H., Jr.; Holmes, C.W. 2003. Sedimentation rates in the marshes of Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge. Quick Response Project QR-F6-00-07. Jamestown, ND: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center. 27 p.

Gough, Barry M., ed. 1988. The journal of Alexander Henry the younger: 1799–1814. *In:* Red River and the journey to the Missouri. Vol. 1. Toronto, ON: The Champlain Society. [Pages unknown].

Grace, J.B.; Collins, S.L.; Grace, S.L.; Smith, M.D.; Stohlgren, T.J. 2001. Interactions between fire and invasive plants in temperate grasslands of North America. *In:* Tall Timbers Research Station Miscellaneous Publication 11. Proceedings of the invasive species workshop: the role of fire in the control and spread of invasive species; fire conference 2000: the first national congress on fire ecology, prevention, and management; [Dates of conference unknown]; [Place of conference unknown]. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 40–65.

Grant, T.A.; Berkey, G.B. 1999. Forest area and avian diversity in fragmented aspen woodland of North Dakota. Wildlife Society Bulletin 27. Washington DC: The Wildlife Society. 904–914.

Grant, T.A.; Berkey, G.B.; Madden, E.M. 2004a. Tree and shrub invasion in northern mixed-grass prairie: implications for breeding grassland birds. Wildlife Society Bulletin 32. Washington DC: The Wildlife Society. 807–818.

Grant, T.A.; Madden, E.M.; Murphy, R.K.; Nenneman, M.P.; Smith, K.A. 2004b. Monitoring native prairie vegetation: the belt transect method. Ecological Restoration. 22: 106–111.

Grant, T.A.; Madden, E.M.; Shaffer, T.L.; Martin, J.S. [In review]. Fire effects on vegetation and breeding grassland birds in northern mixed-grass prairie. Journal of Wildlife Management.

Grant, T.A.; Madden, E.M.; Shaffer, T.L.; Pietz, P.J.; Berkey, G.B.; Kadrmas, N.J. [In press]. Nest survival of clay-colored and vesper sparrows in relation to woodland edge in mixed-grass prairies. Journal of Wildlife Management.

Grant, T.A.; Murphy, R.K. 2005. Changes in woodland cover on prairie refuges in North Dakota, USA. Natural Areas Journal. 25: 359–368.

Grant, Todd. Unpublished data. Fire effects on duck and songbird nest density and nest survival; J. Clark Salyer NWR, 1998–2003. Field forms on file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Grant, Todd; Hammond, Merrill. Unpublished data. Prairie grouse survey field forms. On file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Grant, Todd; Shaffer, Terry. Unpublished data. Island nesting study field forms and data summaries. On file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Great Plains Flora Association. 1986. Flora of the Great Plains. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas. 1402 p.

Hammond, M.C. [No date]. Marsh transects and surveys, 1946–1956, Lower Souris Refuge. On file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Hammond, M.C. 1961. Proposal for needed research on aquatic plant (pondweed) study. Memo on file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Hammond, M.C. 1962. Herbicides in control of moist soil, marsh and aquatic vegetation. Memo to the regional director. On file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Hammond, M.C.; Mann, G.E. 1956. Waterfowl nesting islands. Journal of Wildlife Management. 20: 345–352.

Hanson, J.R. 1984. Bison ecology in the northern plains and a reconstruction of bison patterns for the North Dakota Region. Plains Anthropologist. 29: 93–113.

Hanowski, J.M.; Christian, D.P.; Niemi, G.J. 2000. Landscape requirements of prairie sharp-tailed grouse *Tympanuchus phasianellus campestris* in Minnesota, USA. Wildlife Biology. 6: 257–263.

Henry, C. J. 1939. Response of wildlife to management practices on the Lower Souris Migratory Waterfowl Refuge. *In:* Transaction of the North American wildlife conference; [Dates of conference unknown]; [Place of conference unknown]. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 4: 372–377.

Hickerson, Harold. 1965. The Virginia deer and intertribal buffer zones in the upper Mississippian Valley. *In:* Lewis, Anthony; Vayda, Andrew P.; eds. Man, culture, and animals: the role of animals in human ecological adjustments. Publication 78. Washington DC: American Association for the Advancement of Sciences. 43–65.

Higgins, K.F. 1986. Interpretation and compendium of historical fire accounts in the northern Great Plains. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Resource Publication 161. [Place of publication unknown]: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 39 p.

Higgins, K.F.; Barker, W.T. 1982. Changes in vegetation structure in seeded nesting cover in the prairie pothole region. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Special Science Report, Wildlife No. 242. [Place of publication unknown]: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. [Number of pages unknown].

Hood, G.N. 1994. Against the flow: Rafferty–Alameda and the politics of the environment. Saskatoon, SK: Fifth House Publishers. 220 p.

United States and Canadian Negotiating Delegation. 1989. Agreement between the United States of America and Canada for water supply and flood control in the Souris River basin. Modified in 2000.

James, F.C.; Shugart, Jr., H.H. 1970. A quantitative method of habitat description. Audubon Field Notes. 24: 727–736.

Johnson, D. H. 1979. Estimating nest success: the Mayfield method and an alternative. Auk. 96: 651-661.

Johnson, D.H.; Igl, L.D. 1995. Contribution of the Conservation Reserve Program to populations of breeding birds in North Dakota. Wilson Bulletin. 107: 709–718.

Johnson, D.H.; Igl, L.D. 2001. Area requirements of grassland birds: a regional perspective. Auk. 118: 24–34.

Jones, J.K.; Armstrong, D.M.; Hoffman, R.S.; Jones, C. 1983. Mammals of the northern Great Plains. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. 379 p.

Jordan, Nicholas; Larson, Diane; Huerd, Sheri. Unpublished data. Manuscript on file with Nicholas Jordan, Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN. 33 p.

Kadlec, J.A. 1982. Mechanisms affecting salinity of Great Salt Lake marshes. American Midland Naturalist. 107: 82–94.

Kadrmas, Neil. Unpublished data. Vegetation survey field notes. On file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Kadrmas, N.J. 2005. Community dynamics of terrestrial vertebrates in aspen parkland–mixed grass prairie habitats at J. Clark Salyer National Wildlife Refuge, North Dakota. Grand Forks, ND: University of North Dakota. 103 p. M.S.

Kemner, D.P.; Higgins, K.F. 1993. Response by upland nesting ducks to three rejuvenation treatments applied to two types of seeded nesting cover in eastern South Dakota. *In:* Proceedings of the South Dakota Academy of Sciences; [Dates of academy unknown]; [Place of academy unknown]. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 72: 87–109.

Kerns, C. 2005. Passerine nest survival in managed, mixed-grass prairie. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri. 87 p. M.S.

Kruse, A.D.; Bowen, B.S. 1996. Effects of grazing and burning on densities and habitats of breeding ducks in North Dakota. Journal of Wildlife Management. 60: 233–246.

Kuchler, A.W. 1964. Potential natural vegetation of the conterminous United States. American Geographical Society Special Publication 36. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 39 p.

Laubhan, M.K.; Fredrickson, L.H.; Gleason, R.A. 2003. A biological assessment of wetland conditions on the Souris River National Wildlife Refuges (Upper Souris, Des Lacs, and J. Clark Salyer). Jamestown, ND: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center. 91 p.

Laubhan, M.K.; Roelle, J.E.. 2001. Managing wetlands for waterbirds. *In:* Rader, R.B, Batzer, D.P., Wissinger, S. Biomonitoring and management of North American freshwater wetlands. New York: John Wiley and Sons. 387–411.

Livingston, R.J.; Loucks, O.L. 1979. Productivity, trophic interactions, and food web relationships in wetlands and associated systems. *In:* Greeson, P.E., Clark, J.R., Clark, J.E. Wetland functions and values: the state of our understanding. American Water Resources Technical Publication 79-2. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 101–119.

Lord, M.L.; Kehew, A.E. 1990. Geomorphology of the Souris River Valley, Saskatchewan, North Dakota, and Manitoba. Journal of the North Dakota Archaeological Association. 4: 8–16.

Ludwick, T.L.; Murphy, R.K. 2006. Fire history and passerine abundance and habitat on a North Dakota drift plain prairie. Prairie Naturalist.

Madden, E.M.; Hansen, A.J.; Murphy, R.K. 1999. Influence of prescribed fire history on habitat and abundance of passerine birds in northern mixed-grass prairie. Canadian Field-Naturalist. 113: 627–640.

Madden, E.M.; Hansen, A.J.; Murphy, R.K.; Murray, L. 2000. Models for guiding management of prairie bird habitat in northwestern North Dakota. American Midland Naturalist. 144: 377–392.

Miller, H.W. 1971. Relationships of duck nesting success to land use in North and South Dakota. *In:* Transactions of the Congress of International Union of Game Biologists; [Dates of congress unknown]; [Place of congress unknown]. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 10: 133–141.

Minot Chamber of Commerce. 2005. <www.minot chamber.org>

Mitsch, W.J.; Gosselink, JG. 2000. Wetlands. 3d ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons. 936 p.

Murphy, R.K.; Freed, D.W.; Grondahl, C.D.; Hasselblad, K.W.; Martin, R.E.; Sidle, J.G. 2001. Status of the burrowing owl in North Dakota. Journal of Raptor Research. 35: 322–330.

Murphy R.K.; Grant, T.A. 2005. Land management history and floristics in mixed-grass prairie, North Dakota, USA. Natural Areas Journal. 25: 351–358.

Murphy, R.K.; Sondreal, M.L. 2003. Breeding bird abundance and habitat along the Des Lacs River valley, North Dakota. Blue Jay. 61: 82–94.

Murphy, Robert; Boyle, Jennifer; Behrend, Keith. Unpublished data. On file at Des Lacs NWR, Kenmare, ND.

Murphy, Robert; Whipp, Stacy. Unpublished data. On file at Des Lacs NWR, Kenmare, ND.

Naugle, D.E.; Bakker, K.K.; Higgins, K.F. 2000. A synthesis of the effects of upland management practices on waterfowl and other birds in the northern Great Plains of the U.S. and Canada. Wildlife Technical Report 1. Stevens Point, WI: University of Wisconsin, College of Natural Resources. 28 p.

Nenneman, Melvin; Grant, Todd; Kadrmas, Neil. Unpublished data. Woodland plot vegetation sampling field forms. On file at J. Clark Salyer NWR, Upham, ND.

Nenneman, Melvin; Murphy, Robert. Unpublished data. On file at Des Lacs NWR, Kenmare, ND.

Nenneman, M.P. 2003. Vegetation structure and floristics at nest sites of grassland birds in north central North Dakota. Missoula, MT: University of Montana. 103 p. M.S.

Nenneman, M.P.; Grant, T.A.; Murphy, R.K.; Sondreal, M.L. 2003. Nesting habitat of Cooper's hawks in northern Great Plains woodlands. Journal of Raptor Research. 37: 246–252.

Nenneman, M.P.; Murphy, R.K.; Grant, T.A. 2002. Cooper's hawks (*Accipiter cooperii*) nest successfully at high densities in deciduous woodlands of the northern Great Plains. Canadian–Field Naturalist. 116: 573–577.

Peterjohn, B.G.; Sauer, J.R. 1999. Population status of North American grassland birds from the North American breeding bird survey, 1966–96. Studies in Avian Biology. 19: 27–44.

Robinson, Elwyn B. 1966. History of North Dakota. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. 599 p.

Romo, J.T.; Grilz, P.L.; Driver, E.A. 1990. Invasion of the Canadian prairies by an exotic perennial. Blue Jay. 48: 131–135.

Rumble, M.M.; Sieg, C.H.; Uresk, D.W.; Javersak, J. 1998. Native woodlands and birds of South Dakota: past and present. Research Paper RMRS-RP-8. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 11 p.

Schneider, Fred E. 1977. Preliminary cultural resource investigation of the upper Souris River basin. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Research Report, Purchase Order Number, DACW37, 77M-1387. [Place of publication unknown]: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 39–51.

Schranck, B.W. 1972. Waterfowl nest cover and some predation relationships. Journal of Wildlife Management. 36: 182–186.

Schweigert, Kurt P. 1990. An historic overview of the Souris River valley in North Dakota. *In:* Gnabasik, V., ed. Journal of the North Dakota Archaeological Association. 4: 206–229.

Seastedt, T.R. 1995. Soil systems and nutrient cycles of the North American prairie. *In:* Joern, A.; Keeler, K.H.; eds. The changing prairie: North American grasslands. New York: Oxford University Press. 157–174.

Sexton, N.R.; Koontz, L.; Stewart, S.C. 2005. Visitor survey results for Souris River loop national wildlife refuges. Completion report: U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Division, Open-file Report 2005-1399. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 172 p.

Speulda, Lou Ann; Lewis, Rhoda Owen. 2003. Historical and architectural assessment of the Depression era work projects, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Region 6. Lakewood, CO: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6. 129 p.

Squires, L.; van der Valk, A.G. 1992. Water-depth tolerances of the dominant emergent macrophytes of the Delta Marsh, Manitoba. Canadian Journal of Botany. 70: 1860–1867.

Stammen, Henry. 1978. Personal communication. Foxholm, ND.

Steenis, J.H. 1939. Marsh management on the Great Plains waterfowl refuges. *In:* North American wildlife conference; [Dates of conference unknown]; [Place of conference unknown]. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. 4: 400–405.

Stewart, R.E. 1975. Breeding birds of North Dakota. Fargo, ND: Tri-college Center for Environmental Studies. 295 p.

Stewart, R.E.; Kantrud, H.A. 1971. Classification of natural ponds and lakes in the glaciated prairie region. Resource Publication 92. [Place of publication unknown]: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 57 p.

Ulrich, R.A.; Pfeifer, F.K. 1976. Limnological survey of the Souris River and its major tributaries in North Dakota, October 1975. Bismarck, ND: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Fishery Services, Bismarck Area Office. 75 p.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2004. <http://www.mvp.usace.army.mil> 12 February 2004

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census 2000 summary file, American factfinder. <http://factfinder .census.gov>

U.S. Department of Commerce. 2002. Regional economic information system. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. <www.bea.gov>

U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. 2002. 2001 National survey of fishing, hunting, and wildlife-associated recreation. [Place of publication unknown]: [Publisher unknown]. [Number of pages unknown].

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1999. Fulfilling the promise: the National Wildlife Refuge System. Arlington, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 94 p.

———. 1994. Draft revised recovery plan for piping plovers (*Charadrius melodus)*, breeding on the Great Lakes and northern Great Plains of the United States. Twin Cities, MN: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 120 p.

———. 2002. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Arlington, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Division of Migratory Bird Management. 99 p.

———. Unpublished data. Weather records. On file at Des Lacs NWR (Kenmare, ND) and at J. Clark Salyer NWR (Upham, ND).

U.S. Soil Conservation Service. 1975. Field technical guide. Bismarck, ND: USDA, Soil Conservation Service. 14 p.

van der Valk, A.G. 1981. Succession in wetlands: a Gleasonian approach. Ecology. 62: 688–696.

van der Valk, A.G.; Welling, C.H. 1988. The development of zonation in freshwater wetlands: an experimental approach. *In:* During, H.; Werger, M.; Willems, J. Diversity and pattern in plant communities. Hague, Netherlands: Academic Publishing. 145–158.

Weller, M.W.; Fredrickson, L.H. 1974. Avian ecology of a managed glacial marsh. Living Bird. 12: 269–291.

Weller, M.W.; Spatcher, C.E. 1965. Role of habitat in the distribution and abundance of marsh birds. Entomology Special Report 43. Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Department of Zoology, Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station. 31 p.

Wettlaufer, B.N.; Mayer-Oakes, W.J. 1960. The Long Creek site. Anthropological Series No. 2. Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Museum of Natural History. 137 p.

Willms, M.A.; Crawford, R.C. 1989. Use of earthen islands by nesting ducks in North Dakota. Journal of Wildlife Management. 53: 411–417.

Willson, G.D.; Stubbendieck, J. 2000. A provisional model for smooth brome management in degraded tall-grass prairie. Ecological Restoration. 18: 34–38.

Wilson, S.D. 2002. Prairies. In: Davy, A.J.; Perrow, M.R.; eds. Handbook of ecological restoration. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. 443–465.

Wilson, S.D.; Belcher, J.W. 1989. Plant and bird communities of native prairie and introduced Eurasian vegetation in Manitoba, Canada. Conservation Biology. 3: 39–44.