Comprehensive Conservation Plan

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge

September 2004

Prepared by:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
PO Box 568
Dugway, Utah 84022

and

Division of Refuge Planning
Region 6
PO Box 25486 DFC
Lakewood, CO 80225

Approved by:

Ralph O. Morgenweck
Regional Director, Region 6
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

9/24/04
Date

Comprehensive Conservation Plan Approval

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge

Submitted by:

Jay Banta

09-17-04

Jay Banta
Refuge Manager
Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dugway, Utah

Date

Concurred with:

Steve Berendzen

9/24/04

Steve Berendzen
Refuge Program Supervisor
Montana, Utah, and Wyoming
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

Date

and

Ron Shuey ACTING

9/24/04

Richard A. Coleman, Ph.D.
Assistant Regional Director
National Wildlife Refuge System
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

Date

Contents

Summary S-1

Chapter 1. Introduction 1
- Area Description 1
- The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Refuge System 5
- Purpose of and Need for the Comprehensive Conservation Plan 6
- History of Refuge Establishment, Acquisition, and Management 7
- Refuge Purpose 9
- Refuge Vision Statement 9
- Refuge Goals 9
- Legal and Policy Guidance 10

Chapter 2. Planning Process 11
- Description of Planning Process 11
- Planning Issues 12

Chapter 3. Refuge and Resource Descriptions 14
- Geographic/Ecosystem Setting 14
- Topography 15
- Soils 15
- Water 15
- Water Rights 16
- Climate 16
- Habitat and Vegetation 16
- Wildlife 19
- Cultural Resources and History of Refuge Lands 24
- Fire Occurrence and History 25
- Visitor Services 25
- Wilderness 26
- Socioeconomics 27

Chapter 4. Management Direction 28
- Management for Wildlife Diversity 28
- Habitat 31
- Ecological Integrity 34
- Visitor Services 42

Cultural Resources 46
Partnerships..... 48

Chapter 5. Implementation and Monitoring 50
Personnel..... 50
Funding..... 50
Step-down Management Plans..... 51
Partnership Opportunities..... 52
Monitoring and Evaluation..... 52
Plan Amendment and Revision..... 53

Tables

Table 1. Estimated waterfowl populations from 1997 to 2002. 20
Table 2. Estimated waterfowl production from 1988 to 1995..... 20
Table 3. Nest success of rookery sites for colonial wading birds by species for the years 1994-1996. 21
Table 4. Nest success of colonial wading birds in Refuge units for the years 1994-1996..... 21
Table 5. Public use at Fish Springs NWR, 1995-2002..... 26
Table 6. Unit drawdown and prescribed burning sequence..... 28
Table 7. Target water elevations for marsh units under 1991 Marsh Management Plan..... 32
Table 8. Suggested indicator species. 33
Table 9. Step-down management plans for Fish Springs NWR. 51

Figures

Figure 1. Interior Basin Ecosystem and National Wildlife Refuges in Utah. 2
Figure 2. Ancient Lake Bonneville. 3
Figure 3. Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge Units and Pools. 4
Figure 4. Fish Springs NWR about 1958 at Time of Refuge Establishment. 8
Figure 5. Habitat Types. 18
Figure 6. Harrison Unit Restoration 38
Figure 7. Hunting. 44
Figure 8. Public Use. 45
Figure 9. Proposed Organizational Chart for Fish Springs NWR. 50

Glossary

Appendices

Appendix A. Key Legislation and Policies
Appendix B. Compatibility Determinations
Appendix C. Planning Team
Appendix D. Environmental Compliance
Appendix E. Section 7 Biological Evaluation
Appendix F. Mailing List
Appendix G. Species List for Fish Springs NWR
Appendix H. Refuge Operating Needs System
Appendix I. Maintenance Management System

Bibliography

Summary

This document is a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). The CCP will guide management of Refuge operations, habitat restoration and visitor services for the next 15 years by providing clear goals and objectives, implementation strategies, and recommended staffing and funding for the Refuge.

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), comprising 17,992 acres, is located in western Utah in Juab County. Springs flowing from the eastern base of the Fish Springs Range feed a 10,000-acre saline marsh divided into nine impoundments. The remaining portion comprises 6,000 acres of mud and alkali flat and 2,000 acres of semidesert upland. The Refuge provides the only important wetland habitat for a 70-mile radius, attracting hundreds of wetland-dependent species during migration. Since Refuge establishment, more than 278 species of birds have been seen at Fish Springs NWR, 61 of which nest on the Refuge. Fish Springs NWR was established by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission in 1959 "…for use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds."

The goals set forth in the CCP for Fish Springs NWR are:

Habitat: Improve and maintain habitat for nesting and wintering migratory birds and other wildlife populations of the Bonneville Basin.

Ecological Integrity: Perpetuate the native biodiversity of the Bonneville Basin as represented on Fish Springs NWR.

Cultural Resources: Preserve, protect, and promote an understanding of cultural resources on Fish Springs NWR.

Visitor Services: Promote an understanding and appreciation of the fish, wildlife, and natural and cultural history of Fish Springs NWR by providing high quality environmental education, interpretation, and wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities for persons of all abilities.

Partnerships: Promote partnerships to preserve and enhance the natural characteristics of the Bonneville Basin ecosystem in which Fish Springs NWR plays a key role.

These goals will help fulfill the mission and goals of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 stipulates that a written assessment must be made of any action proposed by an agency of the Federal Government that significantly affects the quality of the human environment or has significant impacts on the affected State or Federal land. NEPA also requires Federal decision makers to study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to the recommended action. Views of other Federal and State agencies and the public are solicited during the decision making process. An environmental assessment (EA) was prepared to accompany the Draft CCP. The proposed action was to prepare and implement the CCP, or Management for Wildlife Diversity Alternative.

Chapter 1. Introduction

Area Description

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), located in western Utah in Juab County (Figure 1 and Figure 2), is one of the most isolated refuges in the lower 48 states. The nearest neighbors reside in Callao, Utah, a ranching community of about 45 people, 24 miles west of the Refuge. The nearest communities with services are Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 63 miles to the northeast and Delta, Utah, 78 miles to the southeast. The Refuge consists of 17,992 acres of fee-title land surrounded on the east, west, and south by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holdings and on the north by the U.S. Army's Dugway Proving Ground. Springs flowing from the eastern base of the Fish Springs Range feed a 10,000-acre saline marsh divided into nine impoundments (Figure 3). The remaining portion comprises 6,000 acres of mud and alkali flat and 2,000 acres of semidesert upland.

Fish Springs NWR sits in a valley at the eastern front of the Fish Springs Range. The Great Salt Lake Desert is to the north, with the small Thomas and Dugway Ranges to the east and the House Range to the south closing the basin. The valley is about 10 miles wide and 20 miles long. The Fish Springs Range is characterized by rocky outcroppings and lava peaks with some areas devoid of vegetation. The Refuge is entirely within the Interior Basins ecoregion. Within the expanse of that ecoregion, the Refuge lies within the sub-unit known as the Bonneville Basin.

The Refuge was established because of its historic attraction to waterfowl. During fall migrations, 30,000 ducks have been recorded. Since establishment, more than 278 species of birds have been seen at Fish Springs NWR, 61 of which are known to nest on the Refuge. The Refuge provides the only important wetland habitat for a 70-mile radius. Consequently, the Refuge attracts hundreds of wetland-dependent species during migration. More than 40 species spend the winter at the Refuge.

Fish Springs NWR has an extraordinarily rich and diverse human history. As a source of bountiful resources in a very arid and often hostile environment, it has likely been a focal point of human existence as long as 11,000 years. Evidence of such pre-historic occupation can be found over nearly all of the Refuge. Two caves within the Refuge boundary, located on the east face of the northern tip of the Fish Springs Range, are part of a National Archaeological District.

USFWS

Fish Springs NWR

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Figure 1 -

Interior Basin Ecosystem and National Wildlife Refuges in Utah



0 30 60 90 120 Miles

National Wildlife Refuge

USFWS Interior Basin Ecosystem

N


U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Figure 2 -
Ancient Lake Bonneville
Eastern Great Basin
IDAHO
NEVADA
UTAH
WYOMING
UTAH
Logan
BEAR RIVER NWR
Ogden
GREAT SALT LAKE
SALT LAKE CITY
Provo
LAKE UTAH
FISH SPRINGS NWR
SEVIER LAKE
Cedar City
15
84
80
70
Ancient Lake Bonneville
Existing Features
National Wildlife Refuge
Interstate Highway
Existing Lakes
N
20 0 20 40 Miles

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Figure 3

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge Units and Pools

Fish Springs, Utah



Euro-American history of the Refuge begins in 1827 with the first documented visit to the marsh by famed mountain man and pioneering explorer Jedediah Smith. Smith stopped at Fish Springs on one of his trips to California. The first documented Euro-American occupation at the marsh was in 1859. In 1860, Fish Springs became a stop on the Pony Express Route and Overland Stage routes. In 1861, the Transcontinental Telegraph line passed through Fish Springs. In 1913, the Lincoln Highway, the nation's first transcontinental automobile road, passed through Fish Springs to skirt the often impassable salt flats to the north. It is estimated that at the peak usage period for the Lincoln Highway, over 5,000 cars passed each year, compared to less than 2,500 cars currently. Several segments of the Lincoln Highway are still visible in Refuge uplands.

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Refuge System

The National Wildlife Refuge System was started 100 years ago with an Executive Order, signed by President Theodore Roosevelt, protecting pelicans, ibises, and spoonbills on a small and unpretentious island from market hunters. In 1997, the mission and administrative policy for all refuges in the Refuge System was established with the passage of the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act. It also outlined the importance of the six priority public uses (hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, environmental education, and interpretation) and how they should be promoted, except where incompatible with the purpose of the individual refuge or the Refuge System as a whole. A formal process for determining compatibility was also established with this Act. From the first Executive Order to the most recent Act, the overriding principle that guides the Refuge System is that wildlife comes first.

The Service, which administers the Refuge System, is the only Federal agency whose primary responsibility is fish, wildlife, and plant conservation. The National Wildlife Refuge System is the world's largest and most diverse collection of lands set aside specifically for wildlife. 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.*" Goals of the Refuge System are aimed at fulfilling this mission. Some major goals are to provide for specific classes of wildlife species for which the Federal government is ultimately responsible. These "trust resources" are defined by the purpose of the refuge and include threatened and endangered species, migratory birds, and anadromous fish. Most refuges provide breeding, migration, or wintering habitat for these species. Nearly all refuges also supply habitat for big game species and resident or non-migratory wildlife as well.

Goals of the National Wildlife Refuge System are:

1. To fulfill our statutory duty to achieve refuge purpose(s) and further the Refuge System mission.
2. Conserve, restore where appropriate, and enhance all species of fish, wildlife, and plants that are endangered or threatened with becoming endangered.
3. Perpetuate migratory bird, interjurisdictional fish, and marine mammal populations.
4. Conserve a diversity of fish, wildlife, and plants.

5. Conserve and restore, where appropriate, representative ecosystems of the United States, including the ecological processes characteristic of those ecosystems.
6. To foster understanding and instill appreciation of fish, wildlife, and plants, and their conservation, by providing the public with safe, high-quality, and compatible wildlife-dependent public use. Such use includes hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation.

Individual refuges provide specific requirements for the preservation of trust resources. For example, migratory bird refuges in Utah provide important wetland habitats to support populations of birds as required by the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (MBCA). Fish Springs NWR supports migrating and breeding populations of waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds. These birds migrate to and from at least 10 different states and several Canadian provinces. After visiting Fish Springs NWR, many move on to winter on refuges in the southwest or breed on refuges in Alaska. This network of lands is critical to these birds' survival; any deficiency in one location will affect these species and the entire network's ability to maintain adequate populations.

Other refuges may provide habitat for endangered plants or animals that exist in unique habitats found only in very few locations. Refuges in these situations promote the protection of local populations and their habitat. By providing a broad network of lands throughout the United States with secure habitat and opportunities for recovery, refuges help prevent species from being listed as endangered.

Under the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, six wildlife-dependent recreational uses are recognized as priority public uses of refuge lands. These are hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, environmental education, and interpretation. These and other uses are allowed on refuges only after finding that they are compatible with the purpose of the refuge. Uses are allowed through a special regulation process, individual special use permits, and sometimes through State fishing and hunting regulations.

Purpose of and Need for the Comprehensive Conservation Plan

The purpose of the CCP is to describe the goals established for Fish Springs NWR, and the objectives and strategies needed to meet the goals. The goals for Fish Springs NWR are presented in Chapter 4.

The CCP is needed for several reasons. Loss of habitat in the Pacific Flyway has been substantial and continuous, primarily through conversion of wetlands to agriculture. The scope of Federal trust resources has expanded to include threatened and endangered species. Knowledge among wildlife professionals has expanded. Legislative mandates to protect cultural resources must be met. A need exists to describe how Fish Springs NWR can best contribute to efforts to protect our wildlife resources for present and future generations.

The CCP will provide the Refuge Manager with a 15-year management plan for the conservation of wildlife, fish, and plant resources and their related habitats, while providing opportunities for compatible wildlife-dependent recreational uses. The CCP, when fully implemented, will achieve Refuge purposes; help fulfill the Refuge System mission; maintain and, where

appropriate, restore the ecological integrity of the Refuge and the Refuge System; and meet other mandates.

History of Refuge Establishment, Acquisition, and Management

The lands comprising Fish Springs NWR have been part of the Service's National Wildlife Refuge System since 1959. The authorization for the creation of the Fish Springs NWR dates from Migratory Bird Conservation Commission approval on June 18, 1958. The first property acquisition was recorded on March 10, 1959, when 2,160 acres were purchased from the Fish Springs Livestock and Fur Company, and 160 acres were purchased from Charles and Buelah Walker of Salt Lake City, Utah. On March 12, 1959, about 1,455 acres were purchased from the State of Utah. During that same time period, 14,097 acres were withdrawn from existing public domains under Public Land Order 1942 for inclusion in the Refuge. An additional 120 acres of lands were withdrawn from public domain holdings under Public Land Order 2563 in 1961, bringing the acreage total to the present 17,992.

Interest in the possibility of establishing a national wildlife refuge at the base of the Fish Springs Range was as early as 1934. During that year, J. Clark Salyer, Director of the Migratory Bird Program under the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Biological Survey, became aware of land in the area with potential waterfowl values that might be for sale. He directed George Mushback, Game Management Agent-In-Charge of the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, to visit the area and file a report. While Mushback reported that he felt that it would "offer very good possibilities for nesting, feeding, and concentration" of waterfowl, no further action was taken on acquisition at that time.

Renewed interest by Director Ira Gabrielson in 1938 led to additional on-site surveys. Charles C. Sperry, tasked with assessing waterfowl food supplies, reported that they were quite limited and that Fish Springs should not be considered for addition to the National Wildlife Refuge System. A visit by C. S. Williams, a wildlife biologist assigned to the Wildlife Research Lab at Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, in September of 1938 resulted in a report that indicated that Fish Springs "in the past has been a good waterfowl area. By proper management it can be made even better." However, Vanez T. Wilson, the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge Manager, visited the area in December of 1938 and reported that "the Fish Springs area, in my opinion, does not lend itself to extensive development." No further reconnaissance of the Fish Springs area was noted until a summer visit in 1941 by Reuel Janson who reported that "the Fish Springs marsh possesses considerable qualification for a waterfowl refuge." No further written record has been found until 1958 when acquisition of the Refuge was approved (Figure 4).

A Master Plan for the "Physical and Biological Development" of the Refuge was written in 1960. Construction of the physical infrastructure for impounding the springs was implemented in three phases between 1961 and 1965. Phase One included the excavation of the Main Distribution Canal, which runs through the center of the Refuge and the north dike on Harrison Unit. Phase Two, begun in 1962, included the construction of the north dike of Avocet Unit and the north dike of Curlew Unit. Phase Three, completed from 1963 to 1965, involved the construction of all remaining major dikes and structures for Mallard, Shoveler, Egret, Pintail, Ibis, and Gadwall Units.



Figure 4. Fish Springs NWR about 1958 at Time of Refuge Establishment.

Biological "objectives" identified in the original Master Plan included: providing resting and feeding areas for tundra swans, Canada geese, redheads, mallards, and greater sandhill cranes; inducing Canada goose nesting; and re-establishing nesting use of the area by greater sandhill cranes.

Public use plans in the original Master Plan included parking areas and designated access routes to the public hunting area, preservation of items of historical interest, establishment of a picnic area near the Thomas Ranch house, and designation of a tour route through the marsh.

Refuge Purpose

Fish Springs NWR was established under the MBCA by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. The stated purpose is "…for use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds" (16 U.S.C. 715d). Past management at the Refuge was focused on waterfowl production. However, after many years of trying, waterfowl production never reached a substantial level. From 1991 to 1995, the Refuge Manager and the Regional Office of the Service reviewed and discussed the best use for the Refuge. It was decided that marsh management should be altered to accommodate the habitat needs of other migratory birds as well, namely shorebirds and water birds. The MBCA supports this because the Refuge supports many birds other than waterfowl.

Refuge Vision Statement

Fish Springs NWR will continue to conserve native fish, wildlife, plants and their habitats. Water and a diversity of habitats will be available to migratory birds and other indigenous wildlife within the physiographic region known as the Bonneville Basin of the Interior Basin ecoregion. The Refuge is vital to the conservation of migratory birds, interjurisdictional fish, threatened and endangered species, and the habitats on which these species depend. The Refuge will continue to be managed in accordance with sound management principals to provide a wide range of wildlife-related recreation and learning opportunities, including hunting, wildlife observation, and connecting with nature. The preservation and sharing of the cultural past of the area, both on a local and national scale, is an added benefit of Fish Springs NWR.

Refuge Goals

- **Overall Goal:** Provide habitat for maximum wildlife diversity.
- **Habitat**: Improve and maintain habitat for nesting and wintering migratory birds and other wildlife populations of the Bonneville Basin.
- **Ecological Integrity**: Perpetuate the native biodiversity and physical characteristics of the Bonneville Basin as represented on Fish Springs NWR.
- **March Restoration of Harrison Unit**: Restore a portion of Fish Springs NWR to the native biodiversity and physical characteristics of the Bonneville Basin as represented on Fish Springs, including unimpeded hydrological, physical, and biological components.
- **Cultural Resources**: Preserve, protect, and promote an understanding of cultural resources on Fish Springs NWR.
- **Visitor Services**: Promote an understanding and appreciation of the fish, wildlife, and natural and cultural history of Fish Springs NWR by providing high quality environmental education, interpretation, and wildlife-

dependent recreational opportunities for persons of all abilities.

- **Partnerships**: Promote partnerships to preserve and enhance the natural characteristics of the Bonneville Basin ecosystem in which Fish Springs NWR plays a key role.

Legal and Policy Guidance

Administration of the Department of the Interior, the Service, and the National Wildlife Refuge System is guided by international treaties, Federal laws, and Presidential Executive Orders. Refuge management options are further refined by administrative guidelines established by the Secretary of the Interior and policy guidelines established by the Director of the Service.

Treaties, laws, administrative guidelines, and policy guidelines assist the Refuge Manager in making decisions pertaining to soil, water, air, flora, fauna, and other natural resources, historic and cultural resources, research, and recreation on refuge lands.

Other key legislative policies that direct management of refuges include the Endangered Species Act (1973), Clean Water Act (1977), Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (1965), Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918), and Executive Order 12996 Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System (1996). These and other Acts and Executive Orders that guide Refuge System activities are listed in Appendix A. The Service also provides its own policy guidelines, which can be found in refuge manuals.

Chapter 2. Planning Process

Description of Planning Process

Comprehensive Conservation Plans (CCPs) provide a clear and comprehensive statement of desired future conditions for each refuge or planning unit. CCPs provide long-range guidance and management direction to achieve refuge purposes, help fulfill the Refuge System mission, and maintain or restore the ecological integrity of each refuge and the Refuge System. Additional goals of the CCP process include using science and sound professional judgment to support management decisions, ensuring the six priority public uses receive consideration during the preparation of the CCP, providing a public forum for stakeholders and interested parties to have input into refuge management decisions, and providing a uniform basis for funding.

The CCP planning process consists of the following eight steps. Although the steps are listed sequentially, CCP planning and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation can be iterative. Some of the steps may be repeated, or more than one step can occur at the same time.

1. **Preplanning** - form core team, identify needs
2. **Identify Issues and Develop Vision** - gather public input on issues
3. **Develop Goals and Objectives** - from issues, resource relationships, legal responsibilities
4. **Develop and Analyze Alternatives** - including the Proposed Action
5. **Prepare Draft Plan and NEPA Document** - assess environmental effects, gather public comments on draft plan
6. **Prepare and Adopt Final Plan**
7. **Implement Plan, Monitor and Evaluate**
8. **Review and Revise Plan**

Comprehensive conservation planning efforts for Fish Springs began in March 1999 with a meeting of regional management and planning staff and field station employees from Fish Springs NWR at Refuge headquarters in Utah. At that meeting, a Core Planning Team, consisting of the Service, Bureau of Land Management, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, U.S. Army Dugway Proving Ground, and the Utah State Historical Society was designated. A Notice of Intent to prepare a CCP was published in the Federal Register in September of that same year (64 Fed. Reg. 49228 (September 10, 1999)). Public Issues Workbooks were distributed during the Refuge's annual Open House, also in September. From there, work progressed on developing draft Refuge vision, goals, and objectives. However, work was discontinued in September 2000 due to changes in Refuge management and priorities for the regional planning division.

Planning efforts were re-initiated in November of 2001. Issues Workbooks were

sent to 40 individuals and organizations in February 2002, followed by two public meetings in March—one in Salt Lake City, the other in Partoun, Utah. Neither public meeting was attended by the public. Eight completed Issues Workbooks were returned to the Core Planning Team. Further scoping was conducted during a Core Planning Team meeting in April 2002 where each Team member was given the opportunity to discuss concerns, recommendations, and ideas. The Core Planning Team then revised the draft Refuge vision, goals, and management alternatives and evaluated the environmental consequences of each alternative.

The CCP, signed by the Regional Director, provides direction to the Refuge Manger and staff. Copies of the CCP will be provided upon request to all interested parties.

Planning Issues

Issues identified during the scoping process are presented here. This is a synopsis of all comments received, including those from individuals, organizations, State agencies, and other Federal agencies.

Wildlife and Habitat

There was support for managing the Refuge for a diversity of wildlife, with the current emphasis in marsh areas on waterfowl, shorebirds, and other water birds. The quality of the high desert shrubland habitat should be improved. Some concern exists for the well-being of endangered and threatened species and State species of concern. Additionally, some respondents called for protecting invertebrates in the springs, with particular emphasis given to controlling the spread of the nonnative snail, *Melanoides tuberculata*. A number of respondents saw the need for a greatly enhanced biological inventory and assessment program. Some support occurred for expanding the Refuge into nearby salt-flats and springs.

Exotic Species

Concern about the spread of exotic species, both plant and animal, was expressed. Increased control efforts are needed. However, concern with the use of chemicals to control weeds was also expressed.

Cultural Resources

There was support for the University of Utah to continue its archaeological summer field school on the Refuge. The two caves on the Refuge should be excavated. Interpretation of cultural and historic resources should be improved and expanded.

Public Use

Respondents were happy with the level of public access on the Refuge. Development of a nearby off-site campground to accommodate visitors was recommended. Conflicting opinions on hunting and trapping were voiced. Some felt a goose hunt should be implemented in addition to current hunting opportunities. Others supported no hunting or trapping on the Refuge, believing these activities are incompatible with the purpose of the Refuge. It was also requested that the Service work on eliminating the inconsistencies in hunting regulations on different refuges within Utah.

Administration/Operations

The need for additional staff for the Refuge was a concern for some respondents. The Refuge is especially in need of a biologist. A request was made to break down the Refuge budget into administration, conservation, and public use/hunting for

comparison purposes. Partnerships with Dugway Proving Ground should be expanded in light of the commonality between the two regarding habitat types and species present, especially threatened and endangered species.

Chapter 3. Refuge and Resource Descriptions

Geographic/Ecosystem Setting

Fish Springs NWR, located in western Utah in Juab County (Figure 1 and Figure 2), is one of the most isolated refuges in the lower 48 states. The nearest neighbors reside in Callao, Utah, a ranching community of about 45 people 24 miles west of the Refuge. The nearest communities with services are Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 63 miles to the northeast and Delta, Utah, 78 miles to the southeast. The Refuge consists of 17,992 acres of fee-title land surrounded on the east, west, and south by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holdings and on the north by the U.S. Army's Dugway Proving Ground. Springs flowing from the eastern base of the Fish Springs Range feed a 10,000-acre saline marsh divided into nine impoundments (Figure 3). The remaining of the Refuge comprises 6,000 acres of mud and alkali flat and 2,000 acres of semidesert upland.

The Refuge lies entirely within the Interior Basins ecoregion. Within the expanse of that ecoregion, the Refuge is within the subunit known as the Bonneville Basin. The Bonneville Basin comprises the area once covered by the prehistoric Lake Bonneville (Figure 2). Lake Bonneville, a landlocked basin about the size of the State of Montana, was filled about 35,000 years ago and fluctuated with wet and dry cycles until about 15,000 years ago, inundating much of the eastern portions of the Great Basin. At that time, the lake rose to a level that breached a pass in southern Idaho, eroded a large cut, and began draining into the Snake and Columbia Rivers. After a period of about 6 months, Lake Bonneville dropped an estimated 400 feet.

Over the next 4,500 years, Lake Bonneville continued to drop from evaporative losses exceeding inflows. Based on consistent carbon dating for the first organic layer in soil coring samples, the University of Utah has determined that the lake receded to the point where Fish Springs became a marsh type wetland about 11,400 years ago.

Wetlands found at the Refuge are associated with of a series of thermal springs that emerge from a fault line at the base of the east slope of the Fish Springs Range. Five major and several minor springs and seeps provide an average flow of about 29 cubic feet per second resulting in an average annual inflow of about 22,000 acre-feet of water. All Refuge springs exhibit thermal influence with the average spring water temperature being 74 degrees Fahrenheit. The springs are high in dissolved minerals, which results in a water pH of about 7.8. Groundwater recharge for the Refuge springs is believed to be regional rather than local due to the large volume in such an arid climate. Carbon-14 analysis aging indicates that water emanating from the Refuge springs probably fell as precipitation from 9,000 to 14,000 years ago.

The wetlands of Fish Springs NWR are about 75 miles south of the Great Salt Lake and are a major migration point for wetland birds migrating to and from the

lake. The wetlands of Fish Springs NWR comprise a greater acreage than all of the wetlands combined in all directions for a distance of more than 70 miles. As such, the Refuge provides critical migration habitat for a diverse array of wetland birds. Located on the eastern edge of the Pacific Flyway, the Refuge receives waterfowl from the Canadian Arctic and several Prairie Provinces, as well as birds originating in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah.

Topography

Fish Springs NWR is located in a valley at the eastern front of the Fish Springs Range. The Great Salt Lake Desert to the north, the small Thomas and Dugway Ranges to the east, and the House Range to the south close the basin. The valley is about 10 miles wide and 20 miles long. The Fish Springs Range is characterized by rocky outcroppings and lava peaks with some areas devoid of vegetation. The peaks are full of caves and crevices.

The Great Basin is composed topographically of long, narrow, and steep mountain ranges running north-south with fairly flat basins between these mountain ranges. The basin, where the Fish Springs marsh is found, is bordered on the west by the Fish Springs Range and on the east by the Dugway and Thomas Ranges. The Refuge Headquarters sits at an elevation of 4,330 feet and the highest point in the surrounding mountains is 8,523 feet. The portion of the Refuge supporting wetlands is very flat with a minimum elevation of 4,287 feet and a maximum elevation of 4,305 feet.

Between the marsh and the Fish Springs Mountains to the west is a belt (about 6,000 acres) of semidesert uplands composed primarily of greasewood and shadscale. These uplands are flat to gently rolling and soon give way to the shallow marsh. Ancient Lake Bonneville once covered the area except for the peaks of the ranges. The elevation of the Refuge varies from 4,285 to 4,700 feet with a small portion of the Fish Springs Range accounting for elevations above 4,350 feet.

The Refuge's topography was significantly altered in the 1960s with the construction of nine dikes at varying distances from the springs. The dikes created nine impoundments on the Refuge (clockwise from Refuge headquarters: Mallard, Shoveler, Pintail, Harrison, Gadwall, Ibis, Egret, Curlew and Avocet (Figure 3).

Soils

The semidesert uplands leading from the Fish Springs Range to the marsh contain alluvial soils with a high gravel content. Mud and alkali flats surround the eastern, northern, and southern limits of the marsh areas. The marsh soils are generally sandy-clay, about 6 feet deep. These soils occur on top of an impervious hardpan layer. Peat deposits, 4 feet deep or less, occur in the drainage areas downstream from the major springs. These soils are mildly alkaline, having a pH of about 8.0.

In the southern part of the Refuge and along the northern boundary are extensive areas of extremely alkaline soil—the salt flats. On the western edge of the Refuge, rocky outcrops produce an accompanying ground cover of coarse fractured rock. Alluvial deposits of coarse gravel are located in two areas west of the marsh. These deposits were left when ancient Lake Bonneville receded.

Water

After establishment of Fish Springs NWR in 1959, the approximately 10,000-acre marsh was divided into nine units that receive their water supply from warm saline springs rising under artesian

pressure and emanating at the base of the Fish Springs Range. These springs receive recharge from precipitation falling on the Fish Springs Range and Deep Creek Range 25 miles to the west. In addition, some spring recharge may occur from deep ground-water movement from Deep Creek, Snake and Tule Valleys. Movement of groundwater over these large distances is through unconsolidated basin fill as well as solution openings and fractures in the deep, consolidated carbonate rock. The age of the spring water is estimated to be about 10,000 years.

All excess water flows into the Great Salt Lake Desert, which adjoins the Refuge to the north. The Refuge is in an arid environment and is the only source of water for many miles. This oasis attracts a variety of species not common to the rest of the Service's Mountain-Prairie Region.

Water Rights

The Service holds water rights to 43.88 cfs of spring flow originating on the Refuge. The United States acquired the following three Certificates of Appropriation of Water (state perfected water rights) when land was purchased for the Refuge:

Water Right Number 18-51
Certificate No: 1996
Application No: 9922
Flow Rate: 5.0 cfs North Spring
Priority Date: 04/16/1926

Water Right Number 18-59
Certificate No: 2077-a
Application No: 10661
Flow Rate: 10 cfs South Spring
Priority Date: 04/30/1929

Water Right Number 18-66
Certificate No: 2112
Application No: 11020
Flow Rate: 10 cfs Middle Spring
Priority Date: 11/13/1931

After Refuge establishment, the Service filed Application No. A33136 (later assigned as Certificate 13087, Water Right Number 18-215) for an additional 18.88 cfs from the springs. This right, included with the certificated 25 cfs, appropriates a total of 43.88 cfs from the springs. Application No. A-40386, Water Right Number 18-331, 0.1 cfs, is for a domestic well with a priority date of 10/08/1970.

The Service controls 100 percent of the water rights on the Refuge with no other users. While the Services' water right is roughly 44 cfs, the current annual flow from the springs is about 28.69 cfs. The spring water is warm (around 74 degrees Fahrenheit) and saline, with conductivity readings of 3,000 to 5,000 umhos at the source.

Climate

The climate at Fish Springs NWR is arid. The average annual precipitation is 8 inches, with most precipitation falling in the spring and fall. Wide temperature fluctuations typical of desert environments occur daily and seasonally. Temperatures can range from 109 degrees Fahrenheit in summer to minus 19 degrees Fahrenheit in winter. High moisture losses during the summer occur through evapotranspiration as a result of low humidity and high ambient temperatures. Dry thunderstorms are common during the summer. Winter temperatures can remain well below freezing for several days at a time with snowfall averaging 15 inches per year. The frost-free season generally runs from late-April through mid-October. Wind speeds are generally light to moderate.

Habitat and Vegetation

Six habitat types exist on the Refuge—five vegetation communities and open water (Figure 5). These habitat types are:

- Great Basin Arid Shrubland

- Great Basin Cold Desert Shrubland
- Great Basin Cold Desert Grassland
- Shallow Water Marsh and Wetland
- Alkali Mud Flat
- Open Water

The Great Basin Arid Shrubland habitat type (516 acres) is found on the west side of the Refuge in the uppermost reaches. Dominant species include Mormon tea (*Ephedra nevadensis*) and rabbit brush (*Chrysothamnus nauseous* and *C. albidus*). Forbs include globe mallow *(Sphaeralcea coccinea*) and evening primrose (*Oenothera caespitosa*).

The Great Basin Cold Desert Shrubland habitat type (1,577 acres) is found at slightly lower elevations than the Great Basin Arid Shrubland. This habitat type also occupies areas on the west side of the Refuge as well as much smaller patches along the north, east, and south sides of the marshlands. This community is dominated by greasewood (*Sarcobatus vermiculatus*), shadscale (*Atriplex confertifolia*), and fourwing saltbrush (*Atriplex canascens*).

The Great Basin Cold Desert Grassland habitat type (4,328 acres) is found in mostly large patches interspersed with open water, wetlands, and mud flats throughout the marsh area in all nine impoundments. The soil in these areas is sub-irrigated or flooded only seasonally. Primary plant species include saltgrass (*Distichlis stricta*), alkali sacaton (*Sporobolus airoides*), and Baltic rush (*Juncus arcticus*).

The Shallow Water Marsh and Wetland habitat type (3,225 acres) is found in much of the Refuge marsh where water depth is less than 18 inches. Included in this type are Olney's three-square bulrush *(Scirpus americanus*), alkali bulrush (*Scirpus paludosus*), hardstem bulrush (*Scirpus acutus*), common reed (*Phragmites australis*), cattail species (*Typha domingensis* and *T. latifolia*), and spike rush (*Eleocharis rostellata*).

Alkali Mud Flat (6,437 acres), where subsaturated soils and very high salt levels are predominant, are found primarily on the east and south side of the Refuge. Vegetative diversity is severely limited under these conditions with pickle weed (*Allenrolfea occidentalis*) and samphire (*Salicornia utahensis*) being common in the lower portions and alkali sacaton, saltgrass and greasewood found in areas where dunes have formed.

Many Open Water (1,784 acres) areas contain submerged plant species. These communities are the most robust and diverse on the southern end of the Refuge where salt levels are lowest, and the least diverse in the northern reaches where salt levels in the late summer can be quite high. Plant species include wigeongrass (*Ruppia maritima*), coontail (*Ceratophyllum demersum*), spiny najad (*Najas marina*), sago pondweed (*Potamogeton pectinatus*), muskgrass (*Chara* spp.), and filamentous algae.

The only trees native to the Fish Springs area are a few scattered junipers in the higher portions of the uplands. A turn of the century planting consisting of Fremont cottonwoods (*Populus fremonti*) and silverleaf poplars (*Populus alba*) exists at the Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area. This planting is of cultural significance because although Fremont cottonwoods are not native to Fish Springs, these were planted by early settlers to the area and provide a historical context for the Refuge consistent with the Refuge mission. A thin shelterbelt of Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*) and

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Figure 5 -

Habitat Types

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge



Siberian elm (*Ulmus primula*) surrounds the Headquarters and residential area. Unlike other areas of the Great Basin, Russian olive does not readily spread into the marsh at Fish Springs (likely due to unfavorable soils). Several isolated patches of willow exist near the springs.

The primary noxious weeds in the area are saltcedar (*Tamarix ramossisima*), whitetop (*Cardaria draba*), and squarrose knapweed (*Centaurea virgata*). Mature stands of saltcedar exist along the north boundary with the majority of the Refuge containing only scattered young plants.

Whitetop is a recent invader that is confined to multiple small and discrete stands. This plant is a concern in other parts of the State because it is a noxious weed. It is hoped that annual chemical treatments by the Refuge staff will eradicate the plant. The isolation of the Refuge from other seed sources makes reinfestation in the near future unlikely.

Squarrose knapweed is also a recent invader. This plant first became established along the county road skirting the south and west boundaries of the Refuge. It can now be found in the western uplands of the Refuge, as well as throughout the Fish Springs Range. Sheep, along the mandated livestock driveway, are believed to be the most important factor in its continued spread.

A list of plants on the Refuge can be found in Appendix G.

Wildlife

Birds

The Refuge was established because of the historical attraction of waterfowl to its wetland habitat. During fall migrations, up to 30,000 ducks— predominantly mallard, pintail, wigeon, and green-winged teal—have been recorded (Table 1). During the fall and winter, Great Basin Canada geese average around 1,000 birds, and 40 to 100 tundra swans are also present. Recent production records are indicated in Table 2.

Since establishment, more than 278 species of birds have been observed at Fish Springs (Appendix G); 61 are known to nest on the Refuge. The Refuge provides the only important wetland habitat for a 70-mile radius. Consequently, the Refuge attracts hundreds of wetland-dependent species during migration. More than 40 species spend the winter at the Refuge. Great blue herons and black-crowned night herons are year-round marsh residents. A large variety of shorebirds are present during the summer months.

The Refuge hosts a surprisingly wide variety of songbirds. Breeding species include common yellowthroat, yellow warbler, marsh wren, house finch, yellow-headed and red-winged blackbirds, savannah sparrow, and Say's phoebe. Migrant and wintering species include loggerhead shrike, Wilson's warbler, yellow-rumped warbler, western tanager, pine siskin, and American goldfinch.

Commonly observed year-round Refuge residents include northern harrier, golden eagles, bald eagles, red-tailed hawks, rough-legged hawks, and prairie falcons. Winter residents include rough-legged hawk, American kestrel, and prairie falcons. Great horned and short-eared owls are found on the Refuge but are seldom seen.

Colonial nesting wading birds were monitored at Fish Springs NWR from 1994 through 1996 (Ward and Ward 1996). The Service currently manages the marsh system to provide high quality habitat for colonial nesting birds, including white-faced ibis, snowy egret, black-crowned

Table 1. Estimated waterfowl populations from 1997 to 2002.

Waterfowl	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Coot	12,361	3,695	11,235	2,891	7,280	9,800
Tundra Swan	103	120	101	79	87	102
Canada Goose	847	598	858	445	760	1,060
Mallard	1,705	1,669	1,088	435	1,272	1,398
Gadwall	2,052	974	1,102	572	1,862	2,000
Pintail	4,275	1,927	4,609	1,333	7,895	3,267
Green-winged Teal	3,661	1,458	3,120	1,539	1,778	2,032
Cinnamon Teal	1,234	524	1,256	142	376	272
American Wigeon	4,805	281	2,367	495	2,754	5,443
Shoveler	804	883	847	389	374	180
Redhead	1,102	1,206	780	600	455	480
Canvasback	141	91	109	126	128	141
Ring-necked Duck	243	800	280	550	201	316
Lesser Scaup	11	58	140	89	222	72
Bufflehead	137	168	206	239	87	97
Ruddy Duck	287	96	440	119	128	79

Table 2. Estimated waterfowl production from 1988 to 1995.

Waterfowl	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Mallard	70	59	160	96	44	39	119	233
Pintail	370	43	125	59	94	29	62	54
Redhead	350	153	375	173	474	49	128	175
Canvasback	50	5	53	16	157	7	5	23
Shoveler	20	35	64	51	115	15	43	56
Gadwall	110	146	226	129	435	50	236	254
Cinnamon Teal	120	123	328	161	209	35	144	156
Ruddy Duck	50	24	47	52	168	6	17	35
Subtotal	1,140	588	1,378	737	1,696	230	754	986
Canada Goose	75	22	33	18	31	34	24	19
American Coot	300	678	943	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,515	1,288	2,354	755	1,727	264	778	1,005

night heron, and great blue heron. The marsh system is spring-fed, providing consistent, year-to-year nesting habitat that is independent of annual and seasonal fluctuations in precipitation (Ward and Ward 1996). The number and locations of rookery sites varied over the 3 years of monitoring (Table 3). In 1994 the main rookery was in Pintail Slough, shifting to the Mallard Unit with some birds nesting in the south Curlew Unit in 1995, and by 1996 the Mallard Unit was virtually the only active rookery (Ward and Ward 1996). The total number of nests and nest success also varied between years with nest success relatively high for all species (Table 4).

Mammals

Forty-eight species of mammals have been recorded on the Refuge. The majority of these species are small rodents (19) and bats (11). Coyotes, jackrabbits, and introduced muskrats are commonly seen residents. A small mule deer population uses the Refuge, primarily in late summer and fall. Pronghorn antelope are seen occasionally along the Refuge's western boundary.

Coyotes and badgers are regularly observed. Pocket gophers, wood rats, kangaroo rats, and antelope squirrels are among the more numerous smaller mammals. The Refuge supports a healthy muskrat population, which inadvertently assists in maintaining open water areas within the various units.

Reptiles, Fish, and Amphibians

Twelve reptiles, four fish, and two amphibian species are found at Fish

Table 3. Nest success of rookery sites for colonial wading birds by species for the years 1994-1996.

Unit	Number of Nests			Successful Nests			Nest Success (%)		
	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996
Pintail	295	0	0	181	N/A	N/A	70	N/A	N/A
Mallard	74	491	421	40	427	368	54	87	87
Egret	9	0	0	6	N/A	N/A	67	N/A	N/A
Curlew	0	21	2	N/A	5	0	N/A	24	0
Total	342	512	423	227	432	368	66	84	87

Table 4. Nest success of colonial wading birds in Refuge units for the years 1994-1996.

Species	Number of Nests			Successful Nests†			Nest Success (%)		
	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996	1994	1995	1996
W.F. Ibis	164	200	147	108	169	121	66	85	82
S. Egret	135	204	191	85	159	174	63	78	91
B.C.N. Heron	37	99	76	28	95	64	76	96	84
B.G. Heron	1	7	7	1	7	7	100	100	100
C. Egret	5	2	2	5	2	2	100	100	100
Total	342	512	423	227	432	368	66	84	87

†A nest in which one or more eggs hatch.

Source: Ward and Ward 1996.

Springs NWR (Appendix G). The small mosquito fish and both amphibian species (bullfrog and leopard frog) were likely introduced in a bullfrog farm that operated in a major portion of the Middle Springs area from the early 1950s until about 1970 (Hovingh 1993; Service 1987). The mosquito fish is found throughout the canals and water units. Bullfrogs occur in House Spring and Walter Spring and areas connected to the main channel by permanent water flow (McKell et al. undated). Bullfrogs are found in springs and the main channel where water temperatures were greater than 66 degrees Fahrenheit; bullfrogs are not found in Avocet, Curlew, Shoveler, Egret, Ibis, Gadwall, Pintail or Harrison Units or road side pools with water temperature less than 50 degrees Fahrenheit (McKell et al. undated). Leopard frogs occur along the main channel and in dense vegetation at the edge of canals and pools with water temperatures greater than 60 degrees Fahrenheit (McKell et al. undated).

Leopard frogs are native to Utah; however, according to Hovingh (1993), leopard frogs are believed to be introduced into Fish Springs NWR from nearby populations. Bullfrogs are introduced predators that prey on other frogs, fish and waterbirds, sometimes leading to the extirpation of native fauna (McKell et al. undated; Lawler et al. 1999). Bullfrogs and leopard frogs have restricted patterns of distribution and abundance, possibly due to bullfrog predation on leopard frogs (McKell et al. undated). There is no evidence that bullfrogs impact least chub (Banta, pers. comm. 2004).

The least chub, a candidate species, has been successfully reintroduced into Walter's Spring with additional releases planned in the coming years. The Utah chub is the most numerous fish on the Refuge.

Invertebrates

Aquatic invertebrates (aquatic insects) are an important part of the diet of breeding migratory birds. Drawdowns and burns of marsh ponds simulate the wet/dry cycles of a natural wetland and release stored nutrients (Faulkner and Cruz 1992; Kadlec 1962). Aquatic invertebrate populations were monitored in 1983, 1984, and 1990-1997. Sampling of invertebrates at Fish Springs NWR in 1997 and a summary of data from 1990 to 1997 indicated that invertebrate abundance increases following drawdown and burning (Halley 1997). Nonaquatic insects have not been inventoried or monitored. Thirty-eight families of aquatic invertebrates have been identified from Refuge waters.

Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

Three federally listed threatened and endangered species are found in Juab County: bald eagle, yellow-billed cuckoo, and Ute ladies'-tresses orchid. The bald eagle is listed as a threatened species and is known to winter at Fish Springs NWR. The bald eagle was downlisted from endangered to threatened in 1995 and the Service has proposed to delist the species due to population recovery. The bald eagle is an opportunistic forager during winter, often relying on rabbits, injured waterfowl, and carrion and typically roosts communally during winter (Stalmaster 1987). Between two to five bald eagles are typically observed on the Refuge during winter. Currently, the trees at the Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area provide the only suitable roosting site for the eagles, although a recent pole planting near South Spring may provide an additional site in the future.

The yellow-billed cuckoo (cuckoo) is a neotropical migratory bird. The decline of the western population of the yellow-billed cuckoo due to loss of riparian habitat has been reported consistently (Tate and Tate

1982; Finch 1992). The Service identified a distinct western population segment of the cuckoo and determined that there was substantial information to indicate that the listing was warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions (66 Fed. Reg. 38611 (July 25, 2001)). This species has been added to the Service candidate list. Fish Springs NWR contains no potential habitat for the cuckoo.

The Ute ladies'-tresses orchid (orchid) is federally listed as threatened. The orchid occurs at elevations below 6,500 feet in moist to wet alluvial meadows, flood plains of perennial streams, and around springs and lakes (Service 1992). Once thought to be fairly common in low elevation riparian areas in Colorado, Utah, and Nevada, the orchid is currently rare in all three states. Generally, the vegetative cover surrounding the orchid is relatively open. Dense, overgrown sites are not conducive to orchid establishment. Where the orchid is found, soils are typically alluvial deposits of sandy, gravelly material that are saturated to within 18 inches of the surface for at least part of the growing season. No surveys have been conducted on the Fish Springs NWR to determine the potential occurrence of the orchid on the Refuge.

It is believed that Fish Springs NWR once harbored the least chub, currently a proposed endangered fish found only in springs of the Bonneville Basin. The fish has been reintroduced into Deadman and Walter's Springs. Only the reintroduction into Walter's Spring has been successful. These populations are considered by Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (Utah DWR) as experimental.

The Fish Springs pond snail was described in 1890. Some empty shells were found by Russell (1971). Dr. D.W. Taylor declared the pond snail extinct after a 1986 survey. No known resident endangered, threatened, or candidate plant species exist on the Refuge.

The Pacific Coast population of the western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus*) is considered a distinct population segment and was listed as a federally threatened species in 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 12864 (March 5, 1993)); however, the interior population of snowy plover was determined not to warrant listing (59 Fed. Reg. 58982 (November 15, 1994)). On March 22, 2004, the Service issued a 90-Day Finding on a Petition to Delist the Pacific Coast Population of the western snowy plover and initiated a 5-year review (69 Fed. Reg. 13326 (March 22, 2004)). The western snowy plover is a small shorebird that typically breeds on alkali flats and alongside reservoirs, sewage and evaporation ponds (Andrews and Righter 1992; Kingery 1998) in the interior U.S. This species nests on the ground on beaches, dry mud or salt flats and sandy shores of rivers lakes and ponds.

In northern Utah, snowy plovers usually nest in areas devoid of vegetation, generally in recently exposed alkaline flats (Paton and Edwards 1992). Nesting in northern Utah occurs from mid-April to mid July (Paton and Edwards 1991, 1992). Complete clutches may be lost due to high water, adverse weather, trampling by cattle and large mammals or disturbance by humans. Predation by gulls, common raven, red fox, skunk, raccoon and coyote can result in high rates of clutch failure in some years (Page et al. 1985; Paton and Edwards 1991, 1992). Predation by mammalian and avian predators, including coyote, ravens and possibly Great Basin gopher snakes, appears to contribute to low production of plovers at Fish Springs NWR (Banta, pers. comm. 2004). The current annual success rate for snowy plovers nesting on Fish Springs NWR is

unknown. Predator exclusion fences have proven effective for reducing mammalian predation on piping plovers (Mayer and Ryan 1991; Andrews et al. 1999) and have been proposed as a management tool to reduce nest losses for snowy plover (TNC 1998).

Cultural Resources and History of Refuge Lands

Fish Springs NWR has a very rich and diverse human history. Archaeological investigations on the Refuge have documented use of the area to the Early Archaic Period (ca. 7,000-8,000 B.P.). Recent studies have indicated that Lake Bonneville receded to expose the Fish Springs marsh about 11,400 years ago, which have led archaeologists to conclude that Paleoindian occupation within a few hundred years of that date was likely.

Pony Express Marker

Evidence of human use of the area through the Late Archaic has been found on the Refuge. Evidence of more recent occupation by the Fremont culture has been documented at Fish Springs NWR as well. There are few Fremont culture sites from western Utah but they likely occupied the area from 700 to 1,500 years ago. The Goshiute tribe, an ethnographic branch of the Western Shoshonean culture, occupied the Refuge from the 1400s to the 1900s.

Two caves within the Refuge boundary, located on the east face of the northern tip of the Fish Springs Range, are part of a National Archeological District. Numerous other sites, evidenced by large expanses of lithic scatter, support occupation over thousands of years. Inventory efforts by the University of Utah Archaeology Field School over the last several years have documented 11 major sites. Most of the activity around the marsh is attributed to chipping artifacts and hunting, which assumes that the marsh supported a substantial wildlife population during the prehistoric period.

The first documented Euro-American occupation of the marsh was in 1859. George Chorpenning established a station on his mail route to Nevada. This outpost was little more than a thatched shed.

In 1860, the Pony Express and Overland Stage purchased Chorpenning's mail obligations, and Fish Springs became a stop of note on a very inhospitable section of that arduous route. In 1861, the Transcontinental Telegraph line passed through Fish Springs and that entity proved to be the death knell for the Pony Express. The Pony Express assets were sold and the mail delivery route shifted north of the Great Salt Lake to parallel the transcontinental railroad. The route through Fish Springs, however, proved to

be a superior stage route for transporting passengers, and some form of stage service was maintained through the area until the 1920s.

There is little record of activities in the marshes of Fish Springs from 1870 through 1890. By the early 1890s, John Thomas established a ranch on the edge of the marsh and was raising cattle and horses, which he provided to the adjacent Utah and Galena mining operations. He also provided lodging, meals, and hay to the stage service, and sold supplies to the shepherds who wintered enormous flocks of sheep in the region during the winter. Thomas occupied the ranch until his death in 1917.

In 1913, the Lincoln Highway, the nation's first transcontinental automobile road, was built across the Thomas Ranch. This route became a very lucrative source of income for Thomas for several years. In 1919, the completion of the Goodyear Cutoff, about 20 miles north of the marsh, eliminated much of the Lincoln Highway traffic. However, due to the precariousness of that section during winter, a substantial amount of Lincoln Highway traffic continued to pass through the Fish Springs route until 1927. It is estimated that at the peak usage period for the Lincoln Highway more than 5,000 cars passed each year, compared to less than 2,500 cars currently. Several segments of the Lincoln Highway are still visible in Refuge uplands.

Between 1917, when John Thomas died, and 1925, the patented land around the marsh passed through several owners. By 1925 most of that land was owned by Tass Claridge and Jim Harrison, doing business as the Fish Springs Livestock and Fur Company. This property remained in their possession until 1959 when it was purchased fee-title by the Service for inclusion in the Refuge.

Fire Occurrence and History

Fire records prior to Refuge establishment are not readily available. Due to topography and the sparse vegetation surrounding the Refuge, fire in the area was probably a localized phenomenon. With the abundant fuel in the form of dead dry marsh vegetation, frequent lightning storms, and the use of the area by nomadic tribes, all of the ingredients necessary for fires were present. It is assumed that fire historically was a relatively common occurrence in the marsh area and was a determinant in the existing vegetation. It is known that post-settlement landowners periodically burned the marsh to improve its grazing potential. Wildfires were "apparently not a problem" for these prior landowners (Service 1960).

Since Refuge establishment in 1959, 54 fires have been reported on the Refuge (50 prescribed burns within marsh units and four wildfires - all human caused). Prescribed burns have varied from 1 acre to 1,630 acres. Based on a review of the fire history, a wildfire frequency of one fire every 10 years has been established.

Visitor Services

In spite of its isolation, Fish Springs NWR has historically hosted 2,000 to 3,000 visitors each year (Table 5). Most come to enjoy wildlife-oriented recreational opportunities in the Refuge's uncrowded environment. Fish Springs public uses include waterfowl hunting, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, environmental education and interpretation.

Table 5. Public use at Fish Springs NWR, 1995-2002.

Year	Visits
1995	2,642
1996	2,982
1997	2,890
1998	2,957
1999	3,092
2000	2,881
2001	2,049
2002	2,376

Fish Springs NWR provides one of the highest quality public waterfowl hunting opportunities to be found in the western United States. Waterfowl hunting opportunities include ducks, geese, and coots, in accordance with State regulations. Hunter densities rarely exceed one hunter per 200 acres. Opportunities exist for waterfowl hunting by hunters with mobility impairment. The hunting seasons do not conflict with the waterfowl nesting season.

Recreational use other than hunting in the spring and summer months have contributed to an overall increase in visitor numbers. Many come to the Refuge in the process of exploring the rich human history of the area, reaching back into time to more than 11,000 years before present. The Refuge hosts two events annually to provide the public with special opportunities to learn first-hand about the Refuge's resource-rich environment.

The Refuge maintains an auto-tour route that traverses a good cross section of the diverse habitats and provides exceptional opportunities for wildlife viewing and photography. The Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area provides a welcomed shady respite for visitors who have traveled through the dusty, hot, and dry conditions that must be traversed from any cardinal direction to reach the Refuge.

While visits by scout groups and schools are not as frequent as is the case on many refuges, those that do visit find the Refuge to be a wonderful outdoor classroom. Providing service projects, merit badge counseling, and environmental education enhances the visitor experience and understanding of the Refuge for most of these young visitors.

Wilderness

A wilderness review is the process used by the Service to determine whether to recommend lands or waters in the National Wildlife Refuge System to Congress for designation as wilderness. The Service is required to conduct a wilderness review for each refuge as part of the CCP process. Land or waters that meet the minimum criteria for wilderness are identified in a CCP and further evaluated to determine whether they merit recommendation for inclusion in the Wilderness System. According to Section 13 of the Service's Director's Order No. 125 (July 2000), in order for a refuge to be considered for wilderness designation, all or part of the Refuge must:

- Be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the human imprint substantially unnoticeable
- Have outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined type of recreation
- Have at least 5,000 contiguous acres or be sufficient in size to make practical its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition, or be capable of restoration to wilderness character through appropriate management, at the time of review
- Be a roadless island

Fish Springs NWR is not recommended for inclusion in the Wilderness System because it does not meet the above criteria. The Refuge has considerable evidence of past human use, and is not roadless.

Socioeconomics

Population and Demographics

Utah's 2003 population was estimated to be 2.39 million, increasing 2.0% from 2002. Although the state continues to experience net in-migration, natural increase accounts for the majority of Utah's population growth (State of Utah 2004). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Utah ranked eighth among states with a population growth rate of 1.4% from 2002 to 2003. During the same period, the U.S. rate of growth was 1.0%.

The Western region grew the fastest in the 1990s, with the population in the State of Utah growing from 1,722,850 in 1990 to 2,233,169 in 2000, an increase of 29.6%, while the national population growth rate was slightly less at 13.2%. The population in Juab County grew from 5,817 in 1990 to 8,238 in 2000, an increase of 42% for the 1990s (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). Utah's population is expected to increase about 2.6% annually through 2010.

About 96.6% of the Juab County population consider themselves to be white (compared to 75% nation wide). About 2.6% consider themselves to be Hispanic or Latino in origin (compared to 12.5% nation wide), and 1.0% consider themselves to be American Indian (compared to 0.9% nationwide) (U.S. Census Bureau 2000).

Employment

With about 22,000 employees, the State of Utah is the largest employer in Utah. Health care services and education are the next three top employers while the federal government (mainly defense) occupies the number five rank.

Since 1994, the rate of job growth has fallen from 6.2% to 0.9% in 2001. This is Utah's slowest job growth since 1983 and well below the long-term average of 3.5%. Education and health services led the state in job growth from 2000 to 2003. Financial activity, professional and business services, and government (except state government) experienced positive job growth, while many industries experienced a decline in job growth. Utah's 2003 unemployment rate was 5.8%. On average, there were 68,900 Utahans unemployed in 2003.

Income

Utah's average annual nonagricultural pay was $30,500 during 2003, up 1.4% from 2002. After seven years of solid gains in which wages grew faster than inflation, wages matched inflation during 2002, but grew less than inflation during 2003.

Chapter 4. Management Direction

Management for Wildlife Diversity

Refuge management will focus on providing habitat for maximum wildlife diversity including migratory birds, and native mammal, mollusk, invertebrate, and amphibian communities. Habitat needs for species other than migratory birds that have not been addressed adequately in past management efforts will be fully integrated into management efforts. Ensuring that the full complements of fauna and flora historically represented on the Refuge are recognized and that full efforts to understand and meet the habitat requirements for these species will be a priority.

Minor changes in water regimes and management activities at eight of the nine ponds will be directed toward creating diverse habitats in terms of water depth, vegetation composition, and habitat structure. Other new strategies include enhancing areas to provide potential rookeries for nesting colonial wading birds, expanding efforts in threatened and endangered species recovery, and conducting a bathymetric survey.

Restoration of the Harrison Unit will be pursued on an experimental basis. Efforts will focus on restoring to the extent possible historical hydrological, physical and biological conditions to the marsh.

Refuge management also will focus on enhancing the native high desert shrubland community. Natural and prescribed fires will be managed in accordance with the Wildland Fire Management Plan (2002).

Weed management described in the Integrated Pest Management Plan (2003) will continue.

Water management of eight of nine ponds (Figure 3) will include a 5-year drawdown rotation and associated burning (Table 6). Water levels in the ponds will be maintained to create optimum conditions for waterfowl production. The goal is to maintain waterfowl migration, wintering, and production habitat. Water management will also maintain water salinity at minimum levels through winter flushing and maintaining water flows throughout the Refuge.

Table 6. Unit drawdown and prescribed burning sequence.

Unit(s)	Year[1]	Drain	Burn	Fill
Mallard - Gadwall	2003	Feb	Sept	Oct
Avocet - Spring[2]	2004	Feb	Sept	Oct
Curlew-Ibis	2005	Feb	Sept	Oct
Pintail - Shoveler	2006	Feb	Sept	Oct
Egret - Harrison	2007	Feb	Sept	Oct

[1]This sequence is repeated every 5 years. Dry units are burned according to an approved Prescribed Burning Plan. Currently, however, units with large dense stands of *Phragmites australis* (Avocet, Mallard, Curlew, Shoveler, and Harrison) are not burned due to concerns that fire aids the spread of this invasive species.

[2]Spring unit is not drawn down, but 1/3 is burned during the same year that Avocet is drawn down.

Studies indicate that full pool management is not as productive as management involving drawdowns, whereby management intentionally simulates wet and dry cycles of a natural wetland. McKnight and Low (1969) conducted a study within the Fish Springs NWR marsh from 1966 to 1968. Their study revealed that marsh units that had been drained, allowed to dry, and then flooded showed a tremendous increase in waterfowl use and production. Brood census data showed that the newly flooded areas were much more attractive to duck broods than the undisturbed marsh areas, and were more heavily used by waterfowl in general.

Drawdowns play an important role in the rate at which nutrients are released into the food chain. The rate of plant material decay is increased. This in turn provides more food to invertebrates in the form of decaying organic matter or detritus. According to Refuge surveys, invertebrates experience a subsequent population explosion upon reflooding, with both species richness and abundance increasing (Ward and Ward 1996). This provides improved foraging for waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds. Drawdown in many units results in an invasion of the original pool bottom by opportunistic vegetation, primarily fivehook bassia (*Bassia hyssopifolia)* and summer cypress (*Kochia scoparia)*. These plants produce a seed crop that is used by migrating waterfowl when these units are reflooded. The weed crop also provides critical structural habitat used by the burgeoning populations of aquatic invertebrates after reflooding. Salt cedar (*Tamarisk ramosissima*) also appears within most units when the ponds are drawn down; however, this species is killed at nearly 100% after refilling before the plants have developed enough to provide structural habitat for invertebrates or a food source (seed) for waterfowl.

Fire, another important marsh management tool, increases the rate at which nutrients are returned back to the soil, setting back succession and invigorating new plant growth. As wetland vegetation becomes rank, it is of little value to many marsh birds and prescribed burning can improve marsh habitat for migratory waterbirds.

Since 1988, the marsh units at Fish Springs NWR have been dewatered and burned on a set 5-year rotation (Table 6). Draining the units begins in February and reflooding begins between late September and December. Target levels are reached between March and mid-April. These target levels are flexible based on specific seasonal conditions and the professional judgment of the Refuge Manager. Not enough water is available to have all units completely filled during summer and early fall, so some units are left at less than target levels during those times. This actually creates better shorebird nesting and foraging habitat in the spring.

Prior to the summer of 2003, efforts to control *Phragmites* were spring chemical applications of a glyphosate herbicide after the unit had been dewatered and subject to a spring prescribed burn. This method proved to be ineffective in controlling the spread of *Phragmites* on the Refuge. In July 2003, the Refuge experimented with a new approach to the control of *Phragmites*. Stands of *Phragmites* were mowed in July and August, and glyphosate herbicide was applied in September after the re-growth had reached 2 to 3 feet tall. Five areas were treated with this method in FY 2003 and will be monitored for 2 years to determine the effectiveness. Initial results appear encouraging.

This new method of a late summer/early fall manipulation (mowing or burning) to the *Phragmites*, combined with a fall or

spring application of a glyphosate herbicide, will be used in FY 2004 on several sites. The Refuge also will incorporate new techniques in the Avocet Unit, which is scheduled to be burned in September 2004. Several dense *Phragmites* stands on higher sites in the unit will be disked after the burn in late September. Some sites will be disked once, and other sites will be disked twice to expose the roots to hot desiccating temperatures. Disking will be followed by an application of a glyphosate herbicide in October on some sites, and in the spring on other sites after re-growth starts. All sites will be monitored for 2 years to determine the effectiveness of the control methods used.

The high desert shrubland is defined for management purposes as the combined Great Basin Arid Shrubland and Great Basin Cold Desert Shrubland presented on Figure 5. These two shrublands are found on the west side of the Refuge and in smaller patches along the north, east and south sides of the marshlands. Dominant shrubs include Mormon tea, rabbitbrush species, greasewood, shadscale and fourwing saltbrush.

Currently, the high desert shrubland community on Fish Springs NWR is not actively managed. This community historically has been a low management priority and management has been passive. Historical grazing was removed when the Service acquired the Refuge (Banta, pers. comm. 2004). A fence was constructed in the mid-1990s to remedy illegal trespass from livestock on surrounding BLM and U.S. Army properties. Overgrazing of desert shrublands can significantly reduce vegetation diversity and species composition (Bock and Bock 1993; Fleischner 1994). Past cattle grazing and current sheep drives along the county road (Pony Express Trail) on the west side of the Refuge have promoted the spread of invasive weeds and the understory of large patches of the high desert shrubland community is dominated by cheatgrass.

Fires in western high desert shrubland communities have had a profound impact on vegetation composition and structure. Young and Evans (1978) found that cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) increases on post burned areas, frequently out-competing native flora. An increase in fire frequency in shrublands can cause a gradual loss or in some cases dramatic change from a shrub community to an annual dominated community. This shift in plant species composition alters competitive and fire dynamics to maintain annual dominance on the affected sites (Taush et al. 1995). Fire management is conducted on Fish Springs NWR in accordance with the Wildlife Fire Management Plan (2001). Fire is suppressed in shrubland habitats and used as a tool to achieve identified management goals. Prescribed burning of dewatered units is conducted in the fall.

Overall Goal: Provide habitat for maximum wildlife diversity.

Rationale: Shifting the focus of Refuge management from enhancing and protecting breeding, wintering and migration habitat primarily for migratory birds to providing habitat to maximize wildlife diversity will require a substantive shift in management practices. Restoration of a portion of the Refuge to mimic historical conditions will be a departure from management objectives and prescriptions of the last 40 years. To successfully implement marsh restoration, it is critical to prepare a detailed Habitat Management Plan that will carefully develop and implement habitat management goals, objectives, and strategies.

Objective: Within 5 years develop a Habitat Management Plan that provides the following:

- Specific characterization of the existing biological conditions, including: vegetation composition, distribution, and abundance of exotics (plant and animal); vegetation structure (e.g., height, density); and wildlife occurrence, distribution, abundance, productivity and seasonal habitat use patterns.
- Description of existing ecological structure and functions, including food web interactions, predator/prey relationships, foraging patterns and relationships, competition.
- Detailed objectives and strategies and the rationale to support the strategies.
- Detailed description of the expected outcome of habitat management strategies.
- Detailed methods and management tools to be used to meet objectives.
- Detailed inventory and monitoring surveys to evaluate the success of selected strategies, a discussion on how surveys will be used and data assumptions associated with surveys.

Habitat

Goal: Improve and maintain habitats for nesting and wintering migratory birds and other wildlife populations of the Bonneville Basin.

Rationale: Fish Springs NWR, by virtue of its substantial wetlands, is one of the most important habitats in the eastern Bonneville Basin. Use of these wetlands by migrating, wintering, and nesting birds is critical to many species that are found in western Utah. The Refuge is the largest wetland for a radius of over 70 miles and provides such habitat to literally tens of thousands of migratory birds as well as being a true oasis in a very arid region which supports a very diverse population of native wildlife. Efforts to maintain and improve a diverse mosaic of habitats are critical to providing high quality habitat in an area where wetlands and relatively pristine desert shrub communities are exceptionally limited.

Objectives:

1. Throughout the life of this Plan, provide nesting and brood-rearing habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds by maintaining diverse aquatic habitat, adequate food sources, stable water levels during nesting, and enhancing colonial wading bird nesting habitat.

Strategies:

- Drawdown two units each year (Table 6) to maintain an adequate invertebrate supply as a food source and to recycle nutrients through decomposition and prescribed burning.
- Bring five to six units to optimal stable water levels (Table 7) by mid-April when waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds are selecting nest sites.
- Maintain stable water levels through mid-June for shorebirds and water birds in five to six units to prevent flooding or drying of nests.
- Maintain stable water levels through mid-July for waterfowl in three to four designated units to prevent flooding or drying of nests.
- Seek expert consultation on subdividing northern impoundments (Pintail, Ibis, and Gadwall Units) to

Table 7. Target water elevations for marsh units under 1991 Marsh Management Plan.

Unit	Target Water Elevation	Water Surface Acres	Average Depth (feet)	Acre-feet
Avocet	4298.50	575	1.6	920
Mallard	4298.74	192	1.5	288
Curlew	4294.50	480	1.5	720
Shoveler	4295.60[1]	245	1.5	368
Pintail	4286.00	395	1.7	672
Egret	4291.39	380	1.5	570
Ibis	4288.80	235	2.2	517
Harrison	4282.00	620	1.7	1,054
Gadwall	4282.00[2]	430	1.8	774
Total		3,552		5,883

[1] Target water elevation shown here for Shoveler Unit is 0.26 feet lower than originally designated in the Marsh Management Plan. With this slight modification, more islands pop-up or are just below the water, creating better foraging for shorebirds.

[2] Gadwall Unit is actually managed at a much lower water elevation in order to create 25 to-35 more acres of shallowly flooded mudflats for western snowy plover foraging. The Refuge Manager determines at which level to stop filling this unit on a yearly basis according to water availability.

Source: Service 1991.

improve production habitat (i.e., stabilized water through hatching) for waterfowl.

- Within 12 years, provide suitable habitat components (dense hardstem bulrush stands, appropriate water depths, lack of disturbance, protection from prescribed burns) to support expansion of existing rookeries for colonial nesting wading birds (great blue heron, snowy egret, cattle egret, white-faced ibis).

2. Over the next 15 years, maintain existing seasonal closures to minimize disturbance to nesting, wintering, and migrating waterfowl, shorebirds, and waterbirds.

Strategies:

- Close entire Refuge to all forms of boating April 15 to August 15 to protect breeding waterbirds (Table 8).
- Keep 10,746 acres (60 percent of the Refuge) as year-round sanctuary areas.
- Close all roads except the Pony Express Road and the core auto-tour route from April 15 - August 15.

3. Within 5 years of CCP approval, consult with experts and conduct a bathymetric survey to better characterize the Refuge and its resources.

Strategies:

- Identify and monitor indicator species that best represent the various refuge habitats. Indicator species, such as suggested in Table 8, will be developed in consultation with appropriate experts and a better understanding of the specific habitat dynamics of the Refuge and

species that best represent selected habitat.

- Conduct a complete bathymetric survey of all marsh impoundments in order to determine how much habitat or surface water is created at varying water elevations for each unit.

4. Provide spring and fall migration foraging habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds. This involves providing a variety of habitat in each marsh unit, including shallowly flooded (≤ 4 inches) and sub-irrigated saltgrass for shorebirds, and emergent vegetation in water 4 to 12 inches deep for water birds.

Strategies:

- Drawdown two units each year (Table 6) to maintain an adequate invertebrate supply as a food source and to recycle nutrients through decomposition and prescribed burning.
- Partially draw down water in some units and increase water in other units during the early spring (March) to exploit resources not normally available, providing new foraging areas. Where and to what extent water is drawn down will be based on the condition and topography of each unit.
- Delay impoundment drawdowns until March 15 or later in those units scheduled for full drawdown but not scheduled for prescribed burning.
- Cut off water to three to four units in mid- to late June to allow shrinkage through evapotranspiration and evaporation to create mudflats in late summer and into fall.
- Allow water to drop in three to four other units after mid-July when waterfowl nesting is completed until mid-September. During this time, water is still allowed to flow in, but at a rate less than evapotranspiration and evaporation. Begin refilling units after mid-September.

Table 8. Suggested indicator species.

Species	Arrival	Nest	Eggs	Hatch	Fledge
American Bittern	April	April-June	May-Mid July	June-August	July-August
Virginia Rail/Sora	April	April-Early May	June-Early July	July-August	August
Common Yellowthroat	April	May-July	June-July	June-July	July-August
Marsh Wren	April	Mid April-Early May			
Mallard	March	April	April-July	May-July	July-August
Least Chub	Resident				
Utah Chub	Resident				
Possible Negative Indicators					
Gambusia					
Muskrat					

5. Within 3 years of CCP approval, identify any threatened, endangered or sensitive plant species or rare plant communities identified by the Service or Utah Department of Natural Resources that exist on the refuge, particularly within the high desert shrubland community.

Strategies:

- Determine historical native floral composition of the high desert shrubland community, within 3 years.
- Conduct a complete vegetation survey to determine current composition of the high desert shrubland community and create a layer for the GIS database.

6. Within 7 years of CCP approval, develop a plan to restore the high desert shrubland community to the historical native composition.

Strategies:

- Compare current and desired conditions to determine how much restoration is necessary.
- Research appropriate restoration methods such as herbicides, prescribed fire, biological controls or mechanical controls. Refuge managers can use some of these control methods to stimulate new growth, remove unhealthy vegetation, recycle soil nutrients, or create fuel breaks to isolate or protect critical shrub communities from cheatgrass invasion.
- Determine necessary resources, budget, specific actions, and time-frame for project.
- Determine indicator species (e.g., plants, birds, invertebrates) for monitoring health of restored communities.
- Begin implementation of selected appropriate restoration actions.

Ecological Integrity

Two goals have been developed under the Ecological Integrity Management Direction. A Refuge-wide goal and a specific goal for restoring the Harrison Unit to a more historical function as a braided marsh. Restoration of the Harrison Unit complies with the intent of the Refuge Administration Act, and strategies were developed following Service guidance (601 FWS).

Refuge-wide Goal: Perpetuate the native biodiversity and physical characteristics of the Bonneville Basin as represented on Fish Springs NWR.

Rationale: Efforts to gather inventory data on current use by avian species and attempting to reduce the impacts of various influences such as military overflights and invasive vegetation will be vital to maintain the ecological systems at Fish Springs NWR. The physical environment of the Refuge also contains several sites of importance to the understanding of the history of Lake Bonneville. Ensuring that these sites are protected from unreasonable degradation will ensure that the scientific values are maintained for future research needs and interpretation.

Specific actions will be taken on behalf of species of concern, including federally listed species or species proposed for listing. Listed species are Federal trust resources, with the Service having a responsibility to aid their recovery whenever possible. Species proposed for listing are not officially Federal trust resources but are species of concern. Any efforts the Service can make on their behalf is appropriate, and may even help

prevent the species from being listed. Certainly, these efforts are compatible with the Refuge Purpose.

Objectives:

1. Within 5 years of CCP approval, and every 5 years thereafter, assess the status of native biodiversity on the Refuge.

Strategies:

- Conduct community level biological surveys. Include surveying for small mammals, waterfowl, shorebirds, marsh birds, water birds, raptors, passerines, reptiles and amphibians, carnivores, and invertebrates. Create appropriate layers for the GIS database.
- Repeat a complete set of community level surveys every 5 years. Update GIS database accordingly.
- Continue bimonthly bird counts/index, spring and fall mist-netting, and spring and fall shorebird surveys.

2. Within 5 years of CCP approval, develop a plan to maintain the diversity and distribution of native spring snails.

Strategies:

- Establish current distribution and densities of all spring snails and create a layer for the GIS database.
- Identify very limited native species, monitor them for population declines and threats, and determine appropriate protection and restoration actions.
- Refer to historical snail surveys on snail distribution in springs, including work done by the Smithsonian.
- Determine the impact of nonnative snails (*Melanoides tuberculata*) on native snails and other species.
- Investigate ways to eliminate nonnative snails.

3. Within 5 years of CCP approval, rewrite the Marsh Management Plan to maintain native species richness of the marsh plant communities.

Strategies:

- Develop GIS-based vegetation database showing current diversity and distribution of marsh plant Communities. Determine if any relict populations of endemic species exist. Update database as necessary.
- Consult with experts on how to restore and maintain native marsh plant communities and relict populations.
- Evaluate the use of prescribed fire in maintaining native plant communities through a review of the existing literature, experimentation and monitoring, and opportunistically through research.

4. Reduce whitetop by 60 percent and squarrose knapweed by 60 percent within 3 years, tamarisk by 90 percent within 15 years, and cattail stand density by 50 percent within 15 years.

Strategies:

- Develop GIS-based vegetation database showing current distribution as a baseline. Update database as necessary.
- Cooperate with the Bureau of Land Management to treat area above the Refuge for squarrose knapweed.
- Treat invasive species with appropriate chemical control agents and mechanical methods.
- Based on results of experimental control conducted in the Avocet Unit, investigate feasibility of using

biological controls for squarrose knapweed and tamarisk.

- Once target levels are reached, continue to treat invasive species as needed to prevent re-spreading.

5. Within 6 years of CCP approval, determine the effects of management practices on the spread of Phragmites australis.

Strategies:

- Develop GIS-based vegetation database showing current distribution as a baseline. Update database as necessary.
- Monitor spread of *Phragmites australis* after prescribed fire and pool drawdowns.
- Experiment with chemical and mechanical control on *Phragmites australis* to determine if there is any effective level of control.
- Set target for *Phragmites australis* reduction upon completion of above efforts.

6. Continually preserve sites of geological significance for geomorphological research; both known sites and those identified by experts in the future.

Strategies:

- Do not disturb sites through any earthmoving operations.
- Do not fill, level, or flood sites.

7. Continue to work to minimize impacts of military overflights on wildlife.

Strategies:

- Monitor violations of established rules stipulating flying at least 3,000 feet above the Refuge.
- Continue dialog with the U.S. Air Force when violations occur and how to avoid future violations.
- Request involvement of the Service's Utah Resident Agent in Charge when needed.

8. Within 10 years of CCP approval, achieve a nesting success rate of 40 percent for snowy plovers nesting on the Refuge.

Strategies:

- Measure current nesting success rates of snowy plovers.
- Construct elevated nest sites in suitable nesting units.
- Install electric fencing around nesting areas and experiment with the use of scents to condition predators to the presence of the fence.
- Conduct an annual census in cooperation with staff of Dugway Proving Ground.

9. Within 15 years of CCP approval, establish future roosting sites for bald eagles, a threatened species, on the Refuge.

Strategies:

- Plant three to four Fremont cottonwood trees in two sites in areas with minimum potential for disturbance (e.g., Spring Unit).

10. Re-establish the least chub, a candidate species, in North, Deadman, Walter, House, and Percy Springs over the next 10 years.

Strategies:

- Continue to make structural adaptations of water management facilities to create structural

barriers to mosquito fish (*Gambusia affinis)* infestation.

- Conduct multiple removal treatments of nonnative fishes to try and eradicate invasive species in the target springs.
- Move fish from existing Refuge stocks, or from other stocks through Utah DWR, to enhance genetic diversity in nonsystemic sites.

11. Continually inventory, monitor and protect habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive wildlife species.

Strategies:

- Continue to monitor habitat and populations of wintering bald eagles and least chub.
- Look for new opportunities to cooperate with Utah DWR on the introduction/re-introduction of spotted frog and other sensitive wildlife native to the Bonneville Basin.
- Continually monitor spring discharges.
- Continue to look for additional cooperative opportunities with Utah DWR, universities and other agencies to inventory, monitor and enhance sensitive species habitat.

Marsh Restoration of Harrison Unit
Goal: Restore a portion of Fish Springs NWR to the native biodiversity and physical characteristics of the Bonneville Basin as represented on Fish Springs, including unimpeded hydrological, physical and biological components (Figure 6).

Rationale: The Harrison Unit is supplied by a single, isolated spring (North Spring) and retains much of the drainage topography evident in pre-Refuge aerial photography making this unit suitable for restoration. Consistent with and complementary to the Ecological Integrity goal and current Service guidance, marsh restoration of the Harrison Unit will perpetuate the native biodiversity and physical characteristics endemic to the area. Little information is available on the specific ecological conditions of the Refuge prior to Refuge development and the restoration goal has little to no baseline available to establish objectives or measure success. The Refuge is also unique within the Bonneville Basin limiting the Refuge's ability to use a similar site for comparison.

Restoration ecology can be defined as "The return of an ecosystem to a close approximation of its conditions prior to disturbance" (National Resource Council 1992). Ecological systems are dynamic and the restoration objectives will focus on restoring the ecological functions and processes that permit natural succession. The restoration of the Harrison Unit will involve four primary steps:

1) Establishing a baseline inventory to include 3 years of data collection of the flora and fauna prior to any direct management implementation of the restoration process.

2) Conducting management activities, such as dike removal, to restore unimpeded hydrological, physical, chemical, and biological processes.

3) Designing monitoring strategies to evaluate both short term and long-term trends in ecosystem (community) structure and functions (water table dynamics, biodiversity, complete food web, resilience to invasive species). Short-term (1 to 3 years) monitoring to determine establishment and recovery of hydrological and biological components, and long-term

Figure 6 -

Harrison Unit Restoration



Harrison Unit

Historic Hydrology (derived from pre-refuge aerial photo)

Restoration

Phase I Area - North Spring
Braided channels targeted for dike
and water control structure removal

Phase II Area - Harrison Pool

A) Harrison Pool targeted for dike
breach at natural channel crossings
(generalized locations)

B) Harrison Pool dike targeted for removal

N

0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Miles

(10 years and more) monitoring to determine management effects on community structure and functions.

4) Refining and establishing new objectives and success criteria based on monitoring that leads to new management activities.

These primary steps will be implemented in a phased approach with monitoring and evaluation of the success of each phase being conducted before proceeding to the next phase. Phase I will remove check dikes and water control structures from water channels to restore unimpeded flow to braided channels. Phase II will breach dikes in the Harrison Unit at natural drainage channels. Phase III, if data indicate restoration is warranted, will remove the entire dike system of the Harrison Unit.

Objectives:

1. Establish a 3-year baseline inventory of existing soil, water, vegetation and fauna conditions of the North Springs stream channels and Harrison Unit pool within 4 years of CCP approval.

Strategies:

- Obtain various expert opinions on the likelihood of a successful restoration effort and relative benefits to the wildlife using that area being considered for restoration.
- Establish Refuge-wide baselines to be used for comparison and monitoring purposes.
- Partner with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to characterize current soil conditions.
- Gather baseline data by 2009 on current flows using portable flumes from a minimum of four locations within the unit (spring, midway on feeder canal, inlet to Harrison Pool, below Harrison Pool).
- Continually monitor spring discharges.
- Establish a minimum of ten shallow ground water monitoring locations by 2006 using simple, inexpensive measuring techniques such as drive point piezometers. This monitoring will provide a simple assessment of changes in water tables and ground water flow that could be correlated with changes in vegetation and community structure
- Coordinate with U.S. Army Dugway Proving Ground during 3-year baseline inventory period to address issues related to water flow onto Army property.
- Establish a baseline inventory for vegetation within the Harrison Unit. Establish long-term (permanent) transects that traverse all macro vegetation communities for monitoring. Map all plant communities within the Harrison Unit, both native and non-native species.
- Conduct weed and invasive plant mapping by 2008 when the Integrated Pest Management Plan is developed, including areas of tamarisk, *Phragmites*, knapweed, fivehook bassia and summer cypress.
- Monitor response of invasive plant species to large-scale soil disturbance.
- Conduct annual bi-monthly bird surveys of Harrison Unit during refuge-wide survey periods conducted between March 15 and May 1, and between July 15 and September 1.

- Conduct annual shorebird surveys specific to Harrison Unit on weeks opposite the bi-monthly bird survey.
- Establish a baseline inventory of small mammals found within the plant communities in the Harrison Unit. Establish long-term (permanent) transects or grids, and predator scent stations within the Harrison Unit when the Wildlife Inventory Plan is developed by 2007. Transects will be co-located with vegetation transects.

2. Within 3 years of approval of the CCP, develop a set of indicator species that best represent habitat within the Harrison Unit and Refuge-wide as described earlier, and that also provide response data for habitat change.

Strategies:

- Consult with experts to develop a list of indicator species (Table 8) that best indicate changes in hydrologic factors, vegetation cover, and composition, wetland salinity, and biodiversity.
- Develop indicator metrics and methods for monitoring indicator species that best meet objectives such as number of individuals per unit, by season, reproductive success, species distribution, and seasonal habitat.
- Conduct pre- and post-monitoring of target indicator species.

3. During the course of one complete drawdown of Harrison Pool in 2007 (Table 6), conduct a complete on-the-ground assessment of the unit to evaluate current conditions and how the major original watercourses can be restored and how to restore them.

Strategies:

- Compare aerial photos from pre-development with current aerial photos. Overlay original pre-development marsh photos on structural/dike map to identify natural watercourses and any remnants that may remain.
- Survey remnant channels.
- Conduct fly-over to see how much integrity exists in main drainages.
- Create GIS overlays for current and historical channels.
- Contract with a hydrologic engineering firm to conduct complete hydrologic assessment.
- Assess complications associated with invasive species introduction resulting from soil and vegetation disturbance from restoration of the landscape.

4. Restore unimpeded hydrological processes to the North Spring (Harrison Unit) in three phases to be completed in 5-year increments.

Strategies:

- Remove check dikes and water control structures by 2010 to restore unimpeded flow to braided channels (Phase I).
- Breach dikes at natural drainage channels by 2015 (Phase II).
- Remove dike system and any berm that diverts, channelizes, or prevents natural flows by 2020 (Phase III).
- Allow unimpeded hydrological processes to restore natural channels.

- Monitor and evaluate success of each phase before proceeding to next phase.

5. Annually monitor natural vegetation succession within the Harrison Unit.

Strategies:

- Continue to monitor vegetation composition, and community structure on a yearly basis using the line transects established in the baseline inventory. Additional vegetation transects will have to be established once the pool is removed. Plant community (vegetation) characteristics that may be monitored can include: species richness, ocular estimates of ground cover (bare ground, grass/forbs, exotic, and litter), shrub cover, shrub height.
- Establish research partnerships with local colleges and universities to monitor and research vegetation communities and ecological functions.
- Evaluate the need to plant native vegetation by 2009 when the Habitat Management Plan is developed.

6. Upon implementation of the restoration of the Harrison Unit, annually monitor wildlife presence, abundance, and areas of use based on the evaluation of the original watercourses within 5 years of CCP approval.

Strategies:

- Continue to monitor small mammal transects or grids and predator scent stations on a yearly basis. Additional small mammals transects will have to be established once the pool is removed. Data collected on small mammals may include species richness, abundance, and guilds.
- Continue annual refuge-wide bird surveys and shorebird surveys specific to Harrison Unit on weeks opposite the bi-monthly bird survey between March 15 and May 1 and between July 15 and September 1.
- Map and monitor wading bird nesting colonies (if any) that become established.
- Establish research partnerships with local colleges and universities to monitor and research animal communities and ecological functions, such as predator/prey relationships, competition, resource partitioning.

7. Within 5 years of Plan approval, develop and implement an invasive species plan for the Harrison Unit to annually monitor the effects of restoration on the resource.

Strategies:

- Map and control the spread of non-native and invasive plant species, including tamarisk, knapweed, bassia and summer cypress with appropriate chemical control agents and mechanical methods, according to the Integrated Pest Management Plan.
- Establish study plots to evaluate the efficacy of noxious weed treatments and weed responses to altered hydrology and disturbed soils.
- Identify and contain any non-native animal species with the Harrison Unit, including house

mice, mosquito fish, bull frog, leopard frog and non-native snails, according to the Habitat Management Plan

8. Consult with Utah DWR to explore the potential for restoration of least chub in the Harrison Unit over the next 10 years.

- Annually monitor the least chub in the Harrison Unit over the next 10 years and benchmark data against recovery rates in other units.

9. Develop adaptive management simultaneously with the three phases of marsh restoration described in Objective 4, which allows the Refuge Manager to adapt strategies to better meet objectives or determine whether to proceed with restoration.

Strategies:

- Evaluate quality of monitoring data.
- Re-evaluate restoration approach.
- Evaluate if further restoration is warranted.

Visitor Services

Goal: Promote an understanding and appreciation of the fish, wildlife, and natural and cultural history of Fish Springs NWR by providing high quality environmental education, interpretation, and wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities for persons of all abilities.

Rationale: Increased efforts in visitor services and the reinitiation of a goose hunt will provide additional recreational opportunities at the Refuge. The Refuge will maintain an auto-tour route that traverses a cross section of the habitats and provides opportunity for wildlife viewing and photography. The construction of an interpretive boardwalk and an observation platform will further enhance wildlife viewing and photography. Scout groups visiting Fish Springs will find the Refuge to be a wonderful outdoor classroom. Providing service projects, merit badge counseling, and environmental education will enhance the visitor experience and understanding of the Refuge for most of these young visitors. Additional staff, as requested (see Funding and Personnel sections), will make increased efforts in outreach and environmental education possible, thereby enhancing public understanding and appreciation for Fish Springs NWR and the National Wildlife Refuge System.

USFWS

Duck Blind on Fish Springs NWR

Objectives:

1. Provide waterfowl hunting opportunities for up to 2,000 visits annually (Figure 7).

Strategies:

- Continue to open up to 40 percent of the Refuge to duck and coot hunting (no swans or snipe).
- Reinitiate a goose hunt on the Refuge.
- Continue an annual youth hunt.
- Increase law enforcement presence during hunting season.
- Maintain and advertise availability of three universally accessible hunting blinds.
- Maintain parking areas and roads for hunter vehicle access.
- Maintain all hunting related signs on the Refuge.
- Identify areas open to hunting and inform the public about Refuge hunting regulations through signs, news releases, pamphlets, and printed State hunting regulations.
- Produce a new Refuge Hunt Plan within 2 years.
- Produce a hunting tear sheet meeting Service graphic standards.
- Post hunting information, such as harvest data and availability of universally accessible hunting blinds, on Refuge web site.

2. Within 5 years of CCP approval, provide opportunities for up to 5,000 visitors annually to participate in wildlife observation, wildlife photography, and interpretation (Figure 8).

Strategies:

- Open Refuge roads to public access as described on Figure 8. Only core auto-tour route open from April 15 to August 15; close all other roads during that period.
- Maintain all directional signs on the Refuge.
- Maintain 9-mile self-guided auto-tour route with interpretive signs.
- Maintain universally accessible Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area.
- Allow boating (no gas motors) for wildlife observation, wildlife photography, and interpretation on areas open to the public except for the period from April 15 to August 15.
- Exclude year-round sanctuary areas.
- Maintain three universally accessible wildlife observation and photography blinds.
- Maintain a native plant exhibit near the Headquarters building.
- Maintain the Visitor Contact Kiosk and Headquarters exhibits.
- Construct a universally accessible interpretive boardwalk trail that extends into the marsh area and two viewing platforms. Include interpretive panels along the boardwalk and at the viewing platforms that discuss natural and human history of the Fish Springs area.
- Produce a Refuge general brochure in the Service graphic standard.
- Update and reprint the Refuge Wildlife List as needed.
- Conduct a special event each year for International Migratory Bird Day.
- Host an annual Refuge Open House or similar public event.
- Provide interpretive or environmental education discussions and/or tours for groups as requested. Include discussions about contribution of the Refuge to wildlife resources and ecosystem functioning.


U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Figure 7
Hunting
Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
T10S
T11S
R13W
R14W
Callao 18 miles
Harrison Pool
Gadwall Pool
Ibis Pool
Pintail Pool
Egret Pool
Shoveler Pool
Curlew Pool
Mallard Pool
Avocet Pool
Tooele 104 miles
Sand Pass 15 miles
T11S
T12S
R14W
R13W
** CONSULT REFUGE PERSONNEL FOR SPECIFIC REGULATIONS **
N
Refuge Boundary
Closed To Hunting
Open To Hunting
County Road
Refuge Road Open to Public
Service Road Closed to Public
Headquarters
Hunting Information and Registration
Special Blind Area - Permit Required
Parking
Accessible Rest Rooms
0 0.5 1 1.5 2 Miles


U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Figure 8
Public Use
Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
T10S
T11S
T12S
R13W
R14W
Harrison Pool
Gadwall Pool
Ibis Pool
Pintail Pool
Egret Pool
Shoveler Pool
Curlew Pool
Mallard Pool
Avocet Pool
03
02
06
05
10
11
12
07
08
15
14
13
18
17
22
23
24
19
20
27
26
25
30
29
35
36
31
32
N
Public Access
Open Year-Round
Closed April 15 - August 15
Closed April 15 - August 15 Hunting Season
Closed Year-Round
0
0.5
1
1.5
2 Miles
Refuge Boundary
County Road Open to Public
Refuge Road Open to Public
Refuge Road Closed April 15 - August 15
Auto tour route
Lincoln Highway Interpretive Site
Accessible Photo Blinds
Headquarters
Visitor Information
Watchable Wildlife Area
Accessible Rest Rooms
Boardwalk
Observation Platform
Parking

- Co-sponsor other special events as opportunities arise.

3. Upon approval of the CCP, implement at least five different outreach efforts to foster appreciation for the resources of Fish Springs NWR and the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Strategies:

- Accommodate and host Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts as requested. Trips usually include a Refuge tour, service project, merit badge counseling, and environmental education activities. Allow troops to camp at Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area with special permit when deemed compatible.
- Host one to two school visits to the Refuge and make two to four visits to area schools annually, with the target being to increase the number of students reached each year from 50/year currently to 200/year.
- Make three presentations to professional and/or civic organizations annually.
- Write press releases announcing public events.
- Visit County Commissioners at least once a year.
- Visit regional offices of State and Federal Congressional representatives once a year.
- Maintain a Refuge web site with current information.

4. Within 3 years of CCP approval, increase the Refuge volunteer program to reach 1,000 donated hours/year.

Strategies:

- Organize three volunteer days each year with the goal of accomplishing a major task during each event. Provide all necessary training, materials, and lodging as needed. Schedule the event in conjunction with national volunteer efforts, such as Volunteer Week, National Public Lands Day or Earth Day, or in conjunction with special events on the Refuge, such as Migratory Bird Day or the Open House. Write a press release announcing each Volunteer Day and project to be accomplished. Write a press release after each Volunteer Day that recognizes volunteer efforts and what was accomplished during the event.
- Notify area schools, civic groups, and hunting, birding, and environmental organizations of volunteer opportunities on the Refuge.
- Work with the Service's regional volunteer coordinator to develop a volunteer program that meets Refuge needs.
- Provide room and board for volunteers working on the Refuge for extended periods.
- Provide two or more trailer pads for volunteer use.

Cultural Resources

Goal: Preserve, protect, and promote an understanding of cultural resources on Fish Springs NWR.

Rationale: Access for archaeologists will be limited but the majority of the cultural resources would still be reasonably accessible due to their proximity to roads that would remain on the Refuge's west side. Enhanced and expanded efforts to inventory and analyze yet unmapped cultural resources sites, fully understanding known sites, and vigilant protection of these critical and

irreplaceable trust resources will allow a better understanding of the human history of the eastern Bonneville Basin. This additional information, coupled with that which is already known about the area, can provide for a richer and more complete interpretation of the Fish Springs area. Efforts to provide increased interpretation of important sites and a cultural resources brochure that provides an overview of the Refuge's substantial cultural resource values will increase the public's understanding of the important role Fish Springs has played for humans through the ages and appreciation for the Service's responsibility to protect some of this nation's important cultural resources.

Previous work done on the Refuge has suggested such a rich assemblage of prehistoric and historic cultural resource sites and resources that the entire Refuge should be nominated as a National Archeological District. Such a designation will bring increased visibility to the tremendous cultural resources protected within the Refuge's boundary and will likely be valuable in ensuring that full consideration of management project impacts is given in relation to these resources in the future.

Objectives:

1. Increase preservation and protection of known archaeological resources on the Refuge, within 10 years.

Strategies:

- Increase law enforcement presence during peak times of public use.
- Use standard law enforcement practices to protect known resources on the Refuge.
- Upgrade existing barricades on two caves known to have been used by prehistoric cultures; replace vertical barricades with horizontal barricades to allow access by bats.
- Install remote sensing devices on the two caves.
- Catalog, map, and remove surface artifacts in limited cases where public use poses a severe threat.
- Enforce closures of year-round sanctuary areas; most known archaeological sites are within these areas.
- Consult with the Regional Historic Preservation Officer prior to all proposed ground-disturbing actions.
- Avoid areas of known cultural resources and potential sensitive areas when practical during management actions.
- Investigate the suitability of nominating the entire Refuge as a National Archeological District.

2. Within 15 years of CCP approval, perform a complete cultural resources survey to identify important cultural resources on the Refuge.

Strategies:

- Continue to host the University of Utah archaeological summer field school whenever possible.
- Contract with a qualified organization to complete a cultural resources inventory.
- Produce a cultural resources overlay for the GIS database.

3. Within 15 years of CCP approval, have two known archaeologically important caves excavated.

Strategies:

- Work with existing partners, such as University of Utah, Brigham Young University, Institute of Archaeology at University of Nevada - Las

Vegas, and University of Nevada - Reno, to develop a grant proposal to fund the project.

- Provide nonmonetary support to partners, such as vehicles, lodging, and computer support.

4. Within 7 years of CCP approval, develop and implement an expanded cultural and historic interpretation program to include four new initiatives.

Strategies:

- Design and install an interpretive display at the Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area. Display will discuss the uses of the Fish Springs area from prehistoric occupation up to the early days of the Refuge.
- Construct a turnout along the Pony Express Route where the Lincoln Highway runs close by. Include an interpretive display that discusses the Fish Springs area as a major transportation corridor through time and a foot trail to the remnant portion of the Lincoln Highway.
- Design and install an interpretive sign for the Fish Springs Pony Express site.
- Produce a leaflet that provides information on the rich prehistoric and historic cultural resources of the Refuge.
- Maintain cultural resources display and Lincoln Highway marker and sign in Headquarters building.

Partnerships

Goal: Promote partnerships to preserve and enhance the natural characteristics of the Bonneville Basin ecosystem in which Fish Springs NWR plays a key role.

Rationale: It is not enough that staff from Fish Springs NWR simply strive to provide critical habitat in a very arid and harsh environment. Coordination with a diverse array of partners is necessary to ensure that the Refuge can maximize its contribution to natural resource conservation at the landscape level. Fostering and increasing opportunities for participation in and contribution to larger landscape and regional level conservation initiatives will help ensure that the Refuge meets this obligation. Opportunities for academic institutions, other Federal, State, and county agencies, non-government organizations, and private citizens to partner with the Refuge to further this goal are nearly unlimited and can provide a important leveraging of resources toward this end.

The capability of the Refuge staff to participate in and contribute to these potential partnerships, which are geared toward protecting wildlife, cultural, and physical resources at the landscape level, will be maximized. The capability of the Refuge to provide critical habitats for the full complement of native flora and fauna will be enhanced and a broader array of species of concern will be a focus of management. Increased participation in partnerships will enable the Refuge to realize more fully the context of its habitats and populations relative to landscape level efforts and should allow it to focus resources to best complement those efforts and the National Wildlife Refuge System and Service missions.

Objectives:

1. Participate in local partnering opportunities over the next 15 years that will benefit the Refuge by increasing knowledge of Refuge resources or accomplishing specific tasks.

Strategies:

- Continue partnership with University of Utah's Museum of Natural History. Currently, this partnership has resulted in archaeological, geomorphological, and small mammal research being conducted on the Refuge, but the Cooperative Agreement covers many other disciplines.
- Continue partnerships with Brigham Young University and Southern Utah University, which focus on biological research projects.
- Continue cooperative efforts with Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (e.g., least chub re-introduction, fencing, Partners for Fish and Wildlife).
- Assist in the formation of the Eastern Bonneville Basin partnership with Dugway Proving Ground, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, and The Nature Conservancy. The focus of this partnership is common natural resources management issues.

2. Within 3 years of CCP approval, renew participation in existing national and international partnerships at the regional level.

Strategies:

- Renew participation in Partners in Flight, an international bird conservation program.
- Renew participation in the Intermountain West Joint Venture All Birds Conservation planning efforts.
- Initiate participation in the Intermountain West Regional Shorebird Plan team.

Chapter 5. Implementation and Monitoring

Personnel

Fish Springs NWR currently has a staff of four full-time employees and one career seasonal (8 to 9 months/year). This Plan calls for the addition of three new full-time employees and converting the career seasonal to full-time, an overall increase of 3.5 FTE (Figure 9). These increases will greatly enhance the biological programs on the Refuge, which currently lacks a full-time biological staff.

Funding

In fiscal year 2003, Fish Springs NWR had a baseline budget of $330,000 to fund annual operating expenses, including staff salaries. Station backlogs are identified in two databases. The Maintenance Management System (MMS) identifies maintenance project needs for the Refuge. Currently, this database documents $9.5 million in maintenance backlogs for Fish Springs NWR. The Refuge Operations Needs



Figure 9. Proposed Organizational Chart for Fish Springs NWR.

System (RONS) identifies all other Refuge project needs, such as increased staffing and specific on-the-ground projects. This database currently documents $1.3 million in first year costs and $250,000 in recurring annual costs for project needs for Fish Springs NWR. The top 15 Refuge Operating Needs System (RONS) and top 10 Management Maintenance System (MMS) priority projects are presented in Appendices H and I, respectively.

The cost of implementing the CCP will mean supplementing the current baseline budget with those funds needed to accomplish all projects identified in the RONS and MMS databases. As stated above, the RONS identifies $1.3 million in first year costs and $250,000 in recurring annual costs for project needs for Fish Springs NWR. These costs include the expansion of habitat management activities, increased research and monitoring efforts, and the increased staffing level identified.

The cost of implementing marsh restoration in the Harrison Unit is $390,000 to $500,000. This involves the removal of about 3 miles of 8-foot dikes, and about 20 check dams and water control structures (metal culverts, concrete culverts, etc.). This cost estimate does not include vegetation restoration in restored areas such as where the dikes are removed.

Step-down Management Plans

The Fish Springs NWR CCP is intended to be a broad umbrella plan that outlines general concepts and objectives for habitat, wildlife, public use, cultural resources, and partnerships that will guide Refuge management over the next 15 years. Step-down management plans provide greater detail for implementing specific actions authorized by the CCP. Table 9 presents those plans needed for Fish Springs NWR, their current status, and next revision date.

Table 9. Step-down management plans for Fish Springs NWR.

Step-Down Management Plan	Status of Plan Year Completed	Proposed Revision Date
Safety Program/Operations	1990	Not Necessary
Hazardous Materials Operations	1998 HAZCOM	MSDS updated yearly as needed
Law Enforcement	No Plan	2006
Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan	2003	2008
Integrated Pest Management	2003	2008
Refuge Uses (Compatibility)	2003 (with CCP)	2013
Visitor Services Plan	No Plan	2007
Hunting	1981	2005
Habitat Management Plan	1990 (Marsh Management Plan)	2009
Fire Management	2002	2007 (update annually)
Wildlife Inventory Plan	1990	2007
Exotic Species	No Comprehensive Plan, IPM for exotic vegetation	2009
Cultural Resource Management Plan	No Plan	2010

Partnership Opportunities

Partnerships are a key component of accomplishing the Refuge's mission. Existing partnerships will continue and, hopefully, new ones will be developed.

Partnership opportunities for the Refuge have been limited, primarily due to its remoteness and small staff. However, there have been partnering successes with organizations and individuals with whom a common interest is shared. The Utah Division of Wildlife has worked with the Refuge on the reintroduction of the threatened least chub, fencing projects, Partners for Fish and Wildlife efforts, coordinating waterfowl hunting, and distributing information about the Refuge. The University of Utah Museum of Natural History has conducted several archaeological surveys, small mammal trapping, and geomorphological research. Brigham Young University and Southern Utah University have conducted various biological research projects. Volunteers have contributed thousands of hours in the past in support of Refuge biological inventories, habitat management, visitor services, and facility maintenance. These partnerships have proven fruitful for all parties. Every indication is that they will continue.

Undeveloped partnership opportunities exist throughout the region. Dugway Proving Ground has expressed an interest in forming an Eastern Bonneville Basin Partnership with Fish Springs NWR, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, and The Nature Conservancy. The focus of this partnership will be common natural resources management issues, such as landscape-level aspects of providing habitat for species of concern, control of invasive species, and joint law enforcement.

Additionally, the Refuge staff would like to renew participation in regional working groups of national and international partnerships. Partners in Flight, the Intermountain West Joint Venture, Lincoln Highway Association and the Intermountain West Regional Shorebird Plan team are all potential partners. These groups offer shared expertise, ideas, management strategies, problem-solving, experience, and resources.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Appropriate monitoring and evaluation are key to meeting the mission of Fish Springs NWR because they provide the information necessary for adaptive management, a flexible approach to long-term management. Results from the monitoring program and other information will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies laid out in this CCP and whether management goals and objectives are being met. Changes will be made to strategies and/or objectives as necessary based on this evaluation.

In this CCP, habitat management and monitoring receive the primary emphasis. Many of the wildlife species on the Refuge are migratory birds. Migratory birds are impacted by a variety of factors (drought, disease, pollution, habitat destruction, etc.) on their wintering and nesting grounds and all along their migration routes. Determining if a specific habitat manipulation in a Refuge unit is wholly responsible for a change in a Refuge migratory bird population is difficult. Managers strive to gather current information about the critical habitat needs for targeted species and possible strategies for meeting those needs, and then design and implement a Habitat Management Plan. The development of a Habitat Management Plan is a critical step toward accomplishing the goals and objectives described in this CCP. The habitat can then be monitored to determine if the management strategies are providing the critical habitat needs identified. Whether migratory bird or other wildlife use of the manipulated unit increases

may or may not be directly related to the manipulation. Monitoring populations in the manipulated unit over a long period of time can provide only some general local population trend information and document wildlife use. Managers must then carefully evaluate the data to try to determine if a direct correlation exists with the habitat manipulation.

Biological surveys will be conducted for small mammals, waterfowl, shorebirds, water birds, raptors, passerines, reptiles and amphibians, carnivores, and invertebrates. Additionally, a series of vegetative transects/plots in all habitat types will be established as a long-term monitoring tool. This information will be used to assess the effects of abiotic factors (e.g., weather) and habitat manipulation (e.g., water management, burning, invasive species control) on long-term habitat trends on the Refuge.

Much of the monitoring work will be conducted by Refuge staff. The addition of a full-time biologist and a biological technician will dramatically increase monitoring capabilities on the Refuge. Some monitoring projects will be conducted through partnerships with universities or with grant assistance. Other monitoring work will be completed by trained volunteers. Additional communication and cooperation with Service partners in the Bonneville Basin will assist in accomplishing landscape-level monitoring, resolving large scale questions, and testing assumptions.

Plan Amendment and Revision

The Fish Springs NWR Manager will use the CCP to ensure Refuge priorities and work is consistent with the CCP goals, objectives and strategies. Appropriate staff will be assigned tasks and projects, identified in the CCP, to accomplish the objectives stated in the CCP. Refuge staff will review the CCP at least annually to decide if it requires any revisions as new information becomes available, ecological conditions change, or Refuge expansion occurs. At a minimum, the CCP will be revised every 15 years.

Glossary

Adaptive Management: The rigorous application of management, research, and monitoring to gain information and experience necessary to assess and modify management activities. A process that uses feedback from refuge research and monitoring and evaluation of management actions to support or modify objectives and strategies at all planning levels.

Alternative: 1) A reasonable way to fix the identified problem or satisfy the stated need (40 CFR 1500.2). 2) Alternatives are different means of accomplishing refuge purposes and goals and contributing to the System mission (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Biological Control: The use of organisms or viruses to control weeds or other pests.

Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP): A document that describes the desired future conditions of the refuge; and provides long-range guidance and management direction for the refuge manager to accomplish the purposes of the refuge, contribute to the mission of the System, and to meet other relevant mandates (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Concern: See definition of "Issue."

Cover Type: The present vegetation of an area.

Cultural Resources: The remains of sites, structures, or objects used by people in the past.

Cultural Resource Inventory: A professionally conducted study designed to locate and evaluate evidence of cultural resources present within a defined geographic area. Inventories may involve various levels, including background literature search, comprehensive field examination to identify all exposed physical manifestations of cultural resources, or sample inventory to project site distribution and density over a larger area. Evaluation of identified cultural resources to determine eligibility for the National Register follows the criteria found in .36 CFR 60.4 (Service Manual 614 FW 1.7).

Ecological Integrity: An ecosystem has integrity when it is deemed characteristic for its natural region, including the composition and abundance of native species and biological communities, rates of change and supporting processes. In plain language, ecosystems have integrity when they retain their native components and complexity (plants, animals and other organisms) and processes (such as growth, reproduction, energy flow, and nutrient cycling) to maintain the ecosystem's capacity for self-organization through time.

Ecosystem: A dynamic and interrelating complex of plant and animal communities and their associated nonliving environment.

Ecosystem Management: Management of natural resources using system-wide concepts to ensure that all plants and animals in ecosystems are maintained at

viable levels in native habitats and basic ecosystem processes are perpetuated indefinitely.

Endangered Species (Federal): A plant or animal species listed under the Endangered Species Act that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Endangered Species (State): A plant or animal species in danger of becoming extinct or extirpated in an individual State within the near future if factors contributing to its decline continue. Populations of these species are at critically low levels or their habitats have been degraded or depleted to a significant degree.

Environmental Assessment (EA): A concise public document, prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, that briefly discusses the purpose and need for an action, alternatives to such action, and provides sufficient evidence and analysis of impacts to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement or Finding of No Significant Impact (40 CFR 1508.9).

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): A detailed written statement required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, analyzing the environmental impacts of a proposed action, adverse effects of the project that cannot be avoided, alternative courses of action, short-term uses of the environment versus the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources (40 CFR 1508.1 I).

Evapotranspiration: The combined water loss from a biotic community or ecosystem into the atmosphere caused by evaporation of water from the soil plus the transpiration of plants.

Fauna: All the vertebrate and invertebrate animals of an area.

Federal Trust Resources: A trust is something managed by one entity for another who hold the ownership. The FWS holds in trust many natural resources for the people of the United States of America as a result of Federal Acts and treaties. Examples are species listed under the Endangered Species Act, migratory birds protected by international treaties, and native plant or wildlife species found on a national wildlife refuge.

Federal Trust Species: All species where the Federal government has primary jurisdiction including federally endangered or threatened species, migratory birds, anadromous fish, and certain marine mammals.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI): A document prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, supported by an Environmental Assessment, that briefly presents why a Federal action will have no significant effect on the human environment and for which an Environmental Impact Statement, therefore, will not be prepared (40 CFR 1508.13).

Flora: All the plant species of an area.

Forb: A broad-leaved, herbaceous plant; for example, a columbine.

Goal: Descriptive, open-ended, and often broad statements of desired future conditions that conveys a purpose but does not define measurable units (Draft Service Manual 620 FW 1.5).

Geographic Information System (GIS): A computer system capable of storing and manipulating spatial data.

Habitat: Suite of existing environmental condition required by an organism for survival and reproductions. The place where an organism typically lives.

Habitat Type: See Vegetation Type.

Indicator Species: A species of plant or animal that is assumed to be sensitive to habitat changes and represents the needs of a larger group of species. Also referred to as a key species.

Integrated Pest Management: Methods of managing undesirable species (such as weeds) including: education, prevention, physical or mechanical methods of control, biological control, responsible chemical use, and cultural methods.

Issue: Any unsettled matter that requires a management decision; e.g., a Service initiative, opportunity, resource management problem, a threat to the resources of the unit, conflict in uses, public concern, or the presence of an undesirable resource condition (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Management Alternative: See Alternative.

Migration: The seasonal movement from one area to another and back.

Mission Statement: Succinct statement of a unit's purpose and reason for being.

Monitoring: The process of collecting information to track changes of selected parameters over time.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA): Requires all agencies, including the Service, to examine the environmental impacts of their actions, incorporate environmental information, and use public participation in the planning and implementation of all actions. Federal agencies must integrate NEPA with other planning requirements, and prepare appropriate NEPA documents to facilitate better environmental decision making (from 40 CFR 1500).

National Wildlife Refuge: A designated area of land, water, or an interest in land or water within the Refuge System.

National Wildlife Refuge System: Various categories of areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the conservation of fish and wildlife, including species threatened with extinction, all lands, waters, and interests therein administered by the Secretary as wildlife refuges, areas for the protections and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction, wildlife ranges, games ranges, wildlife management areas, or waterfowl production areas.

Native Species: Species that normally live and thrive in a particular ecosystem.

Natural: Pertains to the ecosystem components (biological, physical, chemical) and processes (geological, hydrological and biological) present on the refuge prior to the influence of western man.

Neotropical Migratory Bird: A bird species that breeds north of the U.S./Mexican border and winters primarily south of this border.

Notice of Intent (NOI): In the case of a Federal action, such as analyzed in this documentation, an NOI is a notice that an environmental impact statement will be prepared and considered (40 CFR 1508.22). Published in the *Federal Register*.

Notice of Availability: An NOA is a notice that documentation is available to the public on a Federal action, in this case, the Comprehensive Conservation Plan. Published in the *Federal Register*.

Noxious Weed: A plant species designated by Federal or State law as generally possessing one or more of the following characteristics: aggressive or difficult to manage; parasitic; a carrier or host of serious insect or disease; or nonnative, new, or not common to the United States, according to the Federal Noxious Weed Act (PL 93-639), a noxious weed is one that causes disease or had adverse effects on man or his environment and, therefore, is detrimental to the agriculture and commerce of the Untied States and to the public health.

Objective: An objective is a concise target statement of what will be achieved, how much will be achieved, when and where it will be achieved, and who is responsible for the work. Objectives are derived from goals and provide the basis for determining management strategies. Objectives should be attainable and time-specific and should be stated quantitatively to the extent possible. If objectives cannot be stated quantitatively, they may be stated qualitatively (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Passerine: Perching songbird; includes over half of all birds. For example - sparrows, finches, warblers.

Planning Area: A planning area may include lands outside existing planning unit boundaries that are being studied for inclusion in the System and/or partnership planning efforts. It may also include watersheds or ecosystems that affect the planning area.

Planning Team: A planning team prepared the Comprehensive Conservation Plan. Planning teams are interdisciplinary in membership and function. Teams generally consist of a planning team leader; refuge manager and staff; biologists; staff specialists or other representatives of Service programs, ecosystems or regional offices; and other governmental agencies as appropriate.

Planning Unit: A single refuge, an ecologically / administratively related complex of refuges, or distinct unit of a refuge.

Plant Association: A classification of plant communities based on the similarity in dominants of all layers of vascular species in a climax community.

Plant Community: An assemblage of plant species unique in its composition; occurs in particular locations under particular influences; a reflection or integration of the environmental influences on the site -- such as soil, temperature, elevation, solar radiation, slope, aspect, and rainfall; denotes a general kind of climax plant community, i.e., ponderosa pine or bunchgrass.

Preferred Alternative: This is the alternative determined (by the decision maker) to best achieve the Refuge purpose, vision, and goals; contributes to the Refuge System mission, addresses the significant issues; and is consistent with principles of sound fish and wildlife management.

Prescribed Fire: The skillful application of fire to natural fuels under conditions of weather, fuel moisture, soil moisture, etc., that allow confinement of the fire to a predetermined area and produces the intensity of heat and rate of spread to accomplish planned benefits to one or more

objectives of forest management, wildlife management, or hazard reduction.

Public: Individuals, organizations, and groups; officials of Federal, State, and local government agencies; Indian tribes; and foreign nations. It may include anyone outside the core planning team. It includes those who may or may not have indicated an interest in Service issues and those who do or do not realize that Service decisions may affect them.

Public Involvement: A process that offers affected and interested individuals and organizations an opportunity to become informed about, and to express their opinions on, Service actions and policies. In the process, these views are studied thoroughly and thoughtful consideration of public views is given in shaping decisions for refuge management.

Purpose(s) of the Refuge: The purpose of a refuge is specified in or derived from the law, proclamation, executive order, agreement, public land order, donation document, or administrative memorandum establishing, authorization, or expanding a refuge, refuge unit, or refuge subunit.

Refuge Operating Needs System (RONS): The Refuge Operating Needs System is a national database that contains the unfunded operational needs of each refuge. Projects included are those required to implement approved plans, and meet goals, objectives, and legal mandates.

Refuge Use: Any activity on a refuge, except administrative or law enforcement activity carried out by or under the direction of an authorized Service employee.

Refuge Goal: See Goal.

Refuge Purposes: The purposes specified in or derived from the law, proclamation, executive order, agreement, public land order, donation document, or administrative memorandum establishing, authorizing, or expanding a refuge, a refuge unit, or refuge subunit (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Special Status Species: Plants or animals that have been identified through either Federal law, State law, or agency policy, as requiring special protection of monitoring. Examples include federally listed endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species; state listed endangered, threatened, candidate, or monitor species; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service species of management concern and species identified by the Partners in Flight program as being of extreme or moderately high conservation concern.

Species of Management Concern: Those plant and animal species, while not failing under the definition of special status species, that are of management interest by virtue of being Federal trust species such as migratory birds, important game species including white-tailed deer, furbearers such as American marten, important prey species including red-backed vole, or significant keystone species such as beaver.

Step-down Management Plans: Step-down management plans provide the details necessary to implement management strategies identified in the comprehensive conservation plan (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Sound Professional Judgment: A finding, determination, or decision that is consistent with principles of sound fish and wildlife management and administration, available science and resources, and adherence to the requirements of the Refuge Administration Act and other applicable laws.

Strategy: A specific action, tool, or technique or combination of actions, tools, and techniques used to meet unit objectives (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Succession: Process of change and development in community components - soil, micro-organisms, animal and plant life and microenvironment.

Threatened Species (Federal): Species listed under the Endangered Species Act that are likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of their range.

Threatened Species (State): A plant or animal species likely to become endangered in an individual State within the near future if factors contributing to population decline or habitat degradation or loss continue.

Trust Species: Species for which the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has primary responsibility including most federally listed threatened and endangered species, anadromous fish once they enter inland U.S. waterways, and migratory birds. Also see "Federal Trust Species."

Vegetation Type, Habitat Type, Forest Cover Type: A land classification system based upon the concept of distinct plant associations.

Vision Statement: A concise statement of the desired future condition of the planning unit, based primarily upon the System mission, specific refuge purposes, and other relevant mandates (Draft Service Manual 602 FW 1.5).

Wilderness Study Areas: Lands and waters identified through inventory as meeting the definition of wilderness and undergoing evaluation for recommendation for inclusion in the Wilderness System. A study area must meet the following criteria: (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least 5,000 contiguous roadless acres or is sufficient in size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition (Draft Service Manual 61 0 FW 1.5).

Wilderness: See Designated Wilderness Area.

Wildfire: A free-burning fire requiring a suppression response; all fire other than prescribed fire that occurs on wildlands (Service Manual 621 FW 1.7).

Wildland Fire: Every wildland fire is either a wildfire or a prescribed fire (Service Manual 621 FW 1.3).

Wildlife-dependent Recreation: A use of a refuge involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, or environmental education and interpretation. The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 specifies that these are the six priority general public uses of the System.

Appendix A. Key Legislation and Policies

Antiquities Act (1906): Authorizes the scientific investigation of antiquities on Federal land and provides penalties for unauthorized removal of objects taken or collected without a permit.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918): Designates the protection of migratory birds as a Federal responsibility. This Act enables the setting of seasons, and other regulations including the closing of areas, Federal or non-Federal, to the hunting of migratory birds.

Migratory Bird Conservation Act (1929): Establishes procedures for acquisition by purchase, rental, or gifts of areas approved by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (1934): Authorized the opening of part of a refuge to waterfowl hunting.

Fish and Wildlife Act (1956): Established a comprehensive national fish and wildlife policy and broadened the authority for acquisition and development of refuges.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (1958): Allows the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to enter into agreements with private landowners for wildlife management purposes.

Refuge Recreation Act (1962): Allows the use of refuges for recreation when such uses are compatible with the refuge's primary purposes and when sufficient funds are available to manage the uses.

Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (1965): Uses the receipts from the sale of surplus Federal land, outer continental shelf oil and gas sales, and other sources for land acquisition under several authorities.

National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, 16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee. (Refuge Administration Act): Defines the National Wildlife Refuge System and authorizes the Secretary to permit any use of a refuge provided such use is compatible with the major purposes for which the refuge was established. The Refuge Improvement Act clearly defines a unifying mission for the Refuge System; establishes the legitimacy and appropriateness of the six priority public uses (hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, or environmental education and interpretation); establishes a formal process for determining compatibility; established the responsibilities of the Secretary of Interior for managing and protecting the System; and requires a Comprehensive Conservation Plan for each refuge by the year 2012. This Act amended portions of the Refuge Recreation Act and National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.

National Historic Preservation Act (1966) as amended: Establishes as policy that the Federal Government is to provide leadership in the preservation of the nation's prehistoric and historic resources.

Architectural Barriers Act (1968): Requires federally owned, leased, or funded buildings and facilities to be accessible to persons with disabilities.

National Environmental Policy Act (1969): Requires the disclosure of the environmental impacts of any major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Endangered Species Act (1973): Requires all Federal agencies to carry out programs for the conservation of endangered and threatened species.

Rehabilitation Act (1973): Requires programmatic accessibility in addition to physical accessibility for all facilities and programs funded by the Federal government to ensure that anybody can participate in any program.

Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act (1974): Directs the preservation of historic and archaeological data in Federal construction projects.

Clean Water Act (1977): Requires consultation with the Corps of Engineers (404 permits) for major wetland modifications.

Executive Order 11988 (1977): Each Federal agency shall provide leadership and take action to reduce the risk of flood loss and minimize the impact of floods on human safety, and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by the floodplains.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act (1978): Directs agencies to consult with native traditional religious leaders to determine appropriate policy changes necessary to protect and preserve Native American religious cultural rights and practices.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act (1979) as amended: Protects materials of archaeological interest from unauthorized removal or destruction and requires Federal managers to develop plans and schedules to locate archaeological resources.

Emergency Wetlands Resources Act (1986): The purpose of the Act is "To promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of wetlands by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential habitat, and for other purposes."

Federal Noxious Weed Act (1990): Requires the use of integrated management systems to control or contain undesirable plant species, and an interdisciplinary approach with the cooperation of other Federal and State agencies.

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990): Requires Federal agencies and museums to inventory, determine ownership of, and repatriate cultural items under their control or possession.

Americans With Disabilities Act (1992): Prohibits discrimination in public accommodations and services.

Executive Order 12996 Management and General Public Use of the National Wildlife Refuge System (1996): Defines the mission, purpose, and priority public uses of the National Wildlife Refuge System. It also presents four principles to guide management of the System.

Executive Order 13007 Indian Sacred Sites (1996): Directs Federal land management agencies to accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners, avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites, and where appropriate, maintain the confidentiality of sacred sites.

Volunteer and Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998: To amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to promote volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes. October 5, 1998

Director's Order 148 - Coordination with State Fish and Wildlife Agency Representatives on Management of the National Wildlife Refuge System (December 23, 2003): This Director's Order outlines procedures we will follow for ongoing and effective cooperation with States when developing policy and managing the National Wildlife Refuge System. It was developed in cooperation with a team of State representatives from Alaska, Arizona, Montana, New York, and South Carolina under the auspices of Intergovernmental Personnel Agreements. It builds upon the direction in the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act and the Interior Policy on State-Federal Relationships (43 CFR 24).

Appendix B. Compatibility Determinations

Station Name:

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge

Date Established:

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge was approved for acquisition on June 18, 1958, by the Migratory Bird Conservation Committee.

Establishing and Acquisition Authorities:

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge - Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929, Public Land Order 1942 dated August 12, 1959; Public Land Order 2563 dated December 22, 1961.

Purpose for which Established:

Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge was established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act ". . . for use as inviolate sanctuaries, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds." (16 U.S.C. 715D)

Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System:

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-dependent recreation, including hunting, wildlife observation and photography, environmental education and interpretation

Waterfowl hunting is allowed during the fall. All hunters are required to register at the visitor contact station prior to entering and upon exiting the Refuge for the purpose of hunting. A blind site for hunter with mobility impairments is maintained for use by reservation only and is available for reservation on Saturdays, Sundays, and Wednesdays during the waterfowl hunting season. Hunter parking areas are provided.

Wildlife observation and photography are facilitated by an auto-tour route. The universally accessible waterfowl hunting site is made available for photographers outside of the waterfowl hunting season. Visitors are permitted to hike or use boats without gas motors (electric motors are authorized) in areas open to the public.

The Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge normally sponsors two public use events each year. One event is in conjunction with International Migratory Bird day and usually involves opportunities for the public to learn basic birding skills, how to attract migratory songbirds around the home, and opportunities to go birding on the Refuge with Utah experts. Attendance is normally around 50 visitors.

A second event normally scheduled is the Refuge Open House. Held since 1991 on the third Saturday in September, this

event highlights our fall waterfowl migration and is also a day when various Partners display exhibits regarding their work on the Refuge and in Utah. Visitation for the event is normally between 50 to 100 visitors.

Other opportunities for environmental education and interpretation occur when Boy or Girl Scout groups, church youth groups, and various other organizations such as Elderhostel, Sons of the Pioneers, etc., visit the Refuge. Sometimes these visits are scheduled well in advance although they are frequently accommodated on short notice. School groups visiting the Refuge, due to the extreme travel distances involved, are an uncommon occurrence. However, when they do visit, a tour and talk as well as structured environmental education to meet goals identified by accompanying instructors are part of our effort. Camping is allowed by the issuance of a special use permit for groups engaged in pre-arranged environmental education programs and for organizations involved in Refuge service projects.

Justification:

Based on the biological impacts described in the CCP and Environmental Assessment, the five public uses described here will have minimal, if any, adverse impacts on the wildlife-oriented purposes for which the Refuge was established or the purpose of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

At the same time, these five public uses help carry out the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act mandate to "ensure that opportunities are provided within the System for compatible wildlife-dependent recreational uses."

Additionally, a secondary goal of the National Wildlife Refuge System is to provide opportunities for the public to develop an understanding and appreciation for wildlife. The five uses described here are identified as priority public uses in the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 and will help meet that goal on the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge with minimal conflicts with the wildlife conservation mission of the Refuge System.

Determination:

Wildlife-dependent recreation, including hunting, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation are compatible with the following stipulations.

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility:

- Continue seasonal closures of some Refuge units during the spring breeding season and fall hunting season.
- Monitor use, regulate access, and maintain necessary facilities to prevent habitat degradation and wildlife disturbance in high public use areas.
- Monitor levels of use and effects on wildlife.
- Monitor participants to ensure activities are conducted in compliance with Refuge regulations.

Description of Proposed Use:

Research

The Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge receives periodic requests to conduct scientific research. Priority would be given to studies that support Refuge purposes, goals, and objectives. This would include, for example, studies that contribute to the enhancement, protection, use, preservation, and management of native

Refuge wildlife populations and their habitats, and would include cultural resources. Research applicants must submit a proposal that would outline: 1) objectives of the study; 2) justification for the study; 3) detailed methodology and schedule; 4) potential impact on Refuge wildlife and/or habitat, including disturbance (short- and long-term), injury, or mortality; 5) personnel required; 6) costs to the Refuge; and 7) end products (i.e., reports, publications). Research proposal would be reviewed by Refuge staff and others, as appropriate. Evaluation criteria will include, but not be limited to, the following:

1) Research that will contribute to priority management activities will have highest priority.
2) Research projects that can be done off the Refuge are less likely to be approved without compelling reason.
3) Research that causes disturbance or is intrusive will be closely scrutinized. Level and type of disturbance will be carefully weighed when evaluating a request.
4) If staffing or logistics make it impossible for the Refuge to monitor researcher activity, this may be reason to deny the request.
5) The length of the project will be considered and agreed upon before approval.

Availability of Resources:

Resources to accommodate current levels of research are minimally adequate. If additional staff positions currently approved but not filled, shown in RONS projects listed in Appendix B, were filled, they would provide sufficient staff time needed to accommodate the increased research and monitoring efforts and associated administration, facility maintenance, and law enforcement needs.

Anticipated Impacts on Service Lands, Water, and Interests:

Minimal impact to Refuge wildlife and habitats will be expected with research studies. Some level of disturbance is expected with all research activities since most researchers will be entering areas that are normally closed to the public and may be collecting samples or handling wildlife. Special Use Permit conditions will include special conditions to ensure that impacts to wildlife and habitats are kept to a minimum.

Determination:

Use is compatible with the following stipulations.

Stipulations Necessary to Ensure Compatibility:

- All approved researchers must be issued Special Use Permits by the Refuge Manager.
- Researchers must comply with all Refuge regulations unless authorized otherwise under conditions of their Special Use Permit.
- All data collected by the researcher also become property of the Refuge. Copies of any reports, summaries, and data regarding the research must be submitted to the Refuge.
- Researchers are responsible for coordinating with various agencies to gain specific permits to complete their projects. Authorized projects will be in compliance with all local, State, and Federal laws.
- Refuge Manager may suspend/modify conditions/terminate on-Refuge

research that is already permitted and in progress, should unacceptable impacts or issues arise or be noted.

Justification:

Based on the biological impacts described in the CCP and Environmental Assessment, research as described here will have minimal, if any, adverse impacts on the wildlife-oriented purposes for which the Refuge was established or the purpose of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Research projects will contribute to the enhancement, protection, use, preservation, and management of native wildlife populations and their habitats and cultural and geological resources. Most approved research projects would have significant potential to provide information that would enable Refuge staff to make management decisions that were based on increased levels of biotic soundness.

Signatures:

Jay K. Bonta 10-05-04

Project Leader Date

Concurrence:

Steve Berendzen 10/7/04

Refuge Supervisor Date

Richard A. Coleman 10/7/04

Regional Chief, NWRS Date

Mandatory Re-Evaluation Date

This determination will be re-evaluated by the Refuge Manager after a period of not more than 15 years. If the conditions under which the use is permitted change significantly, or if significant new information exists regarding the effect of this use, then the determination shall be re-evaluated when those condition are known. Not withstanding any of the criteria identified in this paragraph, it is still the prerogative of the Refuge Manager to re-evaluate the compatibility of these uses at any time.

Appendix C. Planning Team

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

- Jay Banta, Refuge Manger, Fish Springs NWR
- James Graham, Refuge Operations Specialist, Fish Springs NWR
- Toni Griffin, Planning Team Leader, Region 6 Office
- Bridget McCann, Vice-Planning Team Leader, Region 6 Office
- Sean Fields, GIS Specialist, Region 6 Office
- Barbara Shupe, Vice-Writer/Editor, Region 6 Office

ERO Resources Corporation

- Richard Trenholme, Environmental Scientist
- Ron Beane, Wildlife Biologist
- Lance Carpenter, Wildlife Biologist
- Martha Clark, Editor and Document Production

Appendix D. Environmental Compliance

Environmental Action Statement

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 6
Denver, Colorado

Within the spirit and intent of the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act and other statutes, orders, and policies that protect fish and wildlife resources, I have established the following administrative record.

I have determined that the action of implementing the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan is found not to have significant environmental effects, as determined by the attached Finding of No Significant Impact and the environmental assessment as found with the draft comprehensive conservation plan.

Ralph O. Morgenweck
Regional Director
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

9/24/04
Date

ACTING

Richard A. Coleman, Ph.D.
Assistant Regional Director, National Wildlife Refuge System
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

9/24/04
Date

Steve Berendzen
Refuge Program Supervisor
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

9/24/04
Date

Jay Banta
Refuge Manager
Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dugway, Utah

09-17-04
Date

Finding of No Significant Impact

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 6
Denver, Colorado

Fulfill the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
Comprehensive Conservation Plan

Three management alternatives for the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge were assessed as to their effectiveness in achieving the Refuge purposes and their impact on the human environment. Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue current management of the Refuge. Alternative B, the Refuge Restoration Alternative, would restore Refuge habitats to mimic pre-settlement conditions. Alternative C, Management for Wildlife Diversity, the Proposed Action, would focus on providing habitat for maximum wildlife diversity including migratory birds, and native mammal, mollusk, invertebrate, and amphibian communities. Based on this assessment and comments received, I have selected Alternative C for implementation.

The preferred alternative was selected because it best meets the purposes for which the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge was established and is preferable to the "no action" alternative in light of physical, biological, economic, and social factors. The preferred alternative will also provide public aces for wildlife-dependent recreation, environmental education, and interpretation.

I find that the preferred alternative is not a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Accordingly, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed action is not required.

The following is a summary of anticipated environmental effects from implementation of the preferred alternative:

- The preferred alternative will not adversely impact endangered or threatened species or their habitat.
- The preferred alternative will not adversely impact archaeological or historical resources.
- The preferred alternative will not adversely impact wetlands nor does the plan call for structures that could be damaged by or that would significantly influence the movement of floodwater.
- The preferred alternative will not have a disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effect on minority or low-income populations.
- The State of Utah has been notified and given the opportunity to review the Comprehensive Conservation Plan and associated environmental assessment.

Ralph Morgenweck

Ralph Morgenweck
Regional Director
Region 6, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Denver, Colorado

9/24/09
Date

Appendix E. Section 7 Biological Evaluation

INTRA-SERVICE SECTION 7 BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Originating Persons: Jay Banta
Toni Griffin
Telephone Numbers: (435) 831-5353 x 2
(303) 236-4378
Date: May 21, 2004

I. Region: 6

II. Service Activity (Program): Refuges & Wildlife, Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge

III. Pertinent Species and Habitat

A. Federally Listed species and/or their critical habitat within the action area
1. bald eagle, Haliaeetus leucocephalus (listed threatened and proposed delisting)
2. There is no federally designated critical habitat on the action area (Fish Springs NWR)

B. Proposed species and/or proposed critical habitat within the action area
1. None

C. Candidate species within the action area
1. Western yellow-billed cuckoo, Coccyzus americanus
2. least chub, Iotichthys phlegethontis

D. Include species/habitat occurrence on a map
1. see attachment

IV. Geographic area or station name and action

Station: Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
Action: Issuance and Implementation of Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Fish Springs NWR

V. Location (map attached)

A. Ecoregion Number and Name: Fish Springs NWR is located within the Service's Region 6, Mountain-Prairie Region and specifically in the Interior Basins Ecosystem

B. County and State: Juab County, Utah

C. Section, township, and range: Fish Springs NWR includes parts or all of Sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, 25, 26, 35, and 36, Township 14 West , Range 11 South; Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9,16, 17, 18, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, Township 12 South, Range13 West.

D. Distance & direction to nearest town: Fish Springs NWR is approximately 78 miles northeast of Delta, UT

E. Species/habitat occurrence

1. bald eagle: This species occurs only as a migrant and winter species. Wintering numbers are typically 2-3 with a range of 0-5. Bald eagle activity occurs throughout the wetland portions of the Refuge. Diurnal roostng is concentrated in the large tree found at the Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife Area.
2. western yellow-billed cuckoo: This species is present as a very rare migrant. There are three records of sitings in 40 years. All have been in the vicinity of the Refuge headquarters and residential compound or at the Thomas Ranch Watchable Wildlife.
3. least chub: Least chub have been introduced into Walter and Deadman springs but are present only in Walter spring at this time.

VI. Description of proposed action: Issuance and Implementation of Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Fish Springs NWR

VII. Determination of effects

A. Explanation of effects of the action on species and critical habitats in items III. A, B & C

1. There is no federally designated critical habitat on the action area (Fish Springs NWR) and the CCP does not find a need to propose designating critical habitat within the Refuge at this time.

B. Explanation of actions to be implemented to reduce adverse effects

1. The actions of the CCP will cause little to no negative impacts upon migrant and wintering bald eagles. There may be a slight increase in visitation to the refuge, but current visitation levels are much lower than most field stations. A project to increase available, secure and undisturbed roosting sites will enhance bald eagle habitat. Habitat improvements that attract a larger waterfowl population will enhance foraging opportunities.
2. Current least chub population would not be negatively impacted by the proposed action. Current, proposed and ongoing efforts to expand the least chub population in conjunction with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources could substantially increase the population of this species on the Refuge.

VIII. Effect determination and response requested

[* = optional]

A. Listed species/designated critical habitat:

Determination	Response requested
No effect/no adverse modification (species: NONE)	✓ *Concurrence
May affect, but is not likely to adversely affect species/adversely modify critical habitat (species: bald eagle)	_____ Concurrence
likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species and adversely modify or destroy their critical habitat	_____ Formal Consultation

(species: NONE)

B. Proposed species/proposed critical habitat:

Determination	Response requested
No effect on proposed species/no adverse modification of proposed critical habitat (species: NONE)	✓ *Concurrence
Is likely to jeopardize proposed species adversely modify proposed critical habitat (species: NONE)	_____ Conference

C. Candidate Species:

Determination	Response requested
No effect (species: yellow-billed cuckoo, least chub)	✓ *Concurrence
Is likely to jeopardize candidate species (species: NONE)	_____ Conference

Jay Banta, Refuge Manager, Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge — 06-21-14 Date

IX. Reviewing ESO Evaluation

A. Concurrence _____ Non-concurrence _____

B. Formal Consultation required _____

C. Conference required _____

D. Informal conference required _____

E. Remarks

Henry Maddux, Utah Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service — 6/14/04 Date


U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Species/Habitat Occurrence
Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge
least chub:
Walter Spring
bald eagle:
Thomas Ranch
Watchable
Wildlife Area
western yellow-billed cukoo:
residential compound and
Thomas Ranch Watchable
Wildlife Area
Scale 1:55000
N
0
0.5
1
1.5
2 Miles
Refuge Boundary
Spring
Wetland (bald eagle habitat)
Open Water (bald eagle habitat)
County Road
Refuge Road
Service Road
Headquarters

Appendix F. Mailing List

Federal Officials

- Senator Robert Bennett, Washington, D.C. and Salt Lake City, UT
- Rep. Rob Bishop, Washington, D.C. and Ogden, UT
- Senator Orrin G. Hatch, Washington, D.C. and Salt Lake City, UT

Federal Agencies

- BLM, Salt Lake City, UT; Fillmore, UT
- Dugway Proving Ground, Dugway, UT
- Great Basin National Park, Baker, NV
- Hill AFB (00-ALC/EM), UT
- National Long Distance Trails Office, Salt Lake City, UT
- US EPA, Denver, CO
- USFWS, Albuquerque, NM; Anchorage, AK; Arapaho NWR, CO; Arlington, VA; Arrowwood NWR, ND; Atlanta, GA; Bear River MBR, UT; Denver, CO; Fort Snelling, MN; Hadley, MA; Juneau, AK; Air Quality Branch, Lakewood, CO; Des Lacs NWR, ND; Ecological Services Field Office, West Valley City, UT; J.Clark Salyer NWR, ND; Lost Trail NWR, MT; Medicine Lake NWR, MT; Ouray NWR, UT; Portland, OR; Sacramento, CA; Sherwood, OR; Sand Lake NWR, SD; Seedskadee NWR, WY; Shepherdstown, WV; Upper Souris NWR, ND
- USGS, BRD, Rick Schroeder, Fort Collins, CO

State Officials

- Governor Mike Leavitt, Salt Lake City, UT
- Rep. Eli H. Anderson, Tremonton, UT
- Senator Leonard M. Blackham, Monono, UT
- Rep. James R. Gowans, Tooele, UT
- Rep. Darin G. Peterson, Nephi, UT
- Rep. Michael R. Styler, Delta, UT

State Agencies/Tribes

- Central Utah Water Conservancy District, Orem, UT
- Confederate Tribes of Goshute Reservation, Ibapah, UT
- Forestry, Fire and State Lands Division, Salt Lake City, UT
- Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources, Washington, D.C.
- Intermountain West Joint Venture, West Valley City, UT
- State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, UT
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Springville, UT
- Utah Museum of Natural History, Salt Lake City, UT
- Utah Natural Heritage Program, UT

City/County/Local Governments

- Juab County Commission, Nephi, UT

Organizations

- Animal Protection Institute, Sacramento, CA
- Audubon Society, Washington, D.C.
- Defenders of Wildlife, Washington, D.C.
- Duck Unlimited, Porterville, UT
- Fund for Animals, Silver Spring, MD
- Great Salt Lake Audubon Society, Holladay, UT
- KRA Corporation, Bethesda, MD
- Lincoln Highway Association, Tooele, UT
- National Trappers Association, New Martinsville, WV
- National Wildlife Refuge Association, Colorado Springs, CO
- Pony Express Trail Association, Sacramento, CA
- Salt Lake Birders, Salt Lake City, UT
- Sierra Club, Salt Lake City, UT
- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, Salt Lake City, UT
- The Nature Conservancy, Moab, UT; Boulder, CO
- Utah County Birders, Elk Ridge, UT
- Utah Historic Trails Consortium, Salt Lake City, UT
- Utah Native Plant Society, Salt Lake City, UT
- Utah Wildlife Federation, Salt Lake City, UT
- The Wilderness Society, Washington, D.C.
- Wildlife Management Institute, Fort Collins, CO; Washington, D.C., Pratt, KS

Libraries

- Delta City Library, Delta, UT
- Tooele City Public Library, Tooele, UT
- Post Library, Dugway, UT

Schools/Universities

- Brigham Young University, Salt Lake City, UT
- Southern Utah University
- Forest, Range, and Wildlife Sciences, USU, Logan, UT
- Southern Utah University
- Northwestern University, Paul Friesema, Evanston, IL

Individuals

- Kathy Baer
- Glenn Elison
- Joe Engler
- Kim Forrest
- Brent Giezentanner
- Erich Gilbert
- Jim Good
- Jim Graham
- Lynn Greenwalt
- Peter Hovingh
- Patricia Hunter
- David Jabusch
- Selene Jacobs
- Dr. John Kadlec
- Rolf Kraft
- Steve Martin
- Bridget McCann
- Tom Neuman
- Ron Perry
- Clyde Pritchett
- Terry Sadler
- Jim Savery
- Mark Stackhouse
- Amy Sullivan
- David Zippin

Appendix G. Species List for Fish Springs NWR

Birds

Loons

Pacific Loon	*Gavia pacifica*
Common Loon	*Gavia immer*
Yellow-billed Loon	*Gavia adamsii*

Grebes

Pied-billed Grebe	*Podilymbus podiceps*
Horned Grebe	*Podiceps auritus*
Eared Grebe	*Podiceps nigricollis*
Western Grebe	*Aechmophorus occidentalis*
Clark's Grebe	*Aechmophorus clarkii*

Pelicans

American White Pelican	*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*

Cormorants

Double-crested Cormorant	*Phalacrocorax auritus*

Bitterns, Herons, and Egrets

American Bittern	*Botaurus lentiginosus*
Great Blue Heron	*Ardea herodias*
Great Egret	*Ardea alba*
Snowy Egret	*Egretta thula*
Cattle Egret	*Bubulcus ibis*
Green Heron	*Butorides virescens*
Black-crowned Night-Heron	*Nycticorax nycticorax*

Ibises and Spoonbills

White-faced Ibis	*Plegadis chihi*

Storks

Wood Stork	*Mycteria americana*

New World Vultures

Turkey Vulture	*Cathartes aura*

Swans, Geese, and Ducks

Greater White-fronted Goose	*Anser albifrons*
Snow Goose	*Chen caerulescens*
Ross' Goose	*Chen rossii*
Canada Goose	*Branta canadensis*
Brant	*Branta bernicla*
Trumpeter Swan	*Cygnus buccinator*
Tundra Swan	*Cygnus columbianus*
Wood Duck	*Aix sponsa*
Gadwall	*Anas strepera*
Eurasian Wigeon	*Anas penelope*
American Wigeon	*Anas americana*
Mallard	*Anas platyrhynchos*
Blue-winged Teal	*Anas discors*
Cinnamon Teal	*Anas cyanoptera*
Northern Shoveler	*Anas clypeata*
Northern Pintail	*Anas acuta*
Green-winged Teal	*Anas crecca*
Canvasback	*Aythya valisineria*
Redhead	*Aythya americana*
Ring-necked Duck	*Aythya collaris*
Lesser Scaup	*Aythya affinis*
White-winged Scoter	*Melanitta fusca*
Black Scoter	*Melanitta nigra*
Long-tailed Duck	*Clangula hyemalis*
Bufflehead	*Bucephala albeola*
Common Goldeneye	*Bucephala clangula*
Hooded Merganser	*Lophodytes cucullatus*
Common Merganser	*Mergus merganser*
Red-breasted Merganser	*Mergus serrator*
Ruddy Duck	*Oxyura jamaicensis*

Osprey, Kites, Hawks, and Eagles

Osprey	*Pandion haliaetus*
Bald Eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*
Northern Harrier	*Circus cyaneus*
Sharp-shinned Hawk	*Accipiter striatus*
Cooper's Hawk	*Accipiter cooperii*
Northern Goshawk	*Accipiter gentilis*
Red-shouldered Hawk	*Buteo lineatus*
Swainson's Hawk	*Buteo swainsoni*
Red-tailed Hawk	*Buteo jamaicensis*
Ferruginous Hawk	*Buteo regalis*
Rough-legged Hawk	*Buteo lagopus*
Golden Eagle	*Aquila chrysaetos*

Falcons and Caracaras

American Kestrel	*Falco sparverius*
Merlin	*Falco columbarius*
Peregrine Falcon	*Falco peregrinus*
Prairie Falcon	*Falco mexicanus*

Gallinaceous Birds

Chukar, Introduced	*Alectoris chukar*
Ring-necked Pheasant, Introduced	*Phasianus colchicus*

Rails

Virginia Rail	*Rallus limicola*
Sora	*Porzana carolina*
Common Moorhen	*Gallinula chloropus*
American Coot	*Fulica americana*

Cranes

Sandhill Crane	*Grus canadensis*

Plovers

Black-bellied Plover	*Pluvialis squatarola*
American Golden-Plover	*Pluvialis dominica*
Snowy Plover	*Charadrius alexandrinus*
Semipalmated Plover	*Charadrius semipalmatus*
Killdeer	*Charadrius vociferus*
Mountain Plover	*Charadrius montanus*

Stilts and Avocets

Black-necked Stilt	*Himantopus mexicanus*
American Avocet	*Recurvirostra americana*

Sandpipers and Phalaropes

Greater Yellowlegs	*Tringa melanoleuca*
Lesser Yellowlegs	*Tringa flavipes*
Solitary Sandpiper	*Tringa solitaria*
Willet	*Catoptrophorus semipalmatus*
Spotted Sandpiper	*Actitis macularia*
Whimbrel	*Numenius phaeopus*
Long-billed Curlew	*Numenius americanus*
Marbled Godwit	*Limosa fedoa*
Ruddy Turnstone	*Arenaria interpres*
Red Knot	*Calidris canutus*
Sanderling	*Calidris alba*
Semipalmated Sandpiper	*Calidris pusilla*
Western Sandpiper	*Calidris mauri*
Least Sandpiper	*Calidris minutilla*
Baird's Sandpiper	*Calidris bairdii*
Pectoral Sandpiper	*Calidris melanotos*
White-rumped Sandpiper	*Calidris fuscicollis*
Dunlin	*Calidris alpina*
Stilt Sandpiper	*Calidris himantopus*
Short-billed Dowitcher	*Limnodromus griseus*
Long-billed Dowitcher	*Limnodromus scolopaceus*
Common Snipe	*Gallinago gallinago*
Wilson's Phalarope	*Phalaropus tricolor*
Red-necked Phalarope	*Phalaropus lobatus*

Skuas, Jaegers, Gulls, and Terns

Parasitic Jaeger	*Stercorarius parasiticus*
Long-tailed Jaeger	*Stercorarius longicaudus*
Franklin's Gull	*Larus pipixcan*
Bonaparte's Gull	*Larus philadelphia*
Ring-billed Gull	*Larus delawarensis*
California Gull	*Larus californicus*
Herring Gull	*Larus argentatus*
Black-legged Kittiwake	*Rissa tridactyla*
Caspian Tern	*Sterna caspia*
Forster's Tern	*Sterna forsteri*
Least Tern	*Sterna antillarum*
Black Tern	*Chlidonias niger*

Pigeons and Doves

Rock Dove, Introduced	*Columba livia*
White-winged Dove	*Zenaida asiatica*
Mourning Dove	*Zenaida macroura*

Cuckoos and Anis

Yellow-billed Cuckoo	*Coccyzus americanus*

Barn Owls

Barn Owl	*Tyto alba*

Typical Owls

Northern Saw-whet Owl	*Aegolius acadicus*
Great Horned Owl	*Bubo virginianus*
Burrowing Owl	*Athene cunicularia*
Long-eared Owl	*Asio otus*
Short-eared Owl	*Asio flammeus*

Nightjars

Common Nighthawk	*Chordeiles minor*
Common Poorwill	*Phalaenoptilus nuttallii*

Swifts

White-throated Swift	*Aeronautes saxatalis*

Hummingbirds

Black-chinned Hummingbird	*Archilochus alexandri*
Calliope Hummingbird	*Stellula calliope*
Broad-tailed Hummingbird	*Selasphorus platycercus*
Rufous Hummingbird	*Selasphorus rufus*

Kingfishers

Belted Kingfisher	*Ceryle alcyon*

Woodpeckers

Lewis' Woodpecker	*Melanerpes lewis*
Williamson's Sapsucker	*Sphyrapicus thyroideus*
Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	*Sphyrapicus varius*
Red-naped Sapsucker	*Sphyrapicus nuchalis*
Red-breasted Sapsucker	*Sphyrapicus ruber*
Downy Woodpecker	*Picoides pubescens*
Hairy Woodpecker	*Picoides villosus*
Northern Flicker	*Colaptes auratus*

Tyrant Flycatchers

Olive-sided Flycatcher	*Contopus cooperi*
Western Wood-Pewee	*Contopus sordidulus*
Willow Flycatcher	*Empidonax traillii*
Hammond's Flycatcher	*Empidonax hammondii*
Gray Flycatcher	*Empidonax wrightii*
Dusky Flycatcher	*Empidonax oberholseri*
Cordilleran Flycatcher	*Empidonax occidentalis*
Eastern Phoebe	*Sayornis phoebe*
Say's Phoebe	*Sayornis saya*
Vermilion Flycatcher	*Pyrocephalus rubinus*
Ash-throated Flycatcher	*Myiarchus cinerascens*
Cassin's Kingbird	*Tyrannus vociferans*

Western Kingbird	*Tyrannus verticalis*
Eastern Kingbird	*Tyrannus tyrannus*
Scissor-tailed Flycatcher	*Tyrannus forficatus*

Shrikes

Loggerhead Shrike	*Lanius ludovicianus*
Northern Shrike	*Lanius excubitor*

Vireos

Gray Vireo	*Vireo vicinior*
Plumbeous Vireo	*Vireo plumbeus*
Cassin's Vireo	*Vireo cassinii*
Warbling Vireo	*Vireo gilvus*

Crows, Jays, and Magpies

Gray Jay	*Perisoreus canadensis*
Steller's Jay	*Cyanocitta stelleri*
Western Scrub-Jay	*Aphelocoma californica*
Pinyon Jay	*Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus*
Clark's Nutcracker	*Nucifraga columbiana*
Black-billed Magpie	*Pica hudsonia*
American Crow	*Corvus brachyrhynchos*
Common Raven	*Corvus corax*

Larks

Horned Lark	*Eremophila alpestris*

Swallows

Purple Martin	*Progne subis*
Tree Swallow	*Tachycineta bicolor*
Violet-green Swallow	*Tachycineta thalassina*
Northern Rough-winged Swallow	*Stelgidopteryx serripennis*
Bank Swallow	*Riparia riparia*
Cliff Swallow	*Petrochelidon pyrrhonota*
Barn Swallow	*Hirundo rustica*

Titmice and Chickadees

Mountain Chickadee	*Poecile gambeli*
Juniper Titmouse	*Baeolophus ridgwayi*

Bushtit

Bushtit	*Psaltriparus minimus*

Nuthatches

Red-breasted Nuthatch	*Sitta canadensis*

Creepers

Brown Creeper	*Certhia americana*

Wrens

Rock Wren	*Salpinctes obsoletus*
Canyon Wren	*Catherpes mexicanus*
House Wren	*Troglodytes aedon*
Winter Wren	*Troglodytes troglodytes*
Marsh Wren	*Cistothorus palustris*

Kinglets

Golden-crowned Kinglet	*Regulus satrapa*
Ruby-crowned Kinglet	*Regulus calendula*

Old World Warblers

Blue-gray Gnatcatcher	*Polioptila caerulea*

Thrushes

Western Bluebird	*Sialia mexicana*
Mountain Bluebird	*Sialia currucoides*
Townsend's Solitaire	*Myadestes townsendi*
Swainson's Thrush	*Catharus ustulatus*
Hermit Thrush	*Catharus guttatus*
American Robin	*Turdus migratorius*
Varied Thrush	*Ixoreus naevius*

Mimic Thrushes

Gray Catbird	*Dumetella carolinensis*
Northern Mockingbird	*Mimus polyglottos*
Sage Thrasher	*Oreoscoptes montanus*
Brown Thrasher	*Toxostoma rufum*

Starlings

European Starling	*Sturnus vulgaris*

Wagtails and Pipits

American (Water) Pipit	*Anthus rubescens*

Waxwings

Bohemian Waxwing	*Bombycilla garrulus*
Cedar Waxwing	*Bombycilla cedrorum*

Silky-flycatchers

Phainopepla	*Phainopepla nitens*

Wood Warblers

Orange-crowned Warbler	*Vermivora celata*
Nashville Warbler	*Vermivora ruficapilla*
Virginia's Warbler	*Vermivora virginiae*
Lucy's Warbler	*Vermivora luciae*
Yellow Warbler	*Dendroica petechia*
Magnolia Warbler	*Dendroica magnolia*
Black-throated Blue Warbler	*Dendroica caerulescens*
Yellow-rumped Warbler	*Dendroica coronata*
Black-throated Gray Warbler	*Dendroica nigrescens*
Townsend's Warbler	*Dendroica townsendi*
Palm Warbler	*Dendroica palmarum*
Blackpoll Warbler	*Dendroica striata*
Black-and-white Warbler	*Mniotilta varia*
American Redstart	*Setophaga ruticilla*
Prothonotary Warbler	*Protonotaria citrea*
Ovenbird	*Seiurus aurocapillus*
Northern Waterthrush	*Seiurus noveboracensis*
MacGillivray's Warbler	*Oporornis tolmiei*
Common Yellowthroat	*Geothlypis trichas*
Wilson's Warbler	*Wilsonia pusilla*
Yellow-breasted Chat	*Icteria virens*

Tanagers

Summer Tanager	*Piranga rubra*
Western Tanager	*Piranga ludoviciana*

Sparrows and Towhees

Green-tailed Towhee	*Pipilo chlorurus*
Spotted Towhee	*Pipilo maculatus*
American Tree Sparrow	*Spizella arborea*
Chipping Sparrow	*Spizella passerina*
Brewer's Sparrow	*Spizella breweri*
Field Sparrow	*Spizella pusilla*
Vesper Sparrow	*Pooecetes gramineus*
Lark Sparrow	*Chondestes grammacus*
Black-throated Sparrow	*Amphispiza bilineata*
Sage Sparrow	*Amphispiza belli*
Lark Bunting	*Calamospiza melanocorys*
Savannah Sparrow	*Passerculus sandwichensis*
Fox Sparrow	*Passerelia iliaca*
Song Sparrow	*Melospiza melodia*
Lincoln's Sparrow	*Melospiza lincolnii*
White-throated Sparrow	*Zonotrichia albicollis*
Harris' Sparrow	*Zonotrichia querula*
White-crowned Sparrow	*Zonotrichia leucophrys*
Dark-eyed Junco	*Junco hyemalis*
McCown's Longspur	*Calcarius mccownii*
Lapland Longspur	*Calcarius lapponicus*
Chestnut-collared Longspur	*Calcarius ornatus*

Cardinals, Grosbeaks, and Allies

Rose-breasted Grosbeak	*Pheucticus ludovicianus*
Black-headed Grosbeak	*Pheucticus melanocephalus*
Blue Grosbeak	*Guiraca caerulea*
Lazuli Bunting	*Passerina amoena*
Indigo Bunting	*Passerina cyanea*

Blackbirds and Orioles

Bobolink	*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*
Red-winged Blackbird	*Agelaius phoeniceus*
Western Meadowlark	*Surnella neglecta*
Yellow-headed Blackbird	*Xanthocephalus xanthocephalus*
Rusty Blackbird	*Euphagus carolinus*
Brewer's Blackbird	*Euphagus cyanocephalus*
Common Grackle	*Quiscalus quiscula*
Great-tailed Grackle	*Quiscalus mexicanus*
Brown-headed Cowbird	*Molothrus ater*
Bullock's Oriole	*Icterus bullockii*

Finches

Gray-crowned Rosy-Finch	*Leucosticte tephrocotis*
Cassin's Finch	*Carpodacus cassinii*
House Finch	*Carpodacus mexicanus*
Red Crossbill	*Loxia curvirostra*
Pine Siskin	*Carduelis pinus*
Lesser Goldfinch	*Carduelis psaltria*
American Goldfinch	*Carduelis tristis*
Evening Grosbeak	*Coccothraustes vespertinus*

Old World Sparrows

House Sparrow, Introduced	*Passer domesticus*

Mammals

Vagrant Shrew	*Sorex vagrans*
California Myotis	*Myotis californicus*
Western Small-footed Myotis	*Myotis ciliolabrum*
Long-eared Myotis	*Myotis evotis*
Fringed Myotis	*Myotis thysanodes*
Long-legged Myotis	*Myotis volans*
Yuma Myotis	*Myotis yumanensis*
Silver-haired Bat	*Lasionycteris noctivagans*
Western Pipistrelle	*Pipistrellus hesperus*
Townsend's Big-eared Bat	*Plecotus townsendii*
Pallid Bat	*Antrozous pallidus*
Brazilian Free-tailed Bat	*Tadarida brasiliensis*
Pygmy Rabbit	*Brachylagus idahoensis*
Desert Cottontail	*Sylvilagus audubonii*
Black-tailed Jackrabbit	*Lepus californicus*
Least Chipmunk	*Tamias minimus*
White-tailed Antelope Ground Squirrel	*Ammospermophilus leucurus*
Townsend's Ground Squirrel	*Spermophilus tridecemlineatus*
Botta's Pocket Gopher	*Thomomys bottae*
Little Pocket Mouse	*Perognathus longimembris*
Great Basin Pocket Mouse	*Perognathus parvus*
Long-tailed Pocket Mouse	*Chaetodipus formosus*
Dark Kangaroo Mouse	*Microdipodops megacephalus*
Chisel-toothed Kangaroo Rat	*Dipodomys microps*
Ord's Kangaroo Rat	*Dipodomys ordii*
Western Harvest Mouse	*Reithrodontomys megalotis*
Canyon Mouse	*Peromyscus crinitus*
Deer Mouse	*Peromyscus maniculatus*
Pinon Mouse	*Peromyscus truei*
Northern Grasshopper Mouse	*Onychomys leucogaster*
Desert Woodrat	*Neotoma lepida*
House Mouse	*Mus musculus*
Montane Vole	*Microtus montanus*
Common Muskrat	*Ondatra zibethicus*
Coyote	*Canis latrans*
Kit Fox	*Vulpes macrotis*
Red Fox	*Canis rufus*
Ringtail	*Bassariscus astutus*
Long-tailed Weasel	*Mustela frenata*
American Badger	*Taxidea taxus*
Western Spotted Skunk	*Spilogale gracilis*
Striped Skunk	*Mephitis mephitis*
Bobcat	*Lynx rufus*
Mule Deer	*Odocoileus hemionus*
Pronghorn Antelope	*Antilocapra americana*

Fish, Amphibians, and Reptiles

Fish

Mosquito Fish, Introduced	*Gambusia affinis*
Speckled Dace	*Rhinichthys osculus*
Utah Chub	*Gila atraria*
Least Chub, Reintroduced	*Lotichthys phlegethontis*

Amphibians

Leopard Frog , Introduced	*Rana pipiens*
Bullfrog, Introduced	*Rana catesbeiana*

Reptiles

Common Collared Lizard	*Crotaphytus collaris*
Long-nosed Leopard Lizard	*Crotaphytus wislizehi*
Desert Horned Lizard	*Phrynosoma platyrhinos*
Great Basin Sagebrush Lizard	*Sceloporus graciosus*
Great Basin Fence Lizard	*Sceloporus occidentalis*
Side-blotched Lizard	*Uta stansburiana*
Great Basin Whiptail Lizard	*Chemidophorus tigris*
Striped Whipsnake	*Masticophis taeniatus*
Western Long-nosed Snake	*Rhinocheilus lecontei*
Wandering Garter Snake	*Thamnophis elegans vagrans*
Great Basin Rattlesnake	*Crotalus viridis lotusus*
Great Basin Gopher Snake	*Pituophis melanoleucus deserticola*

Fish Springs NWR Plant List
Updated 8/1/98
Erich Gilbert

The list includes all plants identified by E. G. Bolen in 1960 and several anonymous additions to that list since that time. Scientific names were updated based on: 1) Welsh et al. 1987. A Utah Flora. Great Basin Naturalist Memoirs No. 9, Brigham Young University. and 2) Cronquist et al. 1977. Intermountain Flora - Vascular Plants of the Intermountain West, USA, Vol. 6. Columbia University Press. New York. Several archaic scientific names were not referenced in Welsh et al. or Cronquist et al. These names are preceded by an asterisk (*).

Note: Since the last full update in 1998, a few minor changes have been made as new information became known to Refuge staff, such as changes in species names and new plants identified.

Family	*Species*	Common Name
1. Characeae	*Chara* sp.	Muskgrass
2. Cupressaceae	*Juniperus osteosperma* (Torr.) Little	Utah juniper
	Juniperus chinensis, var. *Pfitzeriana*	Pfitzer juniper
3. Ephedraceae	*Ephedra nevadensis* S. Wats.	Mormon tea
4. Taxaceae	*Taxus baccata*	English yew
5. Typhaceae	*Typha domingensis* Pers.	Narrowleaf cattail
	Typha latifolia L.	Broadleaf cattail
6. Najadaceae	*Najas marina* L.	Spiny najad
	Ruppia maritima L.	Wigeongrass
7. Juncaginaceae	*Triglochin maritima* L.	Seaside arrowgrass
8. Gramineae	*Agropyron elongatus* Host	Tall wheatgrass
	Agrostis alba L.	Red top
	Blepharidachne kingii (S. Wats.*) Hack.*	Blepharidachne
	Bromus tectorum L.	Cheatgrass
	Distichlis stricta (Torr.) Rydb.	Desert saltgrass
	Elymus triticoides Buckl.	Beardless wildrye
	Hilaria jamesii (Torr.) Benth.	Galleta
	Hordeum jubatum L.	Foxtail barley
	Muhlenbergia asperifolia (Nees and Mey.) Parodi	Scratchgrass
	Orizopsis hymenoides (Roem. and Schult.) Ricker	Indian ricegrass
	Phragmites australis Trin.	Common reed

Family	*Species*	Common Name
	Polygon monspeliensis (L.) Desf.	Rabbitfoot grass
	Sitanion hystrix (Nutt.) J. G. Smith	Squirreltail
	Spartina gracilis Trin.	Alkali cordgrass
	Sporobolus airoides (Torr.) Torr.	Alkali sacaton
	Sporobolus cryptandrus (Torr.) Gray	Sand dropseed
9. Cyperaceae	*Eleocharis rostellata* Torr.	Spike rush
	Scirpus acutus Muhl.	Hardstem bulrush
	Scirpus americanus Per.	Olney's threesquare bulrush
	Scirpus nevadensis S. Wats.	Nevada bulrush
	Scirpus pungens Vahl	Common threesquare
	Scirpus paludosus A. Nels.	Alkali bulrush
10. Juncaceae	*Juncus arcticus Willd.*, var. *montanus* Engelm.	Wire rush, Baltic rush
11. Liliaceae	*Allium nevadense* S. Wats.	Wild onion
	Smilacina stellata (L.) Desf.	False Solomon's seal
12. Salicaceae	*Populus alba* L.	White popular
	Populus fremontii Wats.	Fremont cottonwood
	Salix lutea Nutt.	Yellow willow
13. Ulmaceae	*Ulmus pumila* L.	Siberian elm
14. Portulaceae	*Portulaca oleracea*	Purslane
15. Polygonaceae	*Erigonum ovalifolium* Nutt.	Cushion buckwheat
	**Erigonum demersum*	
	Erigonum cernuum Nutt.	Nodding buckwheat
	Erigonum deflexum Torr. in Ives var. *nevadense*	Skeletonweed buckwheat
16. Chenopodiaceae	*Allenrolfea occidentalis* (S. Wats.) Kuntze	Pickle weed
	Atriplex canascens	Fourwing saltbrush
	Atriplex confertifolia (Torr. and Frem.) S. Wats.	Shadscale
	Atriplex patula L., var. *hastata* A. Gray	Spearscale
	Bassia hyssopifolia (Pall.) Kuntze	Bassia
	Chenopodium hybridum L.	Mapleleaf goosefoot

Family	*Species*	Common Name
	Halogeton glomeratus (Bieb.) Mey.	Halogeton
	Kochia scoparia (L.) Schrader	Summer cypress
	Kochia vestita (S. Wats.) Rydb.	Green molly
	Nitrophila occidentalis (Nutt.) S. Wats.	Nitrophila
	Salicornia pacifica Standl., var. *utahensis*	(Tidest.) Munz Samphire
	Salsola iberica Sennen and Pau	Russian thistle
	Sarcobatus vermiculatus (Hook.) Torr.	Greasewood
	Suaeda intermedia S. Wats.	Seepweed
	Suaeda occidentalis S. Wats.	Seepweed
17. Ceratophyllaceae	*Ceratophyllum demersum* L.	Coontail
18. Ranunculaceae	*Delphinium andersonii* A. Gray	Delphinium
	Ranunculus cymbalaria Pursh., var. *saximontanus* Fern.	Buttercup
	Ranunculus juniperinus M. E. Jones	Buttercup
19. Cruciferae	*Cardaria draba*	Whitetop
	Coringia orientalis (L.) Dum.	Hare's ear
	Descurainia incisa (Engelm.) Britt.	Tansy-mustard
	Descurainia sophis (L.) Webb	Tansy-mustard
	Lepidium dictyotum Gray	Peppergrass
	Lepidium latifolium L.	Tall whitetop
	Lepidium perfoliatum L.	Clasping peppergrass
	Malcolmia africana (L.) R. Br.	Malcolmia
	Physaria chambersii Rollins	Double bladder-pod
20. Rosaceae	*Rosa woodsii* Lindl.	Woods rose
	**Rosa rugosa*	Musk rose
	Purshia mexicana (D. Don) Welsh	Mexican cliffrose
21. Leguminosae	*Astragalus utahensis* T. and G.	Lady slipper
	Gleditsia tricanthos (L.)	Honey locust
	Melilotus albus Desr. ex Lam.	White sweet-clover
	Melilotus officinalis (L.) Pallas	Yellow sweet-clover
	Mendicago sativa (L.)	Alfalfa
22. Malvaceae	*Sphaeralcea coccinea* (Pursh.) Rydb.	Globe mallow

Family	*Species*	Common Name
	Malva neglecta Wallr.	Mallow, cheeseweed
23. Tamaricaceae	*Tamarix ramosissima* Ledeb.	Salt cedar
24. Cactaceae	*Opuntia rhodantha* Schum.	Prickly pear
25. Onagraceae	*Oenothera caespitosa* Nutt., var. *marginata* (Nutt.) Munz.	Evening primrose
26. Umbelliferae	*Aprium graveolens* L., var. *dulce* DC.	Celery
	Berula erecta (Huds.) Cov.	Water parsnip
	Cymopterus longipes S. Wats.	Cymopterus
	Lomatium grayi C. and R.	Desert parsley
27. Primulaceae	*Glaux maritima* L.	Saltwort
28. Gentianaceae	*Centaurium exaltatum* (Griseb.) Wight ex Piper	Centaury
29. Apocynaceae	*Apocynum sibiricum* Jacq.	Dogbane
30. Asclepiadaceae	*Asclepias incarnata* L.	Swamp milkweed
	Asclepsis speciosa Torr.	Milkweed
31. Convolvulaceae	*Convolvulus arvensis* L.	Bindweed
	Cressa truxillensis H.B.K.	Cressa
32. Polemoniaceae	*Gilia inconspicua* (J.E. Sm.) Sweet	Gilia
	Phlox longifolia Nutt.	Longleaf phlox
33. Solanaceae	*Lycium andersonii* Gray	Anderson wolfberry
34. Orobanchaceae	*Orobanche multiflora* Nutt.	Broomrape
35. Scrophulariaceae	*Castilleja chromosa* A. Nels.	Common paint brush
	Castilleja exilis A. Nels.	Annual paint brush
	Cordylanthus maritimus Nutt. ex Benth.	Cordylanthus
	Penstemon dolius Jones ex. Pennell	Jones penstemon
36. Lentibulariaceae	*Utricularia vulgaris* L.	Common bladderwort
37. Compositae	**Aplopappus racemosus* (Nutt.) Torr.	Aplopappus
	Aster pauciflorus Nutt.	Alkali aster
	Centaurea virgata Lam., var. *squarrosa*	Squarrose knapweed
	Chaenactis douglasii H. and A.	Douglas dustymaiden
	Chrysothamnus nauseosus (Pall.) Britt.	Rubber rabbitbrush
	Chrysothamnus albidus (Jones) Greene	Alkali rabbitbrush

Family	*Species*	Common Name
	Cirsium arvense (L.) Scop.	Canada thistle
	**Cirsium drummondii* T. and G.	Thistle
	Crepis runcinata (James) T. and G.	Meadow hawksbeard
	Enceliopsis nudicaulis (Gray) A. Nels.	Nakedstem
	Erigeron pumilus Nutt.	Vernal daisy
	Grindellia squarrosa (Pursh) Dunal	Curly gumweed
	Haplopappus nanus (Nutt.) D.C. Eaton	Low goldenbush
	Helianthus annuus L.	Common sunflower
	Helianthus nuttallii T. and G.	Nuttall sunflower
	Hymenopappus filifolius Hook., var. *eripodus* (A. Nels)	Hyalineherb
	Iva axillaris L.	Poverty weed
	**Lygodesmia exigua* A. Gray	Lygodesmia
	Malacothrix sonchoides (Nutt.) T. and G.	Malacothrix
	Psathyrotes annua (Nutt.) Gray	Mealy rosettes
	**Senecio uintahensis* (A. Nels.) Greenm.	Senecio
	Sonchus asper (L.) Hill	Spiny sow-thistle
	Stephanomeria tenuifolia (Torr.) Hall	Slender wirelettuce
	Tetradymia glabrata	Littleleaf horsebrush
	Tetradymia spinosa H. and A.	Thorny horsebrush
	Townsendia florifer (Hook.) Gray	Townsendia
38. Elaeagnaceae	*Elaeagnus angustifolia* L.	Russian olive
39. Potamogetonaceae	*Potamogeton pectinatus* L.	Sago pondweed
40. Moraceae	*Morus alba* L.	White mulberry
41. Amaranthaceae	*Amaranthus hybridus* L.	Pigweed
42. Loasaceae	*Mentzelia laevicaulis* (Dougl.) T. and G.	Blazing star
43. Zygophyllaceae	*Tribulus terrestris* (L.)	Puncture vine, goathead
44. Caprifoliaceae	*Lonicera tartarica* L.	Tartarian honeysuckle
45. Geraniaceae	*Erodium circutarium* (L.) L'Her.	Storksbill
46. Polygalaceae	*Polygala acanthroglada* Gray	Thorny milkwort

Appendix H. Refuge Operating Needs System

Priority Projects in Refuge Operations Needs System (RONS) Database						
Rank	Related to CCP Goals*	Project Description	One-time Costs	Recurrin g Costs	Total First Year Costs	FTE
1	H, EI, VS, P	Enhance Refuge Biological Capability (Wildlife Biologist)	$65,000	$74,000	$139,000	1.0
2	H, EI, VS, P	Construct Refuge Residence (for biologist)	$196,000	$11,000	$235,000	
3	H, EI, VS, CR	Enhance Facility Maintenance and Construction Capability (Maintenance Worker)	$33,000	$24,000	$57,000	0.5
4	H, EI	Conduct Essential Biotic Data Gathering	$282,000	$4,000	$286,000	
5	H, EI, VS	Enhance Provision of Wildlife Oriented Visitor Services (Biological Technician)	$65,000	$53,000	$118,000	1.0
6	H, EI	Invasive Plant Control and Monitoring	$144,000	$3,000	$147,000	
7		Modify Residence	$55,000	$2,000	$57,000	
8	H, EI, VS, CR	Enhance Refuge Shop Security and Capability	$167,000	$3,000	$170,000	
9	EI, VS, CR	Enhance Wildlife and Cultural Resource Protection (Refuge Officer)	$65,000	$59,000	$124,000	1.0
10	H, EI, CR, P	Enhance Refuge GPS/GIS/Computer Graphic Capability	$29,000	$5,000	$34,000	
11	H, EI	Vegetative Establishment of Hardstem Bulrush and Fremont Cottonwood	$25,000		$25,000	
12	EI	Sensitive Aquatic Species Reintroductions (Least Chub)	$20,000		$20,000	
13	EI, VS	Facility Monitoring and Resource Recovery Enhancements	$28,000	$5,000	$33,000	
14	CR	Cultural Resources Survey	$99,000	$1,000	$100,000	
15	H, EI	Water Flow Measuring and Impoundment Level Gauging Improvements	$22,000	$2,000	$24,000	
		Totals	$1,295,000	$246,000	$1,569,000	3.5
* H = Habitat, EI = Ecological Integrity, VS = Visitor Services, CR = Cultural Resources, P = Partnerships						

Appendix I. Maintenance Management System

Priority Projects in the Maintenance Management System (MMS) Database			
Rank	**Related to CCP Goals***	**Project Description**	**Estimated Costs**
1	N/A - personnel housing	Replace Dilapidated Quarters	$250,000
2	N/A - vehicle maintenance	Rehabilitate Refuge Shop	$126,000
3	H, VS, EI, CR	Spread Gravel on Public Use Roads	$30,000
4	H	Replace Old Worn-out Muskeg Tractor	$257,000
5	H, VS	Rehabilitate Bridge #12	$25,000
6	VS	Rehabilitate Visitor Contact Station	$35,000
7	H, VS	Replace Old Worn-out Dump Truck	$99,000
8	H, EI, VS	Replace 1994 Ford Pickup	$29,000
9	H, EI, VS	Replace Aging Farm Tractor	$79,000
10	H, EI, VS	Replace Worn-out ATV	$7,000
		Total	$937,000
* H = Habitat, EI = Ecological Integrity, VS = Visitor Services, CR = Cultural Resources, P = Partnerships			

Bibliography

Andrews, R. and R. Righter. 1992. Colorado Birds. Denver Museum of Natural History. Denver, CO.

Andrews, R.D., J.L. Hansen. T.G. Lagrange, and A. W. Hancock. 1999. Effects of predator exclusion and removal on duck production in Iowa. USGS Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center. <http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/1999/symabs/jowa.htm>.

Banta, J. 2004. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. Personal communication with Ron Beane, ERO Resources Corp.

Bock, C. E. and J. H.Bock. 1993. Cover of perennial grasses in southeastern Arizona in relation to livestock grazing. Cons. Biol. 7: 371-377.

Faulkner, S.P. and A.A. de la Cruz. 1992. Nutrient mobilization following winter fires in an irregularly flooded marsh. J. Envir. Qual. 11:129-133.

Finch, D.M. 1992. Threatened, endangered, and vulnerable species of terrestrial vertebrates in the Rocky Mountain Region. USDA Forest Service Gen Tech. Rep. RM-215. Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, CO.

Fleischner, T. L. 1994. Ecological costs of livestock grazing in western North America. Cons. Biol. 8(3): 629-644.

State of Utah. 2004. Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. Economic Report to the Governor. January. Available at: www.governor.utah.gov/dea>.

Halley, M.C. 1997. Invertebrate sampling at Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge. Fish Springs NWR, Dugway, Utah. Manuscript submitted to J. Wildl. Manage.

Hovingh, P. 1993. Horseshoe Springs, Skull Valley: Analysis for amphibians, mollusks and leeches. Report prepared for Bureau of land Management, Salt Lake District, August 12.

Hovingh, P. 1993. Aquatic habitats, life history observations and zoogeographic considerations of the Spotted Frog (*Rana pretiosa*) in Tule Valley, Utah. Great Basin Nat. 53(2):168-179.

Kadlec, G.A. 1962. Effects of a drawdown on a waterfowl impoundment. Ecology 43:1-15.

Kingery, H.E. (ed.). 1998. Colorado Breeding Bird Atlas. Colorado Bird Atlas Partnership and Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, CO.

Lawler, S. P., D. Dritz, T. Strange, and M. Holyoak. 1999. Effects of introduced mosquitofish and bullfrogs on the threatened California red-legged frog. Conservation Biology 13:613-622.

Mayer, P.M. and M.R. Ryan. 1991. Electric fences reduce mammalian predation on piping plover nests and chicks. Wildl. Soc. Bull. 19:59-63.

McKell, M.D., S. Peterson, K. Kobayashi, R. Miyazato, D. Sherratt, M.P. Donovan, and T.D. Schwaner. Undated. Status of bullfrogs and northern leopard frogs at Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge, Juab County, UT.

McKnight, D. E. and J. P. Low. 1969. Factors affecting waterfowl production on a spring-fed salt marsh in Utah. Transactions of the North American Wildlife Conference 34:307-314.

National Research Council. 1992. Restoration of aquatic ecosystems: science, technology, and public policy. National Academy Press. Washington, D.C.

Page, G.W, L.E. Stenzel and C.A. Ribic. 1985. Nest site selection and clutch predation in the snowy plover. Auk 102:347-353.

Paton, P.W.C., and T.C. Edwards, Jr. 1991. Nesting ecology of the snowy plover at Great Salt Lake, Utah – 1991 breeding season. Progress Report, Contract No. 90-2028, Utah Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Utah State University, Logan.

Paton, P.W.C., and T.C. Edwards, Jr. 1992. Nesting ecology of the snowy plover at Great Salt Lake, Utah – 1992 breeding season. Progress Report, Contract No. 90-2028, Utah Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Utah State University, Logan.

Russell, R.H. 1971. Mollusca of Fish Springs, Juab County, Utah: Rediscovery of Stagnicola Pilsbryi. The Great Basin Naturalist 34(4)232-236.

Stalmaster, M. 1987. The Bald Eagle. Universe Books. NY.

Tate, J., Jr. and D.J. Tate. 1982. The Blue List for 1982. Pg. 26 *in* Finch, D.M. Threatened, endangered, and vulnerable species of terrestrial vertebrates in the Rocky Mountain Region. Gen Tech Rep. RM-215. USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO.

Taush, R.J., J.C. Chambers, R.R. Blanks, and R.S. Nowak. 1995. Differential establishment of perennial grasses and cheatgrass following fire on an ungrazed sagebrush-juniper site. Proceedings Wildland Shrub and Arid land Restoration Symposium: 1993. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Intermountain Research Station.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC). 1998. Species management abstract: Snowy plover. Arlington, VA.

U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1987. Letter from Assistant Regional Director (RW) to Assistant Regional Director (FWE). RW-FHS-MSE. May 11.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. Census summary files SF1 and SF3. *In:* Population change and distribution. Marc J. Perry and Paul J. Mackun (eds). April 2001.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1960. Fish Springs Narrative Report, January - April 1960. Unpublished document.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1991. Marsh Management Plan: Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge. Dugway, Utah. Revised February 1991.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 1992. Interim Survey Requirements for *Spiranthes diluvialis.* U.S. Department of the Interior. US. Fish & Wildlife Service, Colorado State Office. November.

Ward, D. and M. Ward. 1996. Wading bird nesting survey: Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge. Report prepared for Fish Springs NWR.

Young, J.A and R.A. Evans. 1978. Population dynamics after wildfires in sagebrush grasslands. J. Range Manage. 31:283-289.