

FINAL DRAFT

Avian Conservation Implementation Plan Fort Donelson National Battlefield

National Park Service
Southeast Region



Compiled by J. Keith Watson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
In cooperation with

FODO Resource Management Staff, National Park Service
And Bird Conservation Partners
January 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Background	3
The North American Bird Conservation Initiative	4
The Southeastern Bird Conservation Initiative: National Park Service	5
Role of NPS in Avian Conservation.....	5
Park Description	7
Avian Resources of the Interior Low Plateaus	8
Avian Conservation in FODO	11
Park Identified Needs for Avian Conservation.....	12
Coordination with Regional Conservation Initiatives	12
North American Bird Conservation Initiative	12
North American Waterfowl Management Plan.....	14
Partners In Flight	14
United States Shorebird Conservation Plan	14
Waterbird Conservation for the Americas.....	14
Integration of NABCI Goals and Objectives into Park Planning and Operations: NABCI Implementation	
Recommendations	14
Inventory	15
Monitoring	16
Habitat Restoration	16
Threat Management.....	18
Research	18
Compliance	19
Outreach	19
Partners and Partnerships	20
Funding Opportunities	21
Contacts.....	24
Literature Cited.....	27
Appendixes	
High Priority Species in the Interior Low Plateaus Bird Conservation Region	
High Priority Habitat-Species Assemblages in the Interior Low Plateaus Bird Conservation Region	
Tennessee Natural Heritage Program Rare Vertebrates List 2001	
USFWS Species of Conservation Concern (2002) in the Central Hardwoods (BCR 24)	

Introduction

This Avian Conservation Implementation Plan (ACIP) is provided to the staff at Fort Donelson National Battlefield (FODO) to help identify and prioritize bird conservation opportunities, and to provide information and guidance for the successful implementation of needed conservation activities. This plan may identify goals, strategies, partnerships, and perhaps specific projects allowing the park to participate in existing bird conservation planning and implementation efforts associated with the North American Bird Conservation Initiative (NABCI). Under the auspice of NABCI, appropriate bird and habitat conservation goals may be recommended as identified in the appropriate existing national or regional bird conservation efforts aligned with this initiative: Partners In Flight (PIF), North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP), US Shorebird Conservation Plan (USSCP), and Waterbird Conservation for the Americas (WCA). For example, parks in the Interior Low Plateaus, including FODO, will have few if any high priority waterbird conservation issues at a regional landscape or greater scale. As such, little information regarding waterbird conservation will be presented in the ACIP, unless there is an identified park need for this species group, or other mandates, such as federal laws. Similarly, because most of the parks in the Interior Low Plateaus are located in and are primarily upland forested landscapes, recommendations will be provided in the ACIP for landbird and habitat conservation and will be derived from the appropriate PIF bird conservation plans, PIF being largely a landbird conservation initiative. However, all high priority bird conservation issues for FODO will be discussed and integrated as appropriate.

Information and data presented in the ACIP have been obtained from several sources: 1) interviews with FODO staff 2) FODO bird conservation partners 3) the PIF Interior Low Plateaus Bird Conservation Plan, Version 1.0 (Ford et al. 2000), 4) NPS databases, 5) peer reviewed bird conservation and management literature, and 6) personal communications with bird conservation specialists throughout North America, especially in the southeastern United States. This plan has been reviewed by FODO resource management staff and managers, Cumberland/Piedmont Inventory and Monitoring Network (CUPN I&M) staff, and bird conservation partners and approved by FODO management. Optimally, this plan will be incorporated into the park's Resource Management Plan (RMP) and updated annually to reflect completed projects, newly identified needs, and shifts in bird conservation priorities in the region.

FODO is not obligated to undertake any of the proposed actions in this plan. The plan is provided to offer guidance to FODO to voluntarily support important park, regional, and perhaps national and international bird conservation projects for which FODO is a primary participant in the proposed actions.

Background

During the past thirty years, monitoring programs across North America have documented declines of certain bird species populations and their habitats, often severe

(Sauer et al. 2000). The decline has caused great concern among scientists, biologists, biodiversity proponents, ecologists, land managers, etc., and the bird conservation community in general. Birds are recognized as critical components of local and global genetic, species, and population diversity, providing important and often critical ecological, social, economic, and cultural values. Their overall decline has stimulated a worldwide focus on conservation efforts, and North American interest in bird conservation is rapidly becoming a focus of government, non-government, industry, and private interests and expenditures.

Many state, federal, and non-governmental wildlife agencies and non-government organizations (NGO's) have recognized this alarming bird decline trend and have joined forces in several extensive partnerships to address the conservation needs of various bird groups and their habitats. The primary initiatives are:

- North American Waterfowl Management Plan
- Partners in Flight
- U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan
- Waterbird Conservation for the Americas

The North American Bird Conservation Initiative: While efforts associated with these plans have generated some successes, it has been increasingly recognized that the overlapping conservation interests of these initiatives can be better served through more integrated planning and delivery of bird conservation. The *North American Bird Conservation Initiative (NABCI; <http://www.nabci-us.org/main2.html>)* arose out of this realization. The vision of NABCI is simply to see **“populations and habitats of North America’s birds protected, restored and enhanced through coordinated efforts at international, national, regional, state and local levels, guided by sound science and effective management.”** NABCI seeks to accomplish this vision through (1) broadening bird conservation partnerships, (2) working to increase the financial resources available for bird conservation in the U.S., and (3) enhancing the effectiveness of those resources and partnerships by facilitating integrated bird conservation (U.S. NABCI Committee 2000). The four bird conservation initiatives mentioned above, as well as several other local and regional partnerships, work collectively to pursue this vision.

NABCI is guided by a set of principles that establish an operational framework within which the Initiative and its partners may conduct integrated bird conservation in the U.S. These will articulate a common understanding of the relationship among NABCI, the individual bird conservation initiatives, and all partner entities to ensure recognition of existing federal legislative and international treaty obligations, state authorities, and respect for the identity and autonomy of each initiative. The fundamental components of the conservation approach to be used by NABCI are expressed within its goal:

To deliver the full spectrum of bird conservation through regionally-based, biologically-driven, landscape-oriented partnerships.

The Southeastern Bird Conservation Initiative: National Park Service: In 1999, the Southeast Region of the National Park Service (NPS) recognized the importance of coordinating existing bird conservation goals into planning and operations of national park units in the southeast, that is, integration of NABCI. In support of this recognition, the Southeast Regional Office NPS approved and allocated eighty-eight thousand dollars, cost sharing 1:1 with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Region 4 (Southeast) to hire a biologist to conduct this two-year project (Interagency Agreement FS028 01 0368). This project is unique in the NPS, and perhaps the nation, and represents a potential model for better coordinating regional bird conservation programs and activities within and outside the NPS. It further represents a progressive action toward institutionalizing bird conservation as a programmatic priority in the Southeast Region of NPS and potentially the nation.

As envisioned, the integration of NABCI into the Southeastern NPS involves:

- 1) Development and delivery of Avian Conservation Implementation Plans,
- 2) Coordination with NPS Inventory and Monitoring Program,
- 3) Development of a web-based project site,
- 4) Establishment or enhancement of bird conservation partnerships,
- 5) Identification and exploration of potential funding opportunities, and
- 6) Technical guidance and assistance as needed or requested.

This ACIP fulfills one aspect of the plan outlined above and serves as a basis for future bird conservation actions in FODO and with adjacent partners or landowners.

Concurrently, the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the FWS and the NPS (Appendix A) to implement Presidential Executive Order (EO) 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds (US Government 2000), calls for integration of programs and recommendations of existing bird conservation efforts into park planning and operations. Complementing each other, the MOU and the Southeastern Bird Conservation Initiative will advance bird conservation in the Southeast Region of the NPS beyond current regional NPS efforts.

Role of NPS in Avian Conservation

The interagency agreement that facilitates this partnership supports both FWS and NPS management policies. Specifically for the NPS, the agreement supports and advances the Strategy for Collaboration, a visionary document developed and signed by the Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Advisory Group (SENRLAG 2000), a consortium of 13 land and resource management agencies in the Southeastern United States whose vision is to encourage and support cooperation in planning and managing the region's natural resources. Furthermore, the agreement is aligned with and implements

a variety of NPS Management Policies (2001) including, but not limited to, External Threats and Opportunities, Environmental Leadership, Cooperative Planning, Land Protection, and especially Natural Resource Management that details policy and management guidelines which apply to bird conservation. Important policies in the Natural Resource Management chapter include:

- Planning for Natural Resource Management
- Partnerships
- Restoration of Natural Systems
- Studies and Collection
- General Principles for Managing Biological Resources
- Plant and Animal Population Management Principles
- Management of Native Plants and Animals
- Management of Endangered Plants and Animals
- Management of Natural Landscapes
- Management of Exotic Species
- Pest Management
- Fire Management and
- Water Resource Management

The NPS is the fourth largest landowner in the United States, consisting of over 380 national park units covering 83 million acres of land and water with associated biotic resources (www.nps.gov). The 64 units in the Southeast Region of the NPS represent 16% of the total number of park units in the national park system and cover approximately 5% of the total land base in the entire system. Park units in the Southeast Region include national seashores (Canaveral National Seashore, Cape Hatteras National Seashore), national parks (Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Everglades National Park), national recreation areas (Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area), national preserves (Big Cypress National Preserve), national battlefields (Cowpens National Battlefield, Fort Donelson National Battlefield), national monuments (Fort Matanzas National Monument, Ocmulgee National Monument), and others such as the Blue Ridge Parkway, Obed Wild and Scenic River, and Timicuan Ecological and Historic Preserve.

Southeast NPS units provide habitat for over 400 species of migrating, breeding, and wintering birds and include a wide range of Federal and State listed threatened and endangered species. Likewise, these units also provide nest, migration, and winter habitat for most of the eastern species identified in the national bird conservation plans in need of conservation attention.

Additionally, the NPS attracts over 280 million visitors to the parks each year, 120 million of these in the Southeast Region, affording excellent recreational bird watching and opportunities to strengthen bird conservation interpretation, outreach, and education programs. These opportunities, the NPS mission, policies, and organization

all lead to the conclusion that the NPS is an extremely valuable partner and contributor to bird conservation in the region.

Nationally, the status of birds in national parks is largely unknown, although many parks have adequate knowledge regarding bird occurrence in the parks (<http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/othrdata/chekbird/chekbird.htm>). Parks often play a role in ongoing regional bird conservation efforts. Indeed many of these parks are often important to regional, national, or international bird conservation, and many have been designated as Important Bird Areas (IBA's) by the National Audubon Society. To date, there are approximately 64 NPS units that are designated IBA's, 35 of which are considered of global importance (<http://abcbirds.org/iba/aboutiba.htm>). In the Southeast Region, the NPS has 13 global IBA's.

The **NPS Inventory and Monitoring (I&M) Program** has been developed to provide management driven scientific information to national park managers so that resources can be adequately protected within national parks. One of the first phases of this program is to inventory vertebrates, including birds, within the 260 national park units in the program. Once completed, data from the inventories will provide an account of the occurrence and abundance of birds in all the national parks in the program. These records will be stored in the NPS I&M NPSpecies database (<http://www.nature.nps.gov/im/apps/npspp/>). Coordination with I&M network staff is important to developing long-term bird monitoring programs that fulfill both park and NABCI objectives.

Park Flight is a NPS international partnership initiative that directs funding toward a variety of NPS programs that involve conservation of Neotropical migratory birds whose life history range covers a US national park and a Latin American protected area. A relatively new program, Park Flight offers parks the opportunity to partner with a Latin American national park or protected area to cooperate on developing bird conservation and education projects (USDI NPS 2002).

Recent increases in NPS base funded programs such as inventory and monitoring, exotic species management, habitat restoration, and fire management all indicate that national park managers recognize that park lands are increasingly subject to a variety of threats and conditions that must be improved to provide the quality of national park experience articulated in the NPS Organic Act (1916). Programmatic funding in these areas will increase the ability of national parks to provide quality habitat and conditions for increased wildlife conservation, including birds. Furthermore, private interests and non-profit conservation organizations have initiated programs, including grant programs, to provide much needed funding to national parks to meet backlogs of identified yet unfunded needs.

Park Description

During the Civil War, this Confederate fort guarded the strategic Cumberland River. Early in 1862 the Union Army, under the command of General Grant, captured Fort

Donelson along with approximately 13,000 Confederate soldiers. This was the first major victory of the Civil War for the Union Army and set the stage for the Union's invasion of the deep South.

The battlefield site is 226 ha (92 acres) and is bordered by the impounded Cumberland River to the north, or what currently is known as Lake Barkley. FODO is a topographically diverse Park ranging from dry ridges to bottomlands, and a mosaic of forest types occur depending upon topography. In general, hills and ridges are divided by deep ravines that contain diverse vegetative communities dominated by tulip poplar, sugar maple, and American beech. Dry slopes are dominated mainly by oak and oak-hickory forests. The vegetation is considered transitional between mixed-deciduous forests and drier oak-hickory forests.

Avian Resources of Interior Low Plateaus

The Interior Low Plateaus physiographic area occupies almost 18,000,000 ha (44,000,000 acres) across portions of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama (see PIF and NPS Locations Maps below). Subdivisions distinguish the Interior Low Plateaus and include the Western Highland Rim, Pennyroyal Plateau, Eastern Highland Rim, Tennessee Valley (or Southern Highland Rim), Central Basin, Shawnee Hills, Bluegrass, and Kentucky Knobs Topography is generally hilly and rolling, but also includes swampy alluvial valleys, deeply entrenched rivers and streams, and karst plains. The area's major waterways are the Ohio, Cumberland, Tennessee, Kentucky, Wabash, and Licking Rivers. Elevations range from 100 m to 320 m (325 feet to 1,050 feet) above sea level. Caves, glades and barrens are among the most biologically important natural characteristics of the physiographic area. The area's diverse landscape captures plant community diversity from both the mid-western and eastern United States; important bird habitats include upland hardwoods such as western mesophytic, oak-hickory, and beech-maple forests, forested wetlands, grasslands, tallgrass prairies, oak savannas, barrens and glades, and short-rotation pine. Oak-hickory forests occur on 31% of the physiographic area, while another 10% is occupied by other forest cover types. Corn, soybean, and other row crops occupy about 40% of the landscape, while pasture and mixed croplands occupy about 14% of the area. Other land uses include irrigated agriculture, prairies, water, and urban areas (Ford et al. 2000).


In the Interior Low Plateaus, the primary bird conservation goals are to stabilize or increase populations of high priority bird species and to provide adequate habitats for two extirpated species, greater prairie chicken and swallow-tailed kite. In order to reach these goals, habitat objectives proposed in this plan include the following items:

1. sustain the existing acreage of forest (about 7,300,00 ha), with about 80% (5,820,560 ha) in hardwood forest and about 20% (1,455,140 ha) in short rotation pine management,

Partners in Flight (PIF) Regions

Southeast Region (SER)


National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



Partners in Flight (PIF) Regions and NPS Locations

Southeast Region (SER)

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



2. of the hardwood forest, manage approximately 400,000 ha in long rotation, sawtimber forest patches of about 4,000 ha each,
3. consolidate and manage an additional 90,000 ha of forested wetlands,
4. restore an additional 40,000 ha of native warm season grass and oak savanna habitats, and
5. continue active participation of bird conservation planning in ongoing barrens and glades management and restoration projects.

Over 150 bird species nest regularly in the Interior Low Plateaus physiographic area. Breeding Bird Atlas results from Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and northern Alabama indicate that Indigo Bunting, Carolina Chickadee, American Robin, Northern Cardinal, and Mourning Dove are among the most common and widely distributed species across the Interior Low Plateaus. Approximately 39% of all species nest in early

successional or semi-open lands habitats. Specifically, these habitats include grasslands, oak savanna, old fields, barrens, glades, early succession forest (natural or managed regeneration), and edge habitats. Typical species include Indigo Bunting, Yellow-breasted Chat, Field Sparrow, and Prairie Warbler.

Approximately 34% nest in mid to late succession forest habitats, which may range from small woodlots to extensive forested tracts. In small woodlots, typical species may include at least 4 woodpecker species, Eastern Wood-pewee, and Red-eyed Vireo. Larger forested tracts may include Acadian Flycatcher, Wood Thrush, Cerulean Warbler, and Kentucky Warbler. Approximately 19% of the species are dependent on water and wetland habitats. Typical species include Great Blue Heron, Wood Duck, and Belted Kingfisher. An additional 8% require forested wetlands. Species in these habitats include Swainson's warbler and Prothonotary Warbler.

Avian Conservation in FODO

Avian Biodiversity: FODO is currently conducting an inventory of birds under the auspice of the NPS Inventory and Monitoring Program. No checklist is currently available; however, upon completion of the inventory a checklist is expected to be published for the park. Stedman and Stedman (2004) have documented 100 species throughout the park, of which approximately 40% are breeding birds. The inventory will continue through summer of 2005.

Verified records of birds in FODO have been entered into the NPS I&M program's database, NPSpecies, and may be viewed via the internet at <http://www.nature.nps.gov/im/app/npspp> with a user identification and password combination authorized by the NPS for NPS personnel and NPS cooperators. Many other avian observational data need to be verified and entered into the database.

Park Priorities: Park staff and consultants have not identified any species of particular management concern or high priority for conservation. Rather, the park is interested in obtaining a complete inventory and conserving all birds and their habitats in FODO.

Inventory: Bird inventory data provide important information for park management, particularly when inventories are conducted within the framework of the NPS I&M Program. FODO is one of several parks in the NPS Cumberland/Piedmont I&M Network for which a plan to conduct high priority inventory projects has been prepared (Nichols et al. 2000). A request for proposals to complete the inventory was released in March of 2003. Inventory effort began in summer of 2003 and will conclude in summer 2005. Dr. Stephen Stedman, Tennessee Technological University, and Ms. Barbara Stedman are presently conducting avian inventory throughout FODO in conjunction with the I&M plan. Current inventory efforts include:

- Breeding bird surveys using point counts, transects, and nest searches in all habitats
- Winter bird survey focused on grassland habitats

- Migration monitoring in all habitats

Threatened and Endangered Species: No Federally listed threatened or endangered avian species are known to occur in FODO.

Only one **Tracked in Tennessee** species, the Sharp-shinned Hawk, occurs in the park (Appendix C).

Several high priority PIF species for the Interior Low Plateaus occur in FODO (see below and Appendixes A and B). Prominent among these species are: Prairie Warbler, Wood Thrush, Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Chimney Swift, Eastern Wood-Pewee, Red-headed Woodpecker, Northern Bobwhite, White-eyed Vireo, Black-and-White Warbler, and Eastern Towhee. Many of these species are associated with the oak-hickory, riparian, grassland, and open woodland habitats in the park.

Upon completion of the inventory, more high priority species are likely to be documented.

Monitoring: Currently, no monitoring is being conducted at FODO.

Research: Scientific research is permitted within the park, but no active avian research is ongoing.

Outreach: No educational and outreach programs related to birds are undertaken in the park.

Park Identified Needs for Avian Conservation

FODO has identified one major objective at this time that would increase the avian knowledge of the park.

Inventory: The highest priority is to **complete the breeding bird inventory as identified in the I&M plan.**

Coordination with Regional Conservation Initiatives


North American Bird Conservation Initiative: NABCI bird conservation planning units, referred to as Bird Conservation Regions (BCR), are often larger than other planning units associated with other plans, such as Partners In Flight. For example, FODO is within the NABCI Central Hardwoods BCR that extends over a large portion of the lower Midwest (see BCR Map below) and encompasses several PIF physiographic areas (the planning unit for PIF)(compare to PIF and NPS Location Maps).

Several NABCI BCR's have coordinators whose primary responsibility is to coordinate all bird conservation planning in the BCR, across all agencies and organizations.

Bird Conservation Regions

Southeast Region (SER)

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



Legend

- Appalachian Mountains
- Central Hardwoods
- Gulf Coastal Prairie
- Mississippi Alluvial Valley
- Peninsular Florida
- Piedmont
- Southeastern Coastal Plain
- West Gulf Coastal Plain/Ouachitas
- NPS Units

No warranty is made by the National Park Service (NPS) as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data or for intended use or appropriate use without the data, or for purposes not intended by the NPS. Spatial data may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This information may be updated without notification.



Currently, the Central Hardwoods BCR has a designated coordinator (J. Fitzgerald, see contacts below) and can provide valuable assistance to FODO with implementation of aspects of this ACIP.

North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP): The NAWMP (<http://northamerican.fws.gov/NAWMP/nawmphp.htm>) is completed and has been revised several times, incorporating updated goals and strategies based on new information. This plan is one of the most successful bird conservation delivery programs in the United States, being monetarily supported by the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA).

Partners In Flight: Goals and strategies for the Interior Low Plateaus can be found in the draft bird conservation plan, previously submitted to the park. The current plan identifies priority bird and habitat conservation goals that must be implemented in order to achieve bird conservation success in this region. FODO being largely a landbird park will utilize this plan more than any other plan to participate in NABCI implementation.

Similar to NABCI BCR's, PIF physiographic areas often do not have designated coordinators. However, state level non-game agencies with investment in PIF will establish key personnel to develop partnerships among cooperators in the physiographic area. The State of Tennessee has a state ornithologist who will be instrumental in assisting FODO to implement recommendations identified in this ACIP and projects important to bird conservation relative to Tennessee's role in implementation of the Interior Low Plateaus PIF plan.

United States Shorebird Conservation Plan (USSCP): The USSCP has been completed and is available on the World Wide Web (<http://shorebirdplan.fws.gov/>). A regional step down plan is in preparation by FWS personnel and should be available in 2004. Since FODO has little habitat of regional importance to shorebird conservation, recommendations for shorebird conservation are not presented.

Waterbird Conservation for the Americas (WCA): The WCA plan has been completed and is available on the World Wide Web or can be ordered from the US Fish and Wildlife Service National Conservation Training Center (<http://www.waterbirdconservation.org/>). Few waterbird conservation priorities exist on the Interior Low Plateaus and none are presented here for FODO.

Integration of NABCI Goals and Objectives into Park Planning and Operations

NABCI Implementation Recommendations

To successfully achieve park established goals and actively participate in NABCI, the park could implement a variety of projects in different NPS programs. Most of these projects would require some level of participation by many existing park programs and

could either be achieved through NPS funding, or more likely, through establishing or improving partnerships with agencies and organizations that already have the necessary expertise to provide guidance, funding, and execution of these programs. Programmatic areas where bird conservation actions are likely to be focused are:

- Inventory
- Monitoring
- Habitat Restoration
- Threat Management (includes exotic species, air quality, water quality, etc.)
- Research
- Compliance
- Outreach
- Partnerships

To the extent appropriate, each of these program areas will be discussed separately and within each, specific opportunities identified that, when implemented, will enable to park to meet its mandates (current and expected), as well as integrate NABCI into its planning and operations. With emphasis added; the park is not expected to implement any of these recommendations or be obligated to pursue any opportunity other than those the park is required to do by law or NPS program or policy. In other words, participation in this effort is currently voluntary. However, implementation of EO 13186 (US Government 2000) will require NPS to incorporate a wide range of bird conservation programs into planning and operations. The development of the MOU between the FWS and the NPS will establish a formal agreement to promote bird conservation within the agency by incorporating goals and strategies of existing bird conservation initiatives, plans, and goals into park planning and operations.

Should the park decide to implement any of these projects, further consultation with bird conservation contacts is encouraged to obtain updated information on the relevance of these opportunities in regional bird conservation.

High priority projects are identified in **bold** print. Priorities that the park is encouraged to seek NPS funding for are marked with an asterisk (*). These projects are those that are critical to the stabilization or improvement of a bird population in the planning region.

Inventory: The park is in the process of completing its inventory. Once completed, abundance and distribution data will be needed to fully understand the status of birds in the park so that conservation actions for birds can be implemented (Nichols et al. 2000). Information regarding the status of high priority species (as identified in the Interior Low Plateaus bird conservation plan, the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Commission Threatened and Endangered Species list, and the USFWS Species of Conservation Concern) is needed to effectively structure park management for the continued preservation and enhancement of the park's avifauna.

The current inventory effort is expected to provide a comprehensive overview of the presence of birds at FODO. Additional inventory needs will be identified following the completion of the ongoing inventory. However, it is important that:

- **abundance and distributional data be gathered for high priority forest, grassland, and open woodland species**

Additionally, FODO is encouraged to:

- **verify other avian observational data collected in the park and enter into the appropriate database (NPSpecies, National Point Count Database, Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA), eBird (Cornell University 2002))**
- **standardize inventory and monitoring methodology to conform to NPS and/or FWS recommended standards (Fancy and Sauer 2000; Hunter 2000).**

Monitoring

The park has not yet identified avian monitoring needs because the inventory is not completed at this time. Preliminary results of the inventory indicate several high priority species are likely to nest in the park and are associated with upland forests, grassland, and open woodland habitats. Efforts should be made to identify appropriate monitoring programs for high priority species and habitats at the conclusion of the inventory. Close coordination with adjacent BCR coordinators and the Tennessee ornithologist is needed to identify and implement high priority projects on park lands and to ensure that park efforts contribute to park or regional bird conservation rather than undertake an action or actions that are not needed or are better conducted in other areas. The park is encouraged to consider establishing permanent monitoring stations in main habitat types to collect baseline data on the distribution and relative abundances of priority species. This information will be useful for documented potential changes in park avifauna resulting from habitat change or management activities. Links to literature detailing inventory and monitoring methodologies for various avian groups (e.g. songbirds, shorebirds, raptors, etc.) can be found at:

<http://biology.dbs.umt.edu/landbird/mbcg/groups.htm>. Specific recommendations are to:

- **establish a monitoring program based on final inventory to measure abundance and population trends for high priority species in a variety of habitats**
- **standardize monitoring methodology to conform to NPS and/or FWS recommended standards (Fancy and Sauer 2000, Hunter 2000).**

Habitat Restoration: Landscape conditions in the Southeastern US have changed dramatically since early European explorers began documenting the area, its habitats,

and its inhabitants. Historic landscapes were influenced by Native American burning, wildfire, bison, beaver, and elk, as well as by insect outbreaks and weather events (Hunter et al. 2001, Williams 2002), thus resulting in a landscape mosaic that supported a rich and diverse bird fauna in the Southeast (Barden 1997; Brawn et al. 2001). The arrival of Europeans and the subsequent change in landscape has dramatically effected bird habitat and bird populations. Bird conservationists have long recognized that habitat restoration is critical to restoration of bird populations, stabilizing or reversing bird declines, and removing birds from both State and Federal Threatened and Endangered Species lists.

Recently, habitat restoration efforts have increased on NPS lands due to the increased restoration emphasis of the Management Policies (USDI NPS 2001). Parks may use a wide range of management tools to restore wetland, grassland, woodland, and other habitats. Restoration tools include, but are not limited to, forest management practices (e.g. silviculture), prescribed fire, exotic species management, and public use and recreation management. In addition, parks can coordinate infrastructure development (e.g. roads and buildings) with restoration activities to mitigate potential adverse impacts.

Due to the protected nature of FODO lands, and generally those in the national park system, the condition of habitats for bird use may be of higher quality than other natural, developed, agricultural, or forest lands under other management regimes. However, national park lands can be greatly improved for wildlife, and particularly bird use, by restoring processes important for habitat formation, succession, and structural development. Largely, these processes have not been managed historically in the national park system, but current policy allows for active management of species, populations, and lands to provide for long-term conservation of park resources. Protection, restoration, and enhancement of habitats in FODO can greatly contribute to established habitat goals identified in the Interior Low Plateaus bird conservation plan.

The park is characterized by forested hills and ridges divided by deep ravines characterized by western mesophytic species and oak-hickory forests in the upland portions. Very little of the park is quality grassland for birds, but what exists creates an open woodland habitat. Much of the habitat provide suitable area and vegetative cover for nesting landbirds, but could be improved through use of habitat restoration and management practices to restore the structural and spatial complexity of the landscape in FODO that are required for many of the high priority bird species that occur there. Specific recommendations are to:

- **restore native warm season grasses to as large an area as possible in existing grass areas***
- **create some shrub scrub habitats intermixed with grassland and forested habitats to provide for breeding and cover areas ***

- **manage remaining forests toward old growth conditions**
- **protect existing snag trees, where not identified as a safety hazard, as important to cavity nesting birds**
- **assess historic landscape cover and determine feasibility of restoring landscape within the context of the park's enabling legislation.**
- **document all major habitat management activities, including the location (e.g. UTM coordinates) and a description of methods and of pre- and post-management habitat conditions. This information, when coupled with bird distribution and abundance data, is useful for assessing and replicating conservation actions**

Threat Management: Due to the urban nature of FODO's setting, the greatest threats to birds and their habitats are a result of adjacent developments causing habitat fragmentation around the park, invasion of exotic plants species, impacts associated with visitor use, and free-roaming and feral cats and dogs. Although the extent of these threats is undocumented, reduction or mitigation of many threats is desired by the park. FODO is encouraged to:

- **work with the local community and other land conservation interests in the region to minimize habitat fragmentation and potentially restore habitats beneficial to wildlife and bird species of the region**
- **work with adjacent landowners and neighbors, the local community, and public officials to curb unregulated and free roaming feral and domestic dogs and cats in the park**

Cape Hatteras National Seashore has recently completed a feral cat reduction campaign that could be used as a model in FODO (Altman 2002, Morrison 2002).

- **partner with the local Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to explore potential to protect adjacent private lands through various private landowner incentive programs**
- **work with local governments to improve water quality of Stones River**
- **continue aggressive approach to eliminate of exotic plant species**

Research

No research needs have been identified at this time. However, FODO is encouraged to:

- **list future identified park needs and projects on Research Permit and Reporting System web site (RPRS)**
- **develop contact with Southern Appalachian Mountains Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit (CESU) at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.**

Compliance: Park compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Executive Order 13186 ([Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds](#) [US Government 2000]), is necessary to assure that park activities incorporate bird conservation into park planning and operations. Further, to ensure that migratory birds are considered in all phases of park planning processes, especially during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Director's Order #12 Compliance processes, the park should consider adding specific language in project evaluations that requires consideration and implications of park projects on migratory birds. The MOU being developed between the NPS and the FWS will likely contain specific language requiring a park to consider implications of park projects on migratory birds. Additional considerations are to encourage:

- **park staff to begin specific consideration of migratory birds during park planning processes**
- park staff to attend USFWS training on implementation of EO 13186 at the National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) (when available) or other training on migratory bird conservation in North America. NCTC has several courses and training related to conservation of migratory birds (<http://training.fws.gov/courses.html>).

The USFWS NCTC offers and reserves two tuition free slots for National Park Service employees wishing to attend NCTC courses on a first come, first served basis. Additionally, discount lodging is also available while attending a NCTC course.

Outreach

- **complete the checklist for public availability**
- **collaborate with Cross Creeks National Wildlife Refuge and Land Between the Lakes staff to coordinate and implement recommendations of this plan**
- **participate in International Migratory Bird Day (IMBD) events with a local partner (<http://birds.fws.gov/imbd.html>) such as the Nashville Chapter of the Tennessee Ornithological Society (TOS) <http://www.tnbirds.org/chapters.htm#nashville>**

- **develop partnership with Nashville TOS to assist with implementation of various aspects of this plan**
- **encourage development of outreach and educational programs to enhance visibility of bird conservation issues, which may include organized bird walks, owl prowls, etc. with the public**
- **encourage accurate documentation and reporting from these and random outings by visitors (see Cornell University's eBird monitoring program (Cornell Lab. Ornith. 2002 (<http://www.ebird.org/about/index.jsp>))**
- **support bird conservation by serving shade-grown coffees at meetings, events, and the office buildings in the park (<http://www.americanbirding.org/programs/consbcof3.htm>)**
- work with adjacent landowners and neighbors, the local community, and public officials to curb unregulated and free roaming feral and domestic dogs and cats in the park
- park interpretation/education staff are encouraged to attend USFWS training on Migratory Bird Education at NCTC
- consider adding links to bird conservation information, data, etc., to the park's web site home page
- subscribe to **TN-Bird Net**, an electronic forum for listing bird sightings and publications in Tennessee
- explore cultural affiliation of landscape to inhabitants, both historical and contemporary. Cultures are strongly tied to the landscape they inhabit and birds often play a role in a cultural tie to the landscape. When these connections are discovered and preserved, a greater appreciation for the landscape and its value to the culture can be achieved.

Partners and Partnerships: Partnerships for land conservation and protection will perhaps have the greatest positive influence on bird conservation above all other landscape scale planning. Specific recommendations are to:

- **keep abreast of Stewart County and Dover initiatives that could impact park resources**
- **contact US Fish and Wildlife Service private lands biologists to discuss private landowner initiatives applicable to the area**

- **continue to develop and strengthen relationship with Ms. Barbara and Dr. Stephen Stedman to coordinate and conduct park bird conservation projects**
- **develop partnership with Tennessee Wildlife Resources Commission**
- **contact the nearest Joint Venture office (see Funding section for explanation of Joint Ventures) or BCR coordinator to develop partnerships and funding proposals tied to priorities established by the park, this ACIP, and the Interior Low Plateaus bird conservation plan**
- **contact and partner with the local chapter of the Tennessee Ornithological Society in Nashville, Tennessee. This group could be active partners in FODO's bird conservation program**
<http://www.tnbirds.org/chapters.htm#nashville>
- evaluate local or regional land use data and plan potential for habitat protection across organizational boundaries
- develop land use agreements with local landowners through state, FWS programs, and especially with protect important habitats and landscapes.

Funding Opportunities: Internal NPS funding is often an effective source to obtain funding; however, the project will have to be a fairly high priority among the park's natural resource program to successfully compete for the limited funding available in the NPS. Therefore, partnerships and outside funding programs are often more productive for securing bird conservation funding. Funding for conservation projects for Neotropical migrants is also available through the Park Flight program. FODO is encouraged to enter all high priority projects into the NPS Performance Management Information System (PMIS) database. Needed at FODO is:

- **increased base funding to implement basic protection and management needs for birds and their habitats (habitat based management not only benefits the birds but other wildlife as well)**

With the exception of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan (NAWMP and its associated funding legislation, the North American Wetland Conservation Act), funding opportunities for bird conservation programs, plans, and initiatives have been lacking. Only within the last decade have other appropriate and specific sources for bird conservation funding been created and used. The NAWMP has been supported for approximately 14 years by the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA 1989). This program has provided \$487 million in appropriated funds matched with \$1.7 billion for wetland and bird conservation projects since its inception. In 2002 alone, over \$70 million US dollars were awarded to US and Canadian agencies and organizations to enhance waterfowl populations by improving, restoring, or protecting

wetland habitats. To adequately evaluate projects and distribute these funds, partnerships called Joint Ventures were established. Nationally, 14 (11 US, 3 Canada) Joint Ventures have been established, several which are funded and staffed. Internet links to Joint Ventures are:

(<http://southwest.fws.gov/gulfcoastjv/ojvcontact.html>) and
(<http://northamerican.fws.gov/NAWMP/jv.htm>).

Funding through NAWCA is highly underutilized by the NPS and any park unit that has wetland, water, or bird conservation needs associated with wetland are encouraged to investigate using this funding source. Naturally, there are certain requirements to be eligible for all grants and park managers are encouraged to consult with the nearest Joint Venture, BCR, PIF Coordinator, to learn how this program might be applicable to implementation of this plan, and other park wetland issues. FODO is not within a region which has an operational Joint Venture, but contact with the Central Hardwoods BCR coordinator and Tennessee state ornithologist will provide opportunity to investigate use of this funding source and developing proposals.

Internal FWS funding programs may be used to support projects, but no effective method of project proposal delivery to these sources is currently in place for the NPS. Current funding in these programs may result from FWS familiarity with NPS needs, or NPS participation in one of the area FWS Ecosystem Teams, where a project has been identified and proposed to be funded through the Ecosystem Team. FODO is encouraged to become a participant in the Lower Tennessee- Cumberland Ecosystem. One unexplored yet potentially fruitful funding source for national parks is the myriad of grants through the FWS State Programs, where grants are awarded to private individuals engaged in habitat conservation projects. No funding is directly available to national parks, but identified projects with important or critical adjacent landowners can sometimes be funded through these sources. Similar programs are available if the adjacent landowner is a federally recognized American Indian tribe.

Specific congressional appropriations to protect migratory birds has recently been authorized under the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (2000) (<http://www.nfwf.org/programs/nmbcapp.htm>). Appropriations through this Act are authorized up to \$5 million per year. However, in 2000, appropriation was approximately \$3.75 million and a majority of this funding was directed toward projects in Central and South America.

Many of the identified projects are eligible for funding under various grant programs of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation: <http://www.nfwf.org/programs/programs.htm>.

Other prominent funding sources available to NPS managers for bird conservation are listed on this projects web site at: <http://southeast.fws.gov/birds/NPSHighlits.htm>.

Funding opportunities for migratory bird conservation are available yet most natural resource agencies are not fully aware of and/or understanding of how to use these

sources. Perhaps a consolidated migratory bird funding source catalog will become available to managers in the future; this is needed.

Contacts: Primary contacts within the region can be obtained by viewing the web site for the Southeastern Bird Conservation Initiative, National Park Service at <http://southeast.fws.gov/birds/npsbirds.htm>. This web site will provide contact information of the appropriate bird conservation coordinator in the region for park personnel. Primary contacts for FODO are:

US Fish and Wildlife Service

Keith Watson
Asheville, NC 28801
828-350-8228
Keith.Watson@fws.gov

Dean Demarest
1875 Century Blvd.
Atlanta, GA
404-679-7371
dean_demarest@fws.gov

Jennifer Wheeler
Waterbird Conservation Plan Coordinator
703-358-1714
Jennifer_A_Wheeler@fws.gov

Chuck Hunter
Regional Refuge Biologist
Atlanta, GA
404-679-7130
Chuck_Hunter@fws.gov

Dwight Cooley
Lower Tennessee-Cumberland
Ecosystem Team
Decatur, AL
256-353-7243
Dwight_Cooley@fws.gov

National Park Service

Teresa Leibfreid
Cumberland/Piedmont
Inventory & Monitoring Network
Coordinator
Mammoth Cave, KY
270 749-2508
Teresa_Leibfreid@nps.gov

Raymond Albright
Southern Appalachian Mountains CESU
Knoxville, TN
865-974-8443
Ray_Albright@nps.gov

Chris Furqueron
National Park Service
Exotic Plant Management Coordinator
404-562-3113 ext 540
Chris_Furqueron@nps.gov

Robert Wallace
Fort Donelson National Battlefield
Dover, TN
931 232-5348
Bob_Wallace@nps.gov

Others

Mike Roedel
Tennessee State Ornithologist
615-781-6653
michael.roedel@state.tn.us

Jane Fitzgerald
American Bird Conservancy
Central Hardwoods BCR Coordinator
314-918-8505
jfitzgerald@abcbirds.org

Stephen J. Stedman
Department of English
Box 5053
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, TN 38505
931-372-3763
sstedman@tntech.edu

Barbara Stedman
2675 Lakeland Dr.
Cookeville, TN 38506
(931) 528-3820

Richard Connors
Tennessee Ornithological Society
Nashville, TN
615- 832-0521
Rconnorsphoto@aol.com

Mark Wimer
US Geological Survey
Biological Research Division
Patuxent Wildlife Research Center
Patuxent, MD

Brett Dunlap
USDA APHIS Wildlife Services Tennessee
(615) 736-5506

LITERATURE CITED

- Barden, L.S. 1997. Historic Prairie in the Piedmont of North and South Carolina, USA. *Natural Areas Journal* 17:149-152.
- Brawn, J.D., S.K. Robinson and F. R. Thomson III. 2001. The Role of Disturbance in the Ecology and Conservation of Birds. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 32:251-76.
- Cornell University and National Audubon Society. 2002. eBird Monitoring Program. Cornell University, Laboratory of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY.
- Fancy, S. and J. Sauer. 2000. Recommended Methods for Inventorying and Monitoring Landbirds in National Parks. National Park Service, Ft. Collins. 13p.
- Ford, B. S. Carr, C. Hunter. J. York, and M. Roedel. 2000. **Draft** Interior Low Plateaus Bird Conservation Plan. Version 1.0. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Arlington, VA. 60p.
- Hunter, C. 2000. Bird Population Survey, Inventory, and Monitoring Standards for National Wildlife Refuges and Partners in the Southeastern U.S. USFWS. January 2002. 49p.
- Hunter C., D. Buehler, R. Canterbury, J. Confer, and P. Hamel. 2001. Conservation of disturbance-dependent birds in eastern North America. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 29:440-455.
- Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act. 2000. 114 Stat. 593. 16 U.S.C. 6102 Public Law 106247, enacted July 20, 2000.
- Nichols, B., M. Jenkins, J. Rock, K. Langdon, and T. Leibfreid. 2000. Study Plan for Vertebrate and Vascular Plant Inventories. Appalachian Highlands Network and Cumberland/Piedmont Network. National Park Service. 80pp.
- North American Wetlands Conservation Act. 1989. 103 Stat. 1968; 16 U.S.C. 4401-4412. Public Law 101-233, enacted December 13, 1989.
- Sauer, J.R., J.E. Hines, I. Thomas, J. Fallon, and G. Gough. 2000. The North American Breeding Bird Survey, Results and Analysis 1966-1999. Version 98.1, U.S.G.S. Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, MD.
- Southeast Natural Resource Leaders Advisory Group (SENRLAG). 2000. A Strategy for Collaboration. Unpublished. 4p.
- Stedman, S. J., and B. H. Stedman. 2004. Checklist of the Birds of Stones River National Battlefield, Rutherford County, Tennessee (in progress). <http://iweb.tntech.edu/sstedman/NPSBirdInventoryFtDonelson.htm>. 4 p.

- USDI, Geological Survey. 2001. National Point Count Database. Biological Research Division, Patuxent Wildlife Research Station, Patuxent, MD.
- USDI, National Park Service. 1916. Organic Act. 39 Stat. 535 16 U.S.C. 1-4, enacted August 25, 1916.
- USDI, National Park Service. 2001. National Park Service Management Policies. 2001. December 2000. 137p.
- USDI, National Park Service. Resource Management Plan, Fort Donelson National Battlefield.
- USDI, National Park Service. 2002. Park Flight and Migratory Bird Conservation. National Park Service, Natural Resource Program Center. 2p.
- US Government. 2000. Presidential Executive Order 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, January 2000.
- US NABCI Committee. 2000. The North American Bird Conservation Initiative in the United States: A Vision of American Bird Conservation. U.S. NABCI Committee, September 2000. 29p.
- Williams, G.W. 2002. Aboriginal Use of Fire: Are There Any "Natural" Plant Communities? USDA Forest Service, Washington D.C., June 2002. 18p.

APPENDIX A

HIGH PRIORITY SPECIES IN THE INTERIOR LOW PLATEAUS BIRD CONSERVATION REGION (from Table 2, Ford et al. 2000)

Priority breeding landbird species pool generated for the Interior Low Plateaus. Total scores and regional scores were developed from Partners in Flight criteria.

Category	Species	Total score	% of pop.	AI	PT Status ¹	Local
la	Highest overall priority					
	Bewick's wren	28	26.6	3	5	D
	Cerulean warbler	28	7.8	3	5	B
lb	High overall priority					
	Henslow's sparrow	27	4.4	3	4	E
	Swainson's warbler	26	-	4	3	E
	Bachman's sparrow	25	-	2	3	E
	Blue-winged warbler	24	7.8	3	5	B
	Prairie warbler	24	12.2	4	5	B
	Worm-eating warbler	24	7.9	3	3	B
	Louisiana waterthrush	23	9.1	4	3	B
	Whip-poor-will	23	12.9	4	5	B
	Bell's vireo	23	1.2	2	3	E
	Dickcissel	23	1.0	3	5	B
	Wood thrush	22	5.1	3	3	B
	Prothonotary warbler	22	2.4	3	3	B
	Kentucky warbler	22	12.6	4	2	B
	Yellow-billed cuckoo	22	7.8	5	5	B
	Chimney swift	22	10.1	5	5	B
	Eastern wood-pewee	22	9.4	5	5	B
	Field Sparrow	22	13.9	5	5	B
	Red-headed woodpecker	22	3.3	4	5	D
Ila	Physiographic area priority species					
	Northern bobwhite	21	6.1	4	5	R
	White-eyed vireo	21	6.5	3	5	B
	Yellow-breasted chat	21	11.2	5	5	B
	Loggerhead shrike	20	-	3	5	R
	Black-and-white warbler	20	-	3	5	B
	Grasshopper sparrow	20	-	3	5	B
	Ruby-throated hummingbird	19	6.9	5	3	B

Category	Species	Total score	% of pop.	AI	PT	Local Status ¹
	Eastern towhee	19	9.4	4	5	R
	Eastern meadowlark	19	7.7	5	5	R
<hr/>						
IIb	Additional species: responsibilities for monitoring (> 10% BBS)					
	Acadian flycatcher	21	10.9	4	2	B
	Orchard oriole	19	10.4	4	2	B
	Eastern bluebird	16	11.9	5	2	R
<hr/>						
III	Additional species: global priority					
	Chuck-will's-widow	21	3.1	3	4	B
	Bobolink	19	-	2	3	B
<hr/>						
IV	Federally listed species					
	Bald eagle	17	-	2	3	D
<hr/>						
V	Local, state, or regional interest species					
	Mississippi kite	20	-	2	3	B
	Chestnut-sided warbler	18	-	2	3	B
	Lark sparrow	17	-	2	4	E

1 – Local status refers to migratory status and is adapted from Texas Partners in Flight. In this category, B refers to birds that breed in the area and winter exclusively in the tropics, D refers to birds that breed and winter in the region but may involve different populations, E refers to species which are reaching distributional limits in the area, and R refers to resident, non-migratory birds.

APPENDIX B

HIGH PRIORITY HABITAT-SPECIES ASSEMBLAGES IN THE INTERIOR LOW PLATEAUS BIRD CONSERVATION REGION (from Table 2, Ford et al. 2000)

Table 3. Priority habitat-species suites generated for the Interior Low Plateaus, with habitat scores and action level.

Habitat Species	Habitat score ¹	TB	AI	PT	Action level ²
Western mesophytic, oak-hickory, beech-maple forests					
Yellow-billed cuckoo	13	3	5	5	III
Eastern wood-pewee	13	3	5	5	VI
Whip-poor-will	12	3	4	5	III
Downy woodpecker	12	2	5	5	VI
Northern flicker	12	3	5	4	VI
Cerulean warbler	12	4	3	5	II
Black-and-white warbler	11	3	3	5	IV
Louisiana waterthrush	11	4	4	3	III
Ruby-throated hummingbird	10	2	5	3	IV
Wood thrush	10	2	5	3	IV
Worm-eating warbler	10	4	3	3	III
Kentucky warbler	10	4	4	2	III
Forested wetlands					
Yellow-billed cuckoo	13	3	5	5	III
Eastern wood-pewee	13	3	5	5	IV
Downy woodpecker	12	2	5	5	VI
Northern flicker	12	3	5	4	VI
Cerulean warbler	12	4	3	5	III
Black-and-white warbler	11	3	3	5	III
Louisiana waterthrush	11	4	4	3	III
Ruby-throated hummingbird	10	2	5	3	III
Wood thrush	10	4	3	3	III
Prothonotary warbler	10	4	3	3	III
Kentucky warbler	10	4	4	2	III
Acadian flycatcher	9	3	4	2	III
Swainson's warbler	9	4	2	3	II
Bald eagle	8	3	2	3	VI
Riparian					

Habitat Species	Habitat score ¹	TB	AI	PT	Action level ²
Yellow-billed cuckoo	13	3	5	5	III
Eastern wood-pewee	13	3	5	5	VI
Downy woodpecker	12	2	5	5	VI
Northern flicker	12	3	5	4	VI
White-eyed vireo	12	4	3	5	III
Cerulean warbler	12	4	3	5	II
Eastern towhee	12	3	4	5	III
Black-and-white warbler	11	3	3	5	III
Louisiana waterthrush	11	4	4	3	III
Indigo bunting	11	1	5	5	VI
Ruby-throated hummingbird	10	2	5	3	IV
Wood thrush	10	2	5	3	IV
Prothonotary warbler	10	4	3	3	III
Kentucky warbler	10	4	4	2	III
Acadian flycatcher	9	3	4	2	III
Swainson's warbler	9	4	2	3	III

Grassland

Eastern meadowlark	13	3	5	5	VI
Field sparrow	13	3	5	5	VI
Northern bobwhite	12	3	4	5	III
Loggerhead shrike	12	4	3	5	II
Eastern towhee	12	3	4	5	VI
Grasshopper sparrow	12	4	3	5	III
Dickcissel	12	4	3	5	III
Henslow's sparrow	10	4	3	3	II
Bobolink	9	4	2	3	VI

Oak Savanna

Bewick's wren	13	4	4	5	I
Prairie warbler	13	4	4	5	IV
Eastern wood-pewee	13	3	5	5	VI
Downy woodpecker	12	2	5	5	VI
Northern flicker	12	3	5	4	VI
Orchard oriole	10	3	5	2	VI
Eastern bluebird	9	2	5	2	VI
Bachman's sparrow	9	4	2	3	VI
Red-headed woodpecker	7	3	3	1	VI

Habitat	Habitat	TB	AI	PT	Action
---------	---------	----	----	----	--------

Species	score ¹				level ²
Barrens/Glades/Old Fields					
Bewick's wren	13	4	4	5	I
Prairie warbler	13	4	4	5	IV
Yellow-breasted chat	13	3	5	5	IV
Field sparrow	13	3	5	5	IV
Eastern meadowlark	13	3	5	5	VI
Northern bobwhite	12	3	4	5	III
Whip-poor-will	12	3	4	5	III
Loggerhead shrike	12	4	3	5	II
White-eyed vireo	12	4	3	5	IV
Blue-winged warbler	12	4	3	5	IV
Eastern towhee	12	3	4	5	VI
Indigo bunting	11	1	5	5	VI
Eastern bluebird	9	2	5	2	VI
Bachman's sparrow	9	4	2	3	VI
Lark sparrow	9	3	2	4	IV
Short Rotation Pine					
Bewick's wren	13	4	4	5	I
Prairie warbler	13	4	4	5	IV
Yellow-breasted chat	13	3	5	5	IV
Field sparrow	13	3	5	5	IV
Northern bobwhite	12	3	4	5	III
Northern flicker	12	3	5	4	VI
Blue-winged warbler	12	4	3	5	IV
Eastern towhee	12	3	4	5	IV
Black-and-white warbler	11	3	5	3	IV
Indigo bunting	11	1	5	5	VI
Wood thrush	10	4	3	3	IV
Eastern bluebird	9	2	5	2	VI
Bachman's sparrow	9	4	2	3	IV
Chestnut-sided warbler	7	2	2	3	VI

1 – Habitat scores are derived from TB (threats breeding), AI (area importance), and PT (population trend) scores, which are determined from CBO prioritization database.

2 - Action level refer to I – crisis recovery needed, II – immediate management or policy needed rangewide, III – management to reverse or stabilize populations, IV – long term planning is needed, V – investigations are needed to better define threats, VI – monitor population changes only.

APPENDIX C

Tennessee Natural Heritage Program Rare Vertebrates List January 2001

Watch-Listed in Tennessee

Scientific Name	Common Name	Physiographic Province	Federal Status	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	State Endemic?
BIRDS							
AMMODRAMUS LECONTEII	LE CONTE'S SPARROW				S1N	G4	
CALIDRIS ALPINA	DUNLIN				S3N	G5	
CAMPEPHILUS PRINCIPALIS	IVORY-BILLED WOODPECKER		LE		SX	G1	
CIRCUS CYANEUS	NORTHERN HARRIER			D	S4N	G5	
CISTOTHORUS PLATENSIS	SHORT-BILLED MARSH WREN				S3NSPB	G5	
DENDROICA PINUS	PINE WARBLER				S5	G5	
DOLICHONYX ORYZIVORUS	BOBOLINK				SHBS4N	G5	
ELANOIDES FORFICATUS	SWALLOW-TAILED KITE				SAN	G5	
LIMNODROMUS	LONG-BILLED DOWITCHER				S2N	G5	
SCOLOPACEUS							
MYCTERIA AMERICANA	WOOD STORK		(PS:LE)		S3N	G4	
PELECANUS	WHITE PELICAN				S3N	G3	
ERYTHRORHYNCHOS							
PICOIDES BOREALIS	RED-COCKADED WOODPECKER	CU CM BR WU CP	LE		SX	G3	
SCOLOPAX MINOR	AMERICAN WOODCOCK				S4B	G5	
VERMIVORA BACHMANII	BACHMAN'S WARBLER		LE		SX	G1	
VERMIVORA PINUS	BLUE-WINGED WARBLER				S4	G5	

Tracked in Tennessee

Scientific Name	Common Name	Physiographic Province	Federal Status	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	State Endemic?
BIRDS							
ACCIPITER GENTILIS	GOSHAWK				SPBS2N	G5	
ACCIPITER STRIATUS	SHARP-SHINNED HAWK	CU CM WR BR RV ER CP	(PS)	D	S3B	G5	
ACTITIS MACULARIA	SPOTTED SANDPIPER	CB			S2B	G5	
AEGOLIUS ACADICUS	NORTHERN SAW-WHET OWL	RV BR	MC	T	S1	G5	
AIMOPHILA AESTIVALIS	BACHMAN'S SPARROW	WR CU WU ER RV CP CB WF	MC	E	S2	G3	
AMMODRAMUS HENSLOWII	HENSLOW'S SPARROW	ER WR	MC	D	S1B	G4	
ANAS DISCORS	BLUE-WINGED TEAL				S2B	G5	
ANHINGA ANHINGA	ANHINGA	MF WR WU		D	S1B	G5	
AQUILA CHRYSAETOS	GOLDEN EAGLE	WR CB CU BR		T	S1	G5	
ARDEA ALBA	GREAT EGRET	WR MF RV BR CP		D	S2BS3N	G5	
BOTAURUS LENTIGINOSUS	AMERICAN BITTERN	ER WR			S1	G4	

Scientific Name	Common Name	Physiographic Province	Federal Status	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	State Endemic?
BUBULCUS IBIS	CATTLE EGRET						S2B53N G5
BUTEO LINEATUS	RED-SHOULDERED HAWK			MF CP WR WU RV CU ER CB			S4B G5
CAPRIMULGUS CAROLINENSIS	CHUCK-WILL'S WIDOW						S3S4 G5
CAPRIMULGUS VOCIFERUS	WHIP-POOR-WILL						S3S4 G5
CERTHIA AMERICANA	BROWN CREEPER						S2B54N G5
CHONDESTES GRAMMACUS	LARK SPARROW			CP WR WU CB MF		T	S1B G5
COCCYZUS	BLACK-BILLED CUCKOO						S2B G5
ERYTHROPTALMUS							
CONTOPUS COOPERI	OLIVE-SIDED FLYCATCHER				BR	D	S1 G5
CORVUS CORAX	COMMON RAVEN				BR RV	T	S2 G5
CORVUS OSSIFRAGUS	FISH CROW				MF		S3 G5
DENDROICA CERULEA	CERULEAN WARBLER			RV BR WR WU CM		D	S3B G4
DENDROICA FUSCA	BLACKBURNIAN WARBLER						S3B54N G5
DENDROICA MAGNOLIA	MAGNOLIA WARBLER						S1B54N G5
EGRETTA CAERULEA	LITTLE BLUE HERON			CP WR MF WU		D	S2B53N G5
EGRETTA THULA	SNOWY EGRET					D	S2B53N G5
EGRETTA TRICOLOR	LOUISIANA HERON						SPB G5
EMPIDONAX ALNORUM	ALDER FLYCATCHER				BR		S1 G5
EMPIDONAX MINIMUS	LEAST FLYCATCHER						S3 G5
EMPIDONAX TRAILLII	WILLOW FLYCATCHER					(PS)	S2S3 G5
EREMOPHILA ALPESTRIS	HORNED LARK						S4 G5
FALCO PEREGRINUS	PEREGRINE FALCON			BR CU RV CB MF		E	S1N G4
FULICA AMERICANA	AMERICAN COOT						S2B G5
GALLINULA CHLOROPUS	COMMON MOORHEN				RV MF	(PS)	D S1B G5
HALIAEETUS	BALD EAGLE			WR MF CP ER RV CB WU CU		T	D S3 G4
LEUCOCEPHALUS							
ICTINIA MISSISSIPPIENSIS	MISSISSIPPI KITE				MF CP		D S2S3 G5
IXOBRYCHUS EXILIS	LEAST BITTERN			RV MF ER CP CU CB			D S2B G5
LANIUS LUDOVICIANUS	LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE					MC	D S3 G5
LATERALLUS JAMAICENSIS	BLACK RAIL				RV		S1 G4
LIMNOTHLYPIS SWAINSONII	SWAINSON'S WARBLER			CP BR WR MF RV CU CM WU		MC	D S3 G4
LOXIA CURVIROSTRA	RED CROSSBILL						S1B52N G5
NYCTANASSA VIOLACEA	YELLOW-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON			RV CP MF CB			S3 G5
NYCTICORAX NYCTICORAX	BLACK-CROWNED NIGHT-HERON			CB RV MF CP			S2S3B G5
PASSERCULUS SANDWICHENSIS	SAVANNAH SPARROW			RV WR			S1B54N G5
PASSERINA CIRIS	PAINTED BUNTING						S2 G5
PODILYMBUS PODICEPS	PIED-BILLED GREBE				WR		S2 G5
POECILE ATRICAPILLUS	BLACK-CAPPED CHICKADEE					MC	D S2B G5
POECETES GRAMINEUS	VESPER SPARROW				BR WR		D S1B54N G5
PORPHYRULA MARTINICA	PURPLE GALLINULE				ER MF		S1B G5
RALLUS ELEGANS	KING RAIL				ER RV WR		D S2 G4G5
RALLUS LIMICOLA	VIRGINIA RAIL				RV		S1B53N G5
REGULUS SATRAPA	GOLDEN-CROWNED KINGLET				BR		S3B54N G5
RIPARIA RIPARIA	BANK SWALLOW				MF RV CB		S3 G5
SITTA CANADENSIS	RED-BREASTED NUTHATCH						S2B54N G5
SITTA PUSILLA	BROWN-HEADED NUTHATCH						S2B G5

Scientific Name	Common Name	Physiographic Province	Federal Status	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	State Endemic?
SPHYRAPICUS VARIUS	YELLOW-BELLIED SAPSUCKER	BR CP	MC	D	S1B54N	G5	
STERNA ANTILLARUM	INTERIOR LEAST TERN	MF	LE	E	S2S3B	G4T2Q	
ATHALASSOS							
THRYOMANES BEWICKII	BEWICK'S WREN	WR CP BR CB CM CU WU ER MF	MC	E	S1	G5	
TROGLODYTES	WINTER WREN				S3B54N	G5	
TROGLODYTES							
TYRANNUS FORFICATUS	SCISSOR-TAILED FLYCATCHER				S1BSAN	G5	
TYTO ALBA	COMMON BARN-OWL	CP MF RV CB BR WR ER		D	S3	G5	
VERMIVORA CHRYSOPTERA	GOLDEN-WINGED WARBLER		MC	D	S3B	G4	
VIREO BELLII	BELL'S VIREO	CP	(PS)		SPB	G5	

Physiographic Provinces

Physiographic province information provides a broad concept of a species' distribution in Tennessee and can be indicative of a particular geologic development or age in Tennessee.

- BR Blue Ridge
- CB Central Basin
- CM Cumberland Mountains
- CP Coastal Plain
- CU Cumberland Plateau
- ER Eastern Highland Rim
- MF Mississippi Floodplain
- RV Ridge and Valley
- SV Sequatchie Valley
- WR Western Highland Rim
- WU Western Uplands

Federal Status

Federally listed animals are protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (as amended), and the list is maintained by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In Tennessee, listing and recovery responsibilities are divided between two USFWS offices, in Cookeville, TN, and Asheville, NC. Please visit <http://southeast.fws.gov/> for additional information about USFWS activities in Tennessee.

The USFWS simplified the assignment of various "candidate species" designations in 1997, and those changes are reflected here. Applicable federal statuses are defined as follows, based on nomenclature adopted by The Nature Conservancy and the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency:

LE	Listed Endangered	Taxon is threatened by extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range
E/SA	Endangered by Similarity of Appearance	Taxon is treated as an endangered species because it may not be easily distinguished from a listed

		species
LT	Listed Threatened	Taxon is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future
T/SA	Threatened by Similarity of Appearance	Taxon is treated as a threatened species because it may not be easily distinguished from a listed species
PE	Proposed Endangered	Taxon proposed for listing as endangered
PT	Proposed Threatened	Taxon proposed for listing as threatened
C	Candidate species***	Taxon for which the USFWS has sufficient information to support proposals to list the species as threatened or endangered, and for which the Service anticipates a listing proposal
MC	Management Concern	Unofficial federal status for potential future candidate species
(PS)	Partial Status (based on taxonomy)	Taxon which is listed in part of its range, but for which Tennessee subspecies are NOT included in the Federal designation
(PS:status)	Partial Status (based on political boundaries)	Taxon which is listed in part of its range, but for which Tennessee populations are NOT included in the Federal designation e.g. (PS:LE)
(status, XN)	Non-essential experimental population in portion of range	Taxon which has been introduced or re-introduced in an area from which it has been extirpated, and for which certain provisions of the Act may not apply

(Modified from Federal Register, 50 CFR Part 17.11 {31 December 1999})

*** Taxa listed as candidate species may be added to the list of Endangered and Threatened species, and as such, consideration should be given to them in environmental planning. Taxa listed as LE, LT, PE, and PT must be given consideration in environmental planning involving federal funds, lands, or permits, and should be given consideration in all non-federal activities. For further information, please contact the Tennessee Field Office of the USFWS, 446 Neal Street, Cookeville, TN 38501; (931) 528-6481.

State Status

In Tennessee, vertebrates, mollusks and crustaceans may be formally listed by the TWRA as Endangered, Threatened, or "Deemed in Need of Management" (T.C.A. 70-8-104, 70-8-105, 70-8-107). No insects or arachnids can be listed by the TWRA, but may be listed by the USFWS.

E	Endangered	Any species or subspecies of wildlife whose prospects of survival or recruitment within the state are in jeopardy or are likely to become so within the foreseeable future.
T	Threatened	Any species or subspecies of wildlife that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future.
D	"Deemed in Need of Management"	Any species or subspecies of nongame wildlife which the executive director of the TWRA believes should be investigated in order to develop information relating to populations, distribution, habitat needs, limiting factors, and other biological and ecological data to determine management measures necessary for their continued ability to sustain themselves successfully. This category is analogous to "Special Concern".
PE	Proposed Endangered	Proposed as Endangered by the TWRA for consideration by the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Commission
PT	Proposed Threatened	Proposed as Threatened by the TWRA for consideration by the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Commission
PD	Proposed "Deemed"	Proposed as Deemed in Need of Management by the TWRA for consideration by the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Commission

Note: Many species presented in this list may have neither a state nor federal designation, however are considered rare by the DNH and should be evaluated during the environmental review process. Information is collected on these species in order to minimize the necessity of listing these taxa as Endangered or Threatened.

GRANK and SRANK

As a guide in setting conservation priorities, TNC developed a ranking system for estimating the abundance of plants and animals tracked by Heritage programs. The Global Rank (GRANK) is assigned by TNC Central Zoology staff based on the best range wide (global) abundance information for each taxon. A five-tier system (G1-G5) is used to describe rarity, from G1 (extremely rare) to G5 (widespread). The same system is applied by DNH to assign the State Rank (SRANK), which describes the species' abundance within our state borders.

SRANK and GRANK are based primarily upon the number of occurrences of the element (species) within the state and range wide, respectively. For obscure or under-studied species, ranks are based on the best available information, and consideration may be given to other factors influencing the rarity of each taxon.

SRANKs used in this list are defined below. GRANKs are similarly defined, except that ranking criteria apply range wide (e.g. an S1 species is "extremely rare" in the state, and a G1 species is "extremely rare" range wide).

S1	Extremely rare and critically imperiled in the state with five or fewer occurrences, or very few remaining individuals, or because of some special condition where the species is particularly vulnerable to extinction.
S2	Very rare and imperiled within the state, six to twenty occurrences, or few remaining individuals, or because of some factor(s) making it vulnerable to extinction.
S3	Rare and uncommon in the state, from 21-100 occurrences.
S4	Widespread, abundant, and apparently secure within the state, but with cause for long-term concern.
S5	Demonstrably widespread and secure in the state
SH	Of historical occurrence in Tennessee, e.g. formally part of the established biota, with the expectation that it may be rediscovered.
SU	Can not be ranked using available information.
SX	Believed to be extirpated from the state.
S#S#	Denotes a "range rank" because the rarity of the species is uncertain (e.g. S1S3).
S?	Unranked at this time
SE	Exotic species established in the state
SE#	Exotic numeric (e.g. European starling would be SE5)
SP	Potentially occurring in Tennessee, but not yet documented by DNH
_N	Occurs in Tennessee in a non-breeding status (several birds)
_B	Breeds in Tennessee
SA	Accidental or casual in the state (several birds)
SR	Reported from the state, but insufficient data to assign rank
SRF	Reported falsely from the state
HYB	Hybrid within its range in Tennessee
SSYN	Synonym for another species
_Q	Questionable taxonomy (GRANKS only)

_T#	Subspecific taxon rank (GRANKS only)
<p><i>Numerous bird species are ranked for breeding and non-breeding status in Tennessee, e.g. RED-BREASTED NUTHATCH (S2B54N), is more common as a wintering or migratory species than as a breeding species.</i></p>	

Note: Those species having an SRANK of S1 to S3, state endemics, and species with limited distribution in Tennessee should be given special consideration in environmental planning. For further information contact DNH at (615) 532-9695.

State Endemic

If a species is endemic to Tennessee (occurs nowhere else), it may be categorized as follows:

Y, Yes	Endemic to Tennessee
P, Probable	Probably endemic to Tennessee
B, Breeding	Endemic to the state as a breeder only



Department of Environment & Conservation
 401 Church Street, 21st Floor
 Nashville, TN 37243-0435
 615.532.0104

**US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, SPECIES OF CONSERVATION
CONCERN (2002) in the CENTRAL HARDWOODS (BCR 24)**

Peregrine Falcon
Stilt Sandpiper
Buff-breasted Sandpiper
Short-eared Owl
Whip-poor-will
Red-headed Woodpecker
Bell's Vireo
Bewick's Wren
Wood Thrush
Blue-winged Warbler
Prairie Warbler
Cerulean Warbler
Worm-eating Warbler
Swainson's Warbler
Louisiana Waterthrush
Bachman's Sparrow
Henslow's Sparrow
Le Conte's Sparrow
Smith's Longspur
Rusty Blackbird