

Chapter

# 4

## Collaboration and Coordination

---

Major Contributors  
Distribution List

---



## CHAPTER 4 COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION

### Major Contributors

The following people were major contributors in the preparation of this environmental impact statement:

<b>Individual</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Professional Experience</b>
<b>Mike McNeill</b> Project Leader	B.S. Rangeland Ecology, Colorado State University	Twenty-six years, including current job as District Ranger on the Fall River RD, Nebraska NF. Previous experience as Range Ecology Program Leader, Dakota Prairie Grasslands Supervisor Office and Rangeland and Resource Management Specialists on the Mark Twain, Custer, and Humboldt/Toiyabe National Forests.
<b>Jeffrey S. Abegglen</b> Range/Wildlife Biologist	B.S. Natural Resources/Wildlife, University of Nebraska at Lincoln	Twenty-three years, including Range and Wildlife Program Manager at the Pine Ridge Ranger District. Prior natural resource conservation and wildlife experience with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service.
<b>Barb Beasely</b> Paleontologist	B.S. GeoSciences with concentration in Geology - University of Tennessee; M.S. Earth Sciences with concentration in Vertebrate Paleontology – Ft. Hays State	Sixteen years; currently Paleontologist for the U.S. Forest Service. Prior experience in paleontology with Bureau of Land Management and South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.
<b>Joan Carlson</b> R2 Water Quality Hydrologist	B.S. Forest Science, University of Minnesota; M.S. Forest Engineering, Hydrology concentration, Oregon State University	Eighteen years with Forest Service. Currently, Hydrologist in Rocky Mountain Regional Office. Prior experience as Forest Hydrologist on National Forests in California and New Hampshire.

<b>Individual</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Professional Experience</b>
<b>Virginia Emly</b> GIS Coordinator	B.S. Animal and Range Science - South Dakota State University. M.S. Animal and Range Science/Botany North Dakota State University.	Nineteen years; currently GIS Coordinator for Nebraska National Forest. Prior interdisciplinary natural resource experience with Forest Service and South Dakota State University.
<b>Mike Erk</b> Supervisory Rangeland Management Specialist	B.S. Range Science, South Dakota State University	Twenty-eight years as a Rangeland Management Specialist, Black Hills and Nebraska National Forest.
<b>Teresa Harris</b> Rangeland Management Specialist	B.S. Animal and Range Science, Montana State University at Bozeman.	Fourteen years experience; currently Rangeland Management Specialist, Wall Ranger District. Prior range management experience with Bureau of Indian Affairs in Montana and South Dakota.
<b>Keri Hicks</b> Archeologist	B.A. Archaeological Studies, University of Texas at Austin; M.A. Anthropology (emphasis in Archaeology), University of Colorado at Boulder.	Twelve years experience, including Heritage Program Manager on Nebraska National Forest. Prior experience with Forest Service, universities and contracting firms.
<b>Robert Hodorff</b> Range/Wildlife Biologist	B.S. Biology, Moorhead State University M.S. Wildlife and Fisheries Science, South Dakota State University	Twenty-seven years; currently wildlife biologist, Fall River Ranger District. Prior wildlife management and research experience with Forest Service Northern Great Plains Research, Rapid City, SD and Laramie, WY.
<b>Tommy John</b> Assistant Regional Soil Scientist	B.S. Forestry, University of Minnesota; M.S. Forest Soils, University of Minnesota.	Thirty years; currently Assistant Regional Soil Scientist in the Regional Office. Prior experience with federal, tribal, and state agencies working in soil management and soil and vegetation inventories.
<b>Glenn Moravek</b> Wildlife Biologist	B.S. Fisheries and Wildlife Biology, Iowa State University	Twenty-five years as a biologist on FS Ranger Districts in South Dakota and Nebraska. Prior experience with U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Colorado, and with the Iowa Conservation Commission.

<b>Individual</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Professional Experience</b>
<b>Lora O'Rourke</b> Rangeland Management Specialist	B.S. Range Science, Utah State University	Twenty-one years; rangeland management specialist with the Nebraska National Forest since 1989. Prior range experience with the Bureau of Land Management and two years in Nigeria, West Africa.
<b>Jerry Schumacher</b> Public Affairs Specialist	B.A. Social Sciences, Chadron State College	Eighteen years; currently Public Affairs Specialist, Nebraska National Forest. Prior experience – 11 years NEPA and Appeals coordinator, Nebraska National Forest.
<b>John Sidle</b> Northern Great Plains TES Coordinator and Certified Wildlife Biologist	B.S. Wildlife Biology; M.S. Wildlife Ecology from Oregon State University and University of Minnesota, respectively	Twenty-nine years, including 9 years as threatened, endangered, and sensitive species coordinator for National Grasslands. Prior wildlife conservation experience with Peace Corps, multi- lateral banks. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service experience in national wildlife refuge management, ecological services, and matters pertaining to the Endangered Species Act.
<b>Tonya Weisbeck</b> Rangeland Management Specialist	B.S. Environmental Management, South Dakota State University; B.S. Biology (minor in Chemistry), University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Eight years experience including Interdisciplinary Range/Wildlife, U.S. Forest Service, Nebraska National Forest (Pierre and Wall, SD); Prior experience as Range Technician, U.S. Forest Service, (Wall, SD); and Senior Field Wildlife Biologist, Southern Nevada Environmental, Las Vegas, NV.

## Distribution List

This final environmental impact statement (FEIS) has been distributed to agencies, organizations, and individuals who provided comments during the scoping process and to individuals or organizations who specifically requested a copy of the document. The FEIS was also made available on the Internet to any interested party.



# Index

## A

- Air quality
  - effects from alternatives, 3-4
- Airshed, 3-4
- Alternative
  - common factors, 2-3
- Alternative 1
  - cumulative effect
    - shooting, 3-83
    - wildlife viewing, 3-83
  - description, 2-3
  - effect on prairie dogs, 3-71
  - effects on black-footed ferrets, 3-50
  - effects on burrowing owl, 3-51
  - effects on ferruginous hawks, 3-50
  - effects on greater prairie chicken, 3-75
  - effects on prairie dogs, 3-49
  - effects on sharp-tailed grouse, 3-75
  - effects on shooting, 3-81
  - effects on species at risk, 3-46, 3-47
  - effects on swift fox, 3-50
  - effects on wildlife viewing, 3-81
  - effects summary, 3-65
  - effects to AUMs, 3-18
  - objectives, 2-3, 2-4
  - thresholds, 2-4
- Alternative 2
  - AUMs, 3-18
  - cumulative effects
    - shooting, 3-83
    - wildlife viewing, 3-83
  - description, 2-6
  - effect on prairie dogs, 3-71
  - effects on burrowing owl, 3-54
  - effects on ferruginous hawks, 3-54
  - effects on greater prairie chicken, 3-76
  - effects on prairie dogs, 3-53
  - effects on sharp-tailed grouse, 3-76
  - effects on shooting, 3-81
  - effects on species at risk, 3-52
  - effects on swift fox, 3-54
  - effects on wildlife viewing, 3-81
  - effects summary, 3-65
  - effectson black-tailed ferrets, 3-53
  - objectives, 2-6, 2-7
  - thresholds, 2-8
- Alternative 3
  - consistency with other alternatives, 2-9
  - cumulative effects
    - shooting, 3-83
    - wildlife viewing, 3-83
  - description, 2-8
  - effect on prairie dogs, 3-72
  - effects on black-footed ferrets, 3-57
  - effects on burrowing owl, 3-58
  - effects on ferruginous hawks, 3-57
  - effects on greater prairie chicken, 3-76
  - effects on prairie dogs, 3-56
  - effects on sharp-tailed grouse, 3-76
  - effects on shooting, 3-82
  - effects on species at risk, 3-55, 3-56
  - effects on swift fox, 3-58
  - effects on wildlife viewing, 3-82
  - effects summary, 3-66
  - effects to AUMs, 3-18
  - objectives, 2-8, 2-9
  - thresholds, 2-10
- Alternative 4
  - cumulative effects
    - shooting, 3-83
    - wildlife viewing, 3-83
  - description, 2-11
  - effect on prairie dogs, 3-72
  - effects on black-footed ferrets, 3-60
  - effects on burrowing owl, 3-61
  - effects on ferruginous hawks, 3-60
  - effects on greater prairie chicken, 3-77
  - effects on prairie dogs, 3-60
  - effects on sharp-tailed grouse, 3-77
  - effects on shooting, 3-82
  - effects on species at risk, 3-58, 3-59
  - effects on swift fox, 3-60
  - effects on wildlife viewing, 3-82
  - effects summary, 3-66
  - effects to AUMs, 3-19
  - objectives, 2-11
  - thresholds, 2-12
- Alternative 5
  - cumulative effects
    - shooting, 3-83
    - wildlife viewing, 3-83
  - description, 2-13
  - effect on prairie dogs, 3-72
  - effects on black-footed ferrets, 3-63
  - effects on burrowing owl, 3-64
  - effects on ferruginous hawks, 3-64
  - effects on greater prairie chicken, 3-77

## Alternative 5, cont.

- effects on prairie dogs, 3-63
- effects on sharp-tailed grouse, 3-77
- effects on shooting, 3-82
- effects on species at risk, 3-62, 3-63
- effects on swift fox, 3-64
- effects on wildlife viewing, 3-82
- effects summary, 3-65
- effects to AUMs, 3-19
- objectives, 2-13
- thresholds, 2-14

## Alternatives

- compliance with forest plan vegetation objectives, 3-22, 3-24

## American burying beetle, 3-25

## Animal Unit Month, 3-18

## Archaic period, 3-9

ARP. *See* Adaptive response protocolAUM. *See also* Animal Unit Month

- changes by alternative, 3-18
- effects from Alternative 1, 3-18
- effects from Alternative 2, 3-18
- effects from Alternative 3, 3-18
- effects from Alternative 4, 3-19
- effects from Alternative 5, 3-19

**B**BBS. *See* Breeding bird survey

## Benefit

- economic, 3-90

## Black-footed ferret

- Alternative 1 objectives, 2-3
- cost to produce, 3-90
- effects from Alternative 1, 3-50
- effects from Alternative 2, 3-53
- effects from Alternative 3, 3-57
- effects from Alternative 4, 3-60
- effects from Alternative 5, 3-63
- home range, 3-27
- management under Alternative 4, 2-12
- population management, 3-26
- population modeling, 3-27
- recovery, 1-7

Black-tailed prairie dog, *See* Prairie dog

## Blowout penstemon, 3-25

BMZs. *See* Boundary management zones

## Boundary management zones, 1-3, 1-7

## Breeding bird survey, 3-31

- routes, 3-31

## Burrowing owl, 3-31

- effects from Alternative 1, 3-51
- effects from Alternative 2, 3-54
- effects from Alternative 3, 3-58
- effects from Alternative 4, 3-61
- effects from Alternative 5, 3-64

**C**CBSG. *See* Conservation Breeding Specialist Group

## Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, 3-26

## Consultation

- with other agencies, 3-94
- with states, 3-94

## Cost

- AUM loss, 3-89
- black-footed ferret production, 3-90
- implementation and monitoring, 3-90
- of prairie dog management, 3-91
- operational, 3-89
- prairie dog management (Conata Basin), 3-92
- production, 3-89

## Cumulative effects

- actions affecting wildlife species, 3-38
- Endangered Species Act definition, 3-38
- drought, 3-39
- plague, 3-41
- prairie dog control, 3-39
- prairie dog shooting, 3-40
- shooting, 3-40
- NEPA definition, 3-38
- drought, 3-41
- plague, 3-44
- prairie dog control, 3-41
- secondary lead poisoning, 3-44
- shooting, 3-43
- travel management, 3-43
- soil resources, 3-8
- to rangeland vegetation, 3-21
- water resources, 3-8

**D**

## Desired plant community

- on prairie dog colonies, 3-14

## Desired vegetation condition, 3-12

## Drought, 1-7, 3-1, 3-5, 3-39, 3-41

**E**

## Earnings, 3-86

## Ecological effective density, 3-35

## Ecological site description, 3-6, 3-11

## Economic benefit, 3-90

Economic effects, 3-88  
  assumptions, 3-87  
  livestock grazing reduction, 3-87  
Economic efficiency, 3-88  
  by alternative, 3-90  
  determination factors, 3-90  
Economic indices, 3-85  
Effects  
  social, 3-87  
Environmental effects  
  cumulative, 3-1  
  direct, 3-1  
  indirect, 3-1  
Environmental justice, 3-93, 3-94  
ESD. *See* Ecological site description  
Ethnic background  
  by county, 3-93  
Existing vegetation condition, 3-15

## F

Farm earnings, 3-92  
  by county, 3-86  
Fencing, 2-7, 3-2  
Ferruginous hawk, 3-30  
  effects from Alternative 1, 3-50  
  effects from Alternative 2, 3-54  
  effects from Alternative 3, 3-57  
  effects from Alternative 4, 3-60  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-64  
Financial efficiency, 3-88  
Floodplains  
  Executive Order 11988, 3-94  
Forage loss  
  potential by alternative, 3-89  
Forage reserves, 2-16

## G

Greater prairie chicken, 3-73  
  effects from Alternative 1, 3-75  
  effects from Alternative 2, 3-76  
  effects from Alternative 3, 3-76  
  effects from Alternative 4, 3-77  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-77  
  forest plan objectives, 3-79  
  population trend, 3-74  
Greater sage-grouse, 3-77  
  forest plan objectives, 3-79  
  observations, 3-78  
  population trend, 3-78

## H

HCPC. *See* Historical climax plant community  
Herbage production, 3-18  
Heritage resources  
  effects common to all alternatives, 3-10  
Heritage surveys, 3-9  
  eligibility for National Register of Historic Places,  
  3-9  
Historical climax plant community, 3-11, 3-13

## I

Implementation cost, 3-90  
Income, 3-86  
Industry earnings, 3-92

## L

Landonwenship adjustment, 1-6, 2-15  
Later Prehistoric period, 3-9  
Least tern, 3-25  
Livestock grazing  
  effects by alternative, 3-88  
  effects on, 3-88  
Livestock management, 3-1  
  options, 1-6  
  unified grazing system, 2-17  
Live trapping, 2-8, 2-17

## M

Major land resource areas, 3-6, 3-11  
Management indicator species, 3-66  
  black-tailed prairie dog, 3-68  
  effects common to all alternatives, 3-68  
  greater prairie chicken, 3-73  
  greater sage grouse, 3-77  
  potential habitat, 3-67  
  sharp-tailed grouse, 3-73  
Median age, 3-86  
MIS. *See* Management indicator species  
MLRAs. *See* Major land resource areas  
Monitoring cost, 3-90  
Mountain plover, 3-29

## N

NOI. *See* Notice of intent  
Nonlethal methods. *See* Prairie dog  
  management:nonlethal methods  
Notice of intent, 1-5

**O**

Operational costs, 3-89

**P**

Paleontological resources

effects common to all alternatives, 3-10

Paleontological sites

in project area, 3-10

Paleontology

Late Cretaceous Mowry formation, 3-10

Pleistocene deposits, 3-10

vertebrate fossils, 3-10

Pedoturbation. *See* Soil:mixing

Phosphine gas, 3-36

Piping plover, 3-25

Plague, 3-26, 3-34, 3-41, 3-44

occurrence

in Conata Basin (2008), 3-34, 3-41, 3-44

occurrence, 3-41, 3-44

outbreak modeling in Conata Basin, 3-26

Plains sharp-tailed grouse. *See* Sharp-tailed grouse

Population

county, 3-85

farm, 3-85

Population demographics, 3-85

Prairie dog, 3-31

colony complex, 3-32, 3-70

conservation incentives, 3-85

conservation strategy, 3-70

control, 3-42

on state and private land, 3-39

effects from Alternative 1, 3-71, 3-49

effects from Alternative 2, 3-53, 3-71

effects from Alternative 3, 3-56, 3-72

effects from Alternative 4, 3-60, 3-72

effects from Alternative 5, 3-63, 3-72

forest plan objectives, 3-70, 3-79

management at Wind Cave National Park, 3-33

population trend, 3-69

predictive model for acres, 3-68

public support for, 3-85

shooting, 3-40, 3-43

shooting opportunities, 3-81

viability, 3-32, 3-33, 3-70

impacts of plague, 3-33, 3-34

Prairie dog management

current direction, 2-1, 2-6, 2-7

history of, 1-1

nonlethal methods

fencing, 2-7

live trapping, 2-8

project area, 1-2, 3-1

project objectives, 1-3

Prairie dog management, cont.

South Dakota state plan, 2-11

use of prescribed fire, 2-16

Prairie dog shooting. *See* Shooting

Production costs (ranching), 3-88

Project area, 3-84

national importance, 3-84

population, 3-92

recreation activities in, 3-84

Proposed action

significant issues, 1-6

thresholds, 1-4

Public comments, 1-5

**R**

Ranching costs, 3-89

operational costs, 3-89

production costs, 3-88

Rangeland vegetation

cumulative effects, 3-21

cumulative effects by alternative, 3-22

direct effects from alternatives, 3-17

indirect effects from alternatives, 3-17

response to prairie dog colonization, 3-17

Recreational shooting, 2-16. *See also* Shooting

Rodenticide, 3-36

Rodenticide use, 3-3, 3-36

by Forest Service, 3-42

effects to other wildlife, 3-80

history of, 1-1, 3-2

indirect effects, 3-37

in South Dakota, 3-39, 3-42, 3-43

restrictions, 3-36

under Alternative 1, 2-5

under Alternative 2, 2-8

under Alternative 3, 2-10

under Alternative 4, 2-12

**S**

Secondary lead poisoning, 3-40, 3-44

Sensitive species, 3-27, 3-29

black-tailed prairie dog, 3-31

burrowing owl, 3-31

ferruginous hawk, 3-30

mountain plover, 3-29

swift fox, 3-29

Seral stage, 3-11

effects by alternative by geographic area, 3-19

Sharp-tailed grouse, 3-73

effects from Alternative 1, 3-75

effects from Alternative 2, 3-76

effects from Alternative 3, 3-76

effects from Alternative 4, 3-77

Sharp-tailed grouse, cont.  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-77  
  forest plan objectives, 3-79  
  population trend, 3-74  
Shooting, 3-2, 3-40, 3-43  
  effects common to all alternatives, 3-81  
  non target animals, 3-40, 3-43  
  opportunities on the Nebraska National Forest, 3-81  
  prairie dog response, 3-40  
  secondary lead poisoning, 3-40  
Similarity index  
  definition of, 2-5  
  under Alternative 1, 2-5, 2-10, 2-12  
  under Alternative 3, 2-10  
  under Alternative 4, 2-12  
Social effects, 3-87  
  by alternative, 3-87  
Social indices, 3-85  
Soil, 3-4  
  analysis, 3-5  
  cumulative effects, 3-8  
  effects common to all alternatives, 3-6  
  effects from Alternative 1, 3-7  
  effects from Alternative 2, 3-7  
  effects from Alternative 3, 3-7  
  effects from Alternative 4, 3-8  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-8  
  in project area, 3-6  
  mixing, 3-7  
South Dakota state plan. *See* Prairie dog management:South Dakota state plan  
Species at risk, 3-25  
  effects from Alternative 1, 3-46, 3-47  
  effects from Alternative 2, 3-52  
  effects from Alternative 3, 3-55, 3-56  
  effects from Alternative 4, 3-58, 3-59  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-62, 3-63  
  effects from alternatives, 3-52  
Species conservation  
  public support for, 3-85  
Swift fox, 3-29  
  effects from Alternative 1, 3-50  
  effects from Alternative 2, 3-54  
  effects from Alternative 3, 3-58  
  effects from Alternative 4, 3-60  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-64  
Sylvatic plague. *See* Plague

## T

Third-party solutions, 2-15  
Thresholds, 2-3  
Total personal income, 3-86  
TPI. *See* Total personal income

## W

Water  
  analysis, 3-5  
  cumulative effects, 3-8  
  effects common to all alternatives, 3-6  
  effects from Alternative 1, 3-7  
  effects from Alternative 2, 3-7  
  effects from Alternative 3, 3-7  
  effects from Alternative 4, 3-8  
  effects from Alternative 5, 3-8  
Water erosion prediction project, 3-5  
Water quality  
  in Conata Basin, 3-5  
Waterbodies, 3-5  
Watershed health, 3-4  
Watersheds  
  in project area, 3-5  
WEPP. *See* Water erosion prediction project  
Wetlands  
  Executive Order 11990, 3-94  
Whooping crane, 3-26  
Wildlife species  
  categories, 3-44  
  effects by alternative, 3-44, 3-46  
Wildlife viewing  
  effects common to all alternatives, 3-81

## Z

Zinc phosphide, 3-36  
  grain bait, 3-36  
  secondary poisoning, 3-80  
  secondary poisoning risks, 3-37  
  toxicity and persistence, 3-36  
  toxicity to other species, 3-36, 3-37

