



TEXAS CONSERVATION ACTION PLAN

Texas Blackland Prairies

DRAFT ECOREGION HANDBOOK

JUNE 2011

Note: text in red in this document will be revised between June 10 Public Comment Draft and the final USFWS-approved document. THIS IS A SUMMARY of the HANDBOOK; more background information will be added.



In accordance with Texas State Depository Law, this publication is available at the Texas State Publications Clearinghouse and/or Texas Depository Libraries.

© Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
PWD insert number when approved

Citing this document:

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. 2011. **Texas Conservation Action Plan 2011 – 2016: Texas Blackland Prairies Handbook**. Editor, Wendy Connally, Texas Conservation Action Plan Coordinator. PWD insert number when approved. Austin, Texas.

Contents

SUMMARY	1
HOW TO GET INVOLVED	2
OVERVIEW	3
RARE SPECIES and COMMUNITIES	13
PRIORITY HABITATS.....	19
ISSUES	24
CONSERVATION ACTIONS	34
CONSERVATION PARTNERS AND PROGRAMS	46
RESOURCES AND REFERENCES.....	47

ECOREGION HANDBOOK FIGURES

Figure 1. TBPR Ecoregion with County Boundaries	5
Figure 2. TBPR EDUs, HUC 8s, and ESSS – 6 maps	8

ECOREGION HANDBOOK TABLES

Table 1. Crosswalk of TBPR Ecoregion with Other Conservation Plan Units	4
Table 2. TBPR EDUs with ESSS and Reservoirs	6
Table 3. TBPR Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN)	14
Table 4. TBPR Rare Communities.....	18
Table 5. TBPR Priority Habitats	20
Table 7. TBPR Priority Issues	25
Table 8. TBPR Conservation Actions	35

See links on Texas Parks and Wildlife Department’s [Texas Conservation Action Plan 2011 Web Page](#) for additional references and supporting documents cited in this handbook.

“Action that grows out of urgency, frustration, or even determination is missing a critical ingredient. For action to be effective, for action to be meaningful, it must also grow out of respect and a deep sense of connection to the things and people that surround us.” – Orion Magazine Editors, March/April 2011

SUMMARY

The Texas Blackland Prairies (TBPR) Handbook is one of the Texas Conservation Action Plan (TCAP) thirteen handbooks, available on the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department’s [Texas Conservation Action Plan website](#):

- an **Overview** – background information about how this Plan came about and was revised;
- a **Statewide/Multi-region handbook** – broad resource concerns and opportunities; and
- 10 other ecoregion handbooks like this one for different areas of Texas with more local information.

This handbook provides insight into specific TBPR resources and conservation issues, including a list of Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN), rare communities, and important habitats that support these unique features. The TBPR handbook also presents a compiled list of issues – things that prevent us from doing our best conservation work here – and proposed solutions or actions. Throughout this document, there are resources – web links, programs, incentives, and contacts – to help you participate in implementation and learn more about the natural resources this region of Texas has to offer.

The TCAP TBPR Ecoregion Handbook takes advantage of many different perspectives to understand local changes and identify actions that will reduce threats to specific natural resources: SGCN, rare communities and the habitats on which they rely. The Plan aims to ensure that we are able to share our natural heritage with future generations of Texans and that they understand what we did to make *progress* toward that goal.

It’s important to prioritize where we need to work to the degree that we can: human and financial resources are limited, certain issues demand more immediate resolution, and some species and habitats are simply more in need. The TCAP 2011 taps into a broad network of conservation service providers, natural resources managers, alliances and working groups, policy makers, stakeholders and the public to define **what’s at risk, what issues are most important, where we need to work, how to best engage the right partners to solve the problems, and what to do.**

This handbook is divided into sections to guide priority setting and actions:

- resources at risk - SGCN, rare communities, and the habitats on which they rely;
- issues that are most important, which could benefit from targeted stakeholder involvement; and
- conservation actions to benefit resources and make progress toward solving issues.

Certain resources also have a statewide context – riparian areas, grasslands – and additional actions at that level are proposed in the Statewide/Multi-region handbook. For more information about how content was developed for all handbooks of the Action Plan, please see the Overview handbook.

HOW TO GET INVOLVED

This handbook contains a list of partners and programs that provide conservation services and/or information in this area. Additionally, certain conservation actions at the end of this handbook may help you connect with partners working on specific issues.

There are many wonderful, energetic public and private conservation providers in Texas who have active volunteer networks, strategic needs, and programs. For more information, check the [Natural Resource Conservation Programs and Services for Texas Landowners](#) (TPWD 2007).

If you have questions about the TCAP content and cannot find what you need on the TPWD TCAP 2011 website or in one of the handbooks, please contact the TCAP Coordinator at the TPWD Headquarters in Austin, Texas:

Phone (512) 389-4800

Email [Texas Conservation Action Plan Coordinator](#)

NOTE this email link for questions and implementation participation will be live AFTER the Public Comment period to ensure that we get all public comment through the posted survey on the

[Texas Conservation Action Plan website](#)

OVERVIEW

A one-page description of this ecoregion is being developed during the public comment period. For more information about the ecoregion's features during this time, please review Griffith (2010) and Griffith et. al. (2007).¹

Table 1 crosswalks this ecoregion with other conservation planning units.²

Figure 1 illustrates the location and extent of this ecoregion in Texas.

Table 2 documents the **Ecological Drainage Units** (EDU) and **Hydrologic Units** ("HUC 8", finer scale watersheds within EDUs), and **Ecologically Significant Stream Segments**³ (ESSS) which occur in this area.

Figure 2 shows those EDUs, HUC8s and ESSS by ecoregion.

¹ Griffith, G. 2010. Level III North American Terrestrial Ecoregions: United States Descriptions. Prepared for the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (www.cec.org), version May 11, 2010. Corvallis, Oregon.

Griffith, G.E., S.A. Bryce, J.M. Omernik, J.A. Comstock, A.C. Rogers, B. Harrison, S.L. Hatch and D. Bezanson. 2007. Ecoregions of Texas. R.S. Geological Survey, Reston VA. http://www.epa.gov/wed/pages/ecoregions/tx_eco.htm (accessed May 2009).

² For more information about planning boundaries, see the Overview handbook on the TCAP 2011 website <http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/landwater/land/tcap/>

³ TPWD. 2002/2005. *Ecologically Significant Stream Segments*.

http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/landwater/water/environconcerns/water_quality/sigsegs/

Table 1. Crosswalk of TBPR Ecoregion with Other Conservation Plan Units

Note Table is formatted 8-1/2" x 11" landscape orientation; see also Ecoregions map on TCAP 2011 website.

2010 TCAP *	2005 TXWAP (Gould 1960)	The Nature Conservancy Terrestrial Ecoregions (1999)	Ecological Drainage Units (Watersheds) From the National Fish Habitat Action Plan <i>TX = Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership and Desert Fish Habitat Partnership (AFWA 2006, Fish Habitat Partnership 2009, Esselman, et.al. 2010)</i>	All Bird Joint Ventures (JV) and Bird Conservation Regions (BCR) (NABSCI-US 2004, USFWS 2009a)	Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC) (USFWS 2009b)	2010 TPWD Land & Water Plan Strategic Regions (TPWD 2010)	Major Land Resource Regions and Areas (MLRA) (NRCS 2006)	Natural Regions of Texas (LBJ School of Public Policy 1978)
Texas Blackland Prairies (TBPR)	Blackland Prairie	Cross Timbers and Southern Tallgrass Prairie (32)	Brazos River – Prairie Colorado River – Ed Plateau Guadalupe – San Antonio Lower Brazos Lower Trinity Lower Colorado Lower Red Sabine – Neches Upper Red Upper Trinity	Oaks and Prairies JV Oaks and Prairies BCR	Gulf Coast Prairie	Guadalupe – San Antonio (4) Colorado Lower (5b) Brazos Lower (6b) Brazos Upper (6a) Trinity – San Jacinto (7) Deep East Texas (8) Northeast Texas (9) Plains Rivers (10)	Southwestern Prairies Cotton and Forage Region: East Cross Timbers (84C), Texas Blackland Prairie Northern (86A), Texas Blackland Prairie South (86B) Southwest Plateaus and Plains Range and Cotton Region: Northern Rio Grande Plain (83A)	Blackland Prairie

Figure 1. TBPR Ecoregion with County Boundaries

Texas Blackland Prairies ecoregion in yellow (note disjunct portion of ecoregion southeast)




Table 2. TBPR EDUs with ESSS and Reservoirs


ECOLOGICAL DRAINAGE UNIT SubBasin (HUC 8)	<i>Ecologically Significant Stream Segment TPWD 2002, w/updates 2005</i>	Lakes and Reservoirs
UPPER RED RIVER		
Lake Texoma		
LOWER RED RIVER		
Bois d’Arc - Island	Bois d’Arc Creek	Valley Lake
Sulphur Headwater		Cooper City/Big Creek, Cooper Lake
Lower Sulphur		
SABINE - NECHES		
Upper Sabine		Greenville City Lake
Lake Fork		
UPPER TRINITY		
Elm Fork Trinity		Lewisville Lake, North Lake
Lower West Fork Trinity		Mountain Creek Lake, Lake Joe Pool
LOWER TRINITY		
Chambers		Lake Waxahachie, Bardwell Lake, Lake Halbert, Richland - Chambers Reservoir
East Fork Trinity		Lavon Lake, Lake Ray Hubbard
Upper Trinity		White Rock Lake
Richland		Navarro Mills Lake, Richland - Chambers Reservoir
Lower Trinity - Tehuacana		
West Fork San Jacinto	Lake Creek	
Cedar		New Terrell City Lake, Cedar Creek Reservoir
BRAZOS RIVER - PRAIRIE		
Middle Brazos - Lake Whitney		Aquilla Lake, Tradinghouse Creek Reservoir, Lake Creek Lake
LOWER BRAZOS RIVER		
Navasota		Lake Mexia
Lower Brazos - Little Brazos	Cow Bayou	
Little	Little River	
Lower Brazos		
San Gabriel	Willis Creek, San Gabriel River	Granger Lake
COLORADO RIVER - EDWARDS PLATEAU		
Austin - Travis Lakes	Colorado River, Onion Creek	Town Lake (Ladybird Lake)

LOWER COLORADO RIVER		
Lower Colorado - Cummins	Colorado River, Cummins Creek	Lake Walter E. Long, Cedar Creek (Fayette) Reservoir
Lower Colorado		
GUADALUPE - SAN ANTONIO		
San Marcos	Comal River, San Marcos River	
Middle Guadalupe	Guadalupe River, Geronimo Creek	Lake Dunlap
Cibolo		
Upper San Antonio		Olmos Reservoir, Calaveras Lake, Braunig Lake
Medina		
Lower San Antonio		
Lavaca		
Navidad		


Note: Ecologically Significant Stream Segments and Reservoirs which occur in the Subbasin (HUC 8) but not in the ECOREGION are not included in this table. There may be other significant stream resources mentioned in the Priority Habitats section

Figure 2. TBPR EDUs, HUC 8s, and ESSS – 6 maps


Upper Red River and Lower Red River EDUs black outline, HUC 8s orange outline, ESSS red lines




Upper Trinity and Lower Trinity EDUs black outline, HUC 8s orange outline, ESSS red lines




Brazos River – Prairie and Lower Brazos River EDUs black outline, HUC 8s orange outline, ESSS red lines



Colorado River – Edwards Plateau, Lower Colorado River, and Guadalupe/San Antonio EDUs black outline, HUC 8s orange outline, ESSS red lines



Lower Brazos River, Lower Colorado River, and Guadalupe/San Antonio EDUs black outline, HUC 8s orange outline, ESSS red lines



Note: other important stream segments may be mentioned in the Priority Habitats section

RARE SPECIES AND COMMUNITIES

While most conservation work is done at the habitat level to address issues and threats, Action Plans' [stated primary purpose](#) is to improve and sustain *species'* populations and prevent the need to list species as federally or state threatened or endangered. The Species of Greatest Conservation Need (**SGCN**) list, one of the Eight Required Elements in all states' Action Plans, is the foundation for the habitat- and issues- based actions in the Plan. In Texas, we've also identified Rare Communities for this planning process.

For more information about how the SGCN and Rare Communities lists were developed, including the changes from the 2005 list, see the [Overview Handbook](#). Species and rare communities included in the [2011 TCAP Final SGCN](#) and [Rare Communities](#) lists are supported by current science, peer-reviewed references and/or other dependable, accessible source documentation, and expert opinion. The revised lists for TCAP 2011 are substantial and representative of conservation targets needing attention in this Plan and are sorted into the following categories:

Mammals	Birds
Reptiles and Amphibians	Freshwater Fishes
Invertebrates	Plants
Plant Communities	

Other categories are listed on the full statewide list, but are not applicable in this ecoregion: Bay and Estuary Fishes, Marine Fishes, Marine Reptiles, and Marine Mammals

Each species has a [NatureServe](#) calculated state and global [conservation rank](#), which accounts for abundance, stability and threats. Additionally, several species have [federal](#) and/or [state](#) listing (endangered, threatened, candidate) status. See the [key to conservation and listing ranks](#) on the TPWD [TCAP 2011 website](#).

Table 3. TBPR Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN)

Note Table is formatted 8-1/2" x 11" portrait orientation;

More information is available in the SGCN table online.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Abundance Ranking	
		Federal	State	Global	State
MAMMALS					
<i>Blarina hylophaga plumblea</i>	Elliot's short-tailed shrew			G5T1Q	S1
<i>Geomys attwateri</i>	Attwater's pocket gopher			G4	S4
<i>Lutra canadensis</i>	River otter			G5	S4
<i>Mustela frenata</i>	Long-tailed weasel			G5	S5
<i>Myotis austroriparius</i>	Southeastern myotis			G3G4	S3
<i>Myotis velifer</i>	Cave myotis			G5	S4
<i>Puma concolor</i>	Mountain lion			G5	S2
<i>Spilogale putorius</i>	Eastern spotted skunk			G4T	S4
<i>Sylvilagus aquaticus</i>	Swamp rabbit			G5	S5
<i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i>	Brazilian free-tailed bat			G5	S5
<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	American badger			G5	S5
<i>Ursus americanus</i>	Black bear	SAT	T	G5	S3
BIRDS					
<i>Anas acuta</i>	Northern Pintail			G5	S3B,S5N
<i>Colinus virginianus</i>	Northern Bobwhite			G5	S4B
<i>Tympanuchus cupido</i>	Greater Prairie-Chicken (Interior)			G4	S1B
<i>Meleagris gallopavo</i>	Wild Turkey			G5	S5B
<i>Ixobrychus exilis</i>	Least Bittern			G5	S4B
<i>Egretta thula</i>	Snowy Egret			G5	S5B
<i>Egretta caerulea</i>	Little Blue Heron			G5	S5B
<i>Butorides virescens</i>	Green Heron			G5	S5B
<i>Mycteria americana</i>	Wood Stork		T	G4	SHB,S2N
<i>Ictinia mississippiensis</i>	Mississippi Kite			G5	S4B
<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Bald Eagle			G5	S3B,S3N
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	Northern Harrier			G5	S2B,S3N
<i>Buteo lineatus</i>	Red-shouldered Hawk			G5	S4B
<i>Pluvialis dominica</i>	American Golden-Plover			G5	S3
<i>Charadrius montanus</i>	Mountain Plover	PT		G3	S2
<i>Scolopax minor</i>	American Woodcock			G5	S2B,S3N
<i>Sternula antillarum</i>	Least Tern	LE*	E*	G4	S3B
<i>Asio flammeus</i>	Short-eared Owl			G5	S4N

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Abundance Ranking	
		Federal	State	Global	State
<i>Caprimulgus carolinensis</i>	Chuck-will's-widow			G5	S3S4B
<i>Melanerpes erythrocephalus</i>	Red-headed Woodpecker			G5	S3B
<i>Dryocopus pileatus</i>	Pileated Woodpecker			G5	S4B
<i>Tyrannus forficatus</i>	Scissor-tailed Flycatcher			G5	S3B
<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	Loggerhead Shrike			G4	S4B
<i>Vireo bellii</i>	Bell's Vireo			G5	S3B
<i>Poecile carolinensis</i>	Carolina Chickadee			G5	S5B
<i>Thryomanes bewickii</i> (<i>bewickii</i>)	Bewick's Wren			G5	S5B
<i>Cistothorus platensis</i>	Sedge Wren			G5	S4
<i>Hylocichla mustelina</i>	Wood Thrush			G5	S4B
<i>Anthus spragueii</i>	Sprague's Pipit	C		G4	S3N
<i>Dendroica dominica</i>	Yellow-throated Warbler			G5	S4B
<i>Protonotaria citrea</i>	Prothonotary Warbler			G5	S3B
<i>Limnothlypis swainsonii</i>	Swainson's Warbler			G4	S3B
<i>Seiurus motacilla</i>	Louisiana Waterthrush			G5	S3B
<i>Oporornis formosus</i>	Kentucky Warbler			G5	S3B
<i>Spizella pusilla</i>	Field Sparrow			G5	S5B
<i>Ammodramus savannarum</i>	Grasshopper Sparrow			G5	S3B
<i>Chondestes grammacus</i>	Lark Sparrow			G5	S4B
<i>Ammodramus henslowii</i>	Henslow's Sparrow			G4	S2S3N,SXB
<i>Ammodramus leconteii</i>	Le Conte's Sparrow				
<i>Zonotrichia querula</i>	Harris's Sparrow			G5	S4
<i>Calcarius mccownii</i>	McCown's Longspur			G4	S4
<i>Calcarius pictus</i>	Smith's Longspur				
<i>Piranga rubra</i>	Summer Tanager			G5	S5B
<i>Passerina ciris</i>	Painted Bunting			G5	S4B
<i>Spiza americana</i>	Dickcissel			G5	S4B
<i>Sturnella magna</i>	Eastern Meadowlark			G5	S5B
<i>Euphagus carolinus</i>	Rusty Blackbird			G4	S3
<i>Icterus spurius</i>	Orchard Oriole			G5	S4B
REPTILES & AMPHIBIANS					
<i>Anaxyrus (Bufo) woodhousii</i>	Woodhouse's toad			G5	SU
<i>Apalone mutica</i>	smooth softshell turtle				
<i>Apalone spinifera</i>	spiny softshell turtle				
<i>Cheylydra serpentina</i>	Common snapping turtle				
<i>Crotalus atrox</i>	Western diamondback				S4

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Abundance Ranking	
		Federal	State	Global	State
	rattlesnake				
<i>Crotalus horridus</i>	Timber (Canebrake) Rattlesnake		T	G4	S4
<i>Graptemys caglei</i>	Cagle's map turtle		T	G3	S1
<i>Graptemys versa</i>	Texas map turtle			G4	SU
<i>Heterodon nasicus</i>	Western hognosed snake				
<i>Macrochelys temminckii</i>	alligator snapping turtle		T	G3G4	S3
<i>Ophisaurus attenuatus</i>	western slender glass lizard				
<i>Phrynosoma cornutum</i>	Texas horned lizard		T	G4G5	S4
<i>Pseudacris streckeri</i>	Strecker's Chorus Frog			G5	S3
<i>Sistrurus catenatus</i>	massasagua				
<i>Terrapene carolina</i>	Eastern box turtle			G5	S3
<i>Terrapene ornata</i>	Ornate box turtle			G5	S3
<i>Thamnophis sirtalis</i>	Common Garter Snake (Eastern/Texas/ New Mexico)			G5	S2
<i>Trachemys scripta</i>	Red-eared slider				
FRESHWATER FISHES					
<i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	American eel			G4	S5
<i>Atractosteus spatula</i>	alligator gar				
<i>Cycleptus elongatus</i>	Blue sucker		T	G3G4	S3
<i>Etheostoma fonticola</i>	Fountain darter	LE	E	G1	S1
<i>Macryhbopsis storeriana</i>	Silver chub				
<i>Micropterus treculii</i>	Guadalupe bass			G3	S3
<i>Notropis atrocaudalis</i>	Blackspot shiner				
<i>Notropis bairdi</i>	Red River shiner				
<i>Notropis buccula</i>	Small eye shiner	C		G2Q	S2
<i>Notropis chalybaeus</i>	Ironcolor shiner				
<i>Notropis oxyrhynchus</i>	Sharprose shiner	C		G3	S3
<i>Notropis potteri</i>	Chub shiner		T	G4	S3
<i>Notropis shumardi</i>	Silverband shiner				
<i>Percina apristis</i>	Guadalupe darter				
<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	Paddlefish		T	G4	S3
<i>Satan eurystomus</i>	Widemouth blindcat		T	G1	S1
<i>Trogloglanis pattersoni</i>	Toothless blindcat		T	G1	S1
INVERTEBRATES					
<i>Bombus pensylvanicus</i>	American bumblebee			GU	SU*

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status		Abundance Ranking	
		Federal	State	Global	State
<i>Chimarra holzenthali</i>	Holzenthals Philopotamid caddisfly			G1G2	S1
<i>Cotinis boylei</i>	A scarab beetle			G2*	S2*
<i>Nicrophorus americanus</i>	American Burying Beetle	LE		G1	S1
<i>Potamilus amphichaenus</i>	Texas heelsplitter		T	G1G2	S1
<i>Procambarus regalis</i>	Regal burrowing crayfish			G2G3	S2?*
<i>Procambarus steigmani</i>	Parkhill prairie crayfish			G1G2	S1S2*
<i>Pseudocentropiloides morihari</i>	A mayfly			G2G3	S2?*
<i>Sphinx eremitoides</i>	Sage sphinx			G1G2	S1?*
<i>Susperatus tonkawa</i>	A mayfly			G1	S1*
PLANTS					
<i>Hymenoxys pygmaea</i>	Pygmy prairie dawn			G1	S1
<i>Agalinis densiflora</i>	Osage Plains false foxglove			G3	S2
<i>Astragalus reflexus</i>	Texas milk vetch			G3	S3
<i>Calopogon oklahomensis</i>	Oklahoma grass pink			G3	S1S2
<i>Carex edwardsiana</i>	canyon sedge			G3G4S3S4	S3S4
<i>Carex shinersii</i>	Shinner's sedge			G3?	S2
<i>Crataegus dallasiana</i>	Dallas hawthorn			G3Q	S3
<i>Cuscuta exaltata</i>	tree dodder			G3	S3
<i>Dalea hallii</i>	Hall's prairie-clover			G3	S3
<i>Echinacea atrorubens</i>	Topeka purple-coneflower			G3	S3
<i>Hexalectris nitida</i>	Glass Mountains coral-root			G3	S3
<i>Hexalectris warnockii</i>	Warnock's coral-root			G2G3	S2
<i>Liatris glandulosa</i>	glandular gay-feather			G3	S3
<i>Paronychia setacea</i>	bristle nailwort			G3	S3
<i>Phlox oklahomensis</i>	Oklahoma phlox			G3	SH
<i>Physaria engelmannii</i>	Engelmann's bladderpod			G3	S3
<i>Polygonella parksii</i>	Parks' jointweed			G2	S2
<i>Prunus texana</i>	Texas peachbush			G3G4	S3S4
<i>Thalictrum texanum</i>	Texas meadow-rue			G2	S2
<i>Zizania texana</i>	Texas wild rice	LE	E	G1	S1

Table 4. TBPR Rare Communities

Note Table is formatted 11" X 17", more information is available on the Rare Communities table posted on the website.

G_RANK	S_RANK (Provisional)	COMMON_NAME	GLOBAL_NAME	ECOLOGICAL_SYSTEM_NAME	KNOWN COUNTIES	Endemic	KNOWN PROTECTED AREAS
G1G2	S1S2	Vertisol Blackland Prairie	Schizachyrium scoparium - Sorghastrum nutans - Andropogon gerardii - Bifora americana Vertisol Herbaceous Vegetation	Texas Blackland Tallgrass Prairie CES205.684	Austin, Bastrop, Bell, Brazos, Burleson, Collin, Colorado, Dallas, Ellis, Fannin, Falls, Fayette, Franklin, Freestone, Grayson, Grimes, Hays, Hill, Hunt, Kaufman, Lamar, Lavaca, Lee, Leon, Limestone, Mc McLennan, Navarro, Robertson, Rockwall, Titus, Travis, Washington, and Williams	Y	Clymer Meadow Preserve (TNC), Leonhardt Prairie (TNC), Parkhill Prairie (Collin County Park), Kachina Prairie (TLC), Peters Prairie (NPAT), Riesel Prairie Preserve (NPAT)
G1	S1	Eastern Gammagrass - Tall Dropseed Herbaceous Vegetation	Tripsacum dactyloides - Sporobolus compositus var. compositus Herbaceous Vegetation	Texas Blackland Tallgrass Prairie CES205.684	Austin, Bastrop, Bell, Brazos, Burleson, Collin, Colorado, Dallas, Ellis, Fannin, Falls, Fayette, Franklin, Freestone, Grayson, Grimes, Hays, Hill, Hunt, Kaufman, Lamar, Lavaca, Lee, Leon, Limestone, Mc McLennan, Navarro, Robertson, Rockwall, Titus, Travis, Washington, and Williams	N	No documented protected areas
G2G3	S1S2	Little Bluestem - Yellow Indiangrass - Pale Purple Coneflower - Purple Prairie-clover Herbaceous Vegetation	Schizachyrium scoparium - Sorghastrum nutans - Echinacea pallida - Dalea purpurea Herbaceous Vegetation	West Gulf Coastal Plain Northern Calcareous Prairie CES203.377	Bowie, Delta, Hopkins, Franklin, Lamar, Red River, and Titus	N	Caddo National Grasslands (USFS)
G1	S1	Silveus' Dropseed - Mead's Sedge Herbaceous Vegetation	Sporobolus silveanus - Carex meadii Herbaceous Vegetation	Texas Blackland Tallgrass Prairie CES205.684	Bowie, Fannin, Franklin, Hopkins, Lamar, Red River, and Titus	N	Tridens Prairie (TNC), Gambill Goose Refuge (City of Paris)
G1	S1	Silveanus Dropseed - Longspike Tridens Tallgrass Prairie	Sporobolus silveanus - Tridens strictus Herbaceous Vegetation	Texas Blackland Tallgrass Prairie CES205.684	Bowie, Franklin, Hopkins, Lamar, Red River, and Titus	Y	No documented protected areas
G1	S1	Gammagrass - Switchgrass Tallgrass Prairie	Tripsacum dactyloides - Panicum virgatum - Sorghastrum nutans - Helianthus maximiliani Herbaceous Vegetation	Texas Blackland Tallgrass Prairie CES205.684	Collin, Dallas, Fannin, Franklin, Grayson, Hunt, Kaufman, Lamar, Rockwall, and Titus	N	Clymer Meadow and Mathews Prairie (TNC)
G2G3	S2S3	Sugarberry - Cedar Elm Calcareous Floodplain Forest	Ulmus crassifolia - Carya illinoensis - Celtis laevigata / Chasmanthium sessiliflorum - Carex cherokeensis Forest	Southeastern Great Plains Floodplain Forest CES205.710	Austin, Brazos, Burleson, Dewitt, Gonzales, Grimes, Guadalupe, Goliad, Matagorda, Refugio, Victoria, Waller, and Washington	N	Stephen F. Austin State Park (TPWD)

PRIORITY HABITATS

Nationally, an SGCN list forms a basis for every Action Plan; however, *species* conservation cannot be successful without defining the *lands and waters species need to survive and thrive*. If it was only important to know about individuals or even populations, we could put representatives in zoos or herbaria or other curated collections and that would be enough; but, it's not **It's important to conserve populations in the context in which they thrive, to the best of their abilities, where they can contribute to and benefit from the systems in which they live.**

[Broad habitat categories](#) were developed to organize all ecoregional handbooks.

See also the Statewide/Multi-region handbook for habitats that are of broader importance – shared with many other regions and/or other states or nations (e.g. riparian or migratory species' habitats as a general category).

See also [Ecoregions of Texas](#) (report is near the bottom of webpage; Griffith et. al. 2007), [Ecological Mapping Systems Project](#) (TPWD et. al. *in progress*), and the [National Fish Habitat Action Plan](#)

Table 5. TBPR Priority Habitats

Note Table is formatted 8-1/2" x 11" landscape orientation

GENERAL HABITAT TYPES	TEXAS BLACKLAND PRAIRIES (TBPR)	TBPR Ecological Systems
NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL TYPES	<i>Habitats in this column were identified in the workshop and surveys (April 2011); additions were made by editor to riverine and cultural aquatic</i>	<i>NatureServe. 2009. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications for Ecological Systems of Texas' Blackland Prairies. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA. U.S.A. Data current as of 08 October 2009.</i>
Barren/Sparse Vegetation <i>See also Marine/Coastal</i>		Southeastern Coastal Plain Cliff
Desert Scrub	Dense southern brush – mixed, diverse; primarily south of San Antonio, intergrades with South Texas Plains ecoregion	Tamaulipan Mixed Deciduous Thornscrub
Grassland	eastern gamagrass-switchgrass-yellow Indiangrass-Maximilian sunflower prairie little bluestem-Indiangrass-big bluestem prairie silveanus dropseed-mead sedge Austin Chalk outcrop herbaceous little bluestem - sideoats grama herbaceous silver bluestem-dropseed-Texas wintergrass	Texas Blackland Tallgrass Prairie
Shrubland	Headwater drainage shrublands Mesquite-granjeno shrublands swale shrublands	Edwards Plateau Limestone Shrubland

GENERAL HABITAT TYPES	TEXAS BLACKLAND PRAIRIES (TBPR)	TBPR Ecological Systems
Savanna/Open Woodland	Osage-Elm-Locust-Hackberry Elm-Hackberry Mature Mesquite Savanna Oak Savanna (limited) chalk glades	Edwards Plateau Limestone Savanna and Woodland
Woodland	Headwater drainage woodlands Swale woodlands Mesic slope mixed woodland Post oak-blackjack oak woodland Pecan-Schumard Oak-Hackberry-Burr Oak	East-Central Texas Plains Post Oak Savanna and Woodland Edwards Plateau Dry-Mesic Slope Forest and Woodland
Forest <i>See also Riparian and Wetlands</i>	Mesic slope mixed forest	Crosstimbers Oak Forest and Woodland
Riparian	periodically flooded or subirrigated floodplain woodlands (oak, juniper) and gallery forests (sycamore, cypress, elm) associated with the Lower Red, Sabine-Neches (and headwaters), upper segments of the Lower Trinity, upper sections of the Lower Brazos, headwaters of Lavaca and the Guadalupe Rivers and tributaries; important areas include bottomland hardwood forests	Edwards Plateau Floodplain Edwards Plateau Riparian Southeastern Great Plains Floodplain Forest Southeastern Great Plains Riparian Forest West Gulf Coastal Plain Large River Floodplain Forest West Gulf Coastal Plain Small Stream and River Forest

GENERAL HABITAT TYPES	TEXAS BLACKLAND PRAIRIES (TBPR)	TBPR Ecological Systems
Riverine	Instream habitats of the watersheds which intersect this ecoregion Sulphur River, Middle Sulphur River, Caddo Creek Ecologically Significant Stream Segments - Bois d'Arc Creek, Lake Creek, Cow Bayou, Little River, Willis Creek, San Gabriel River, Onion Creek, Colorado River, Cummins Creek, Comal River, San Marcos River, Guadalupe River, Geronimo Creek	NA
Lacustrine <i>See also Cultural Aquatic</i>	oxbow lakes of the Trinity River	NA
Freshwater Wetland	springs, seeps	NA
Aquifer	Trinity , (outcrop, subcrop), Edwards BFZ, Carrizo – Wilcox (outcrop, subcrop)	
CULTURAL TYPES	<i>habitats in this column must support SGCN or rare communities to be considered in this plan</i>	
Agricultural		NA
Developed		NA
<i>Urban, Suburban, Rural</i>	urban forests	NA
<i>Industrial</i>		NA
<i>Rights of Way</i>		NA

GENERAL HABITAT TYPES	TEXAS BLACKLAND PRAIRIES (TBPR)	TBPR Ecological Systems
Cultural Aquatic	<p>Reservoirs: Valley Lake, Cooper City/Big Creek, Cooper Lake, Greenville City, Lewisville, North, Mountain Creek, Joe Pool, Waxahachie, Bardwell, Halbert, Richland - Chambers, Lavon, Ray Hubbard, White Rock, Navarro Mills, New Terrell City, Cedar Creek, Aquilla, Tradinghouse Creek, Lake Creek, Mexia, Granger, Town (Ladybird), Walter E. Long, Cedar Creek (Fayette), Dunlap, Olmos, Calaveras, Braunig</p> <p>Check ecoregion boundaries re Lake Tawakoni and Bonham</p>	NA

ISSUES

There are **activities and conditions** which may negatively affect the SGCN populations, rare communities, and the habitats on which they depend in this region. These issues can include **direct or indirect harm** (e.g. inappropriate mining reclamation which uses non-native vegetation or indirectly provides an opportunity for non-native invasive vegetation, streambed gravel mining that directly removes spawning habitat and/or indirectly creates poor water quality downstream) **plus basic “gaps” that prevent us from acting most effectively** (e.g. lack of information, lack of coordination to share current data, incompatible practices among land managers, lack of funding). For information about how this list was developed, see the Overview Handbook and the [descriptions of the broad issue categories](#).

Habitat fragmentation and habitat loss, including open-space land conversion, are always going to be broad issues that need to be addressed, at various scales – local, regional, statewide, interstate, and international. These are such broad categories and, depending on the scale of the problem, these three issues can be symptoms or causes of many other issues. These three issues are not specifically included in the Issues list, although they may be implied in many of the categories presented.

The issues covered in the TBPR Ecoregion Handbook attempt to present more of the specific causes of SGCN, rare communities, and habitats’ decline, providing appropriate context to help target our actions, identified later in this handbook. Several of the habitat types in this handbook are also considered priority habitats in the Statewide/Multi-region handbook.

Table 6. TBPR Priority Issues

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
Invasive Species		
Non-native Plant	<p>This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these “boundaries” is particularly relevant. There are several issues, one of which is non-native invasive plants sold in nursery trade (e.g. ligustrum, chinaberry, nandina); tallow and tree of heaven</p> <p>Cultivated and Old World grasses (e.g. Lehmann's lovegrass, King Ranch (KR) bluestem, Bermuda grass, Bahiagrass, Johnsongrass, Old World Bluestem, Tall Fescue, Chinese Privet and <i>Scabiosa atropurpurea</i>)</p> <p>Aquatic invasives – giant salvinia, water hyacinth, ...OTHERS specifically a problem in this ecoregion?</p>	<p>Urban areas harbor numerous invasive species – Chinese tallow, kudzu, ligustrum, chinaberry, tree of heaven -- that are installed in residential and municipal landscapes, allowed to escape and spread into nearby wildlands and all points downstream (once in waterways, these infestations can spread as far as the floodwater will carry them within the water system and into adjacent areas).</p> <p>Non-native grass dominated areas have claimed millions of acres of native prairie throughout Texas and are a leading cause of steep population declines for wildlife dependent on native grasslands (e.g. bobwhite quail, dickcissel, loggerhead shrike, scissor-tailed flycatcher, many types of pollinating insects, and the plants which in turn depend on these). From pollinators to birds of prey, all prairie dependent species experience population declines. Prairie birds that nest and forage on the ground do not have suitable nesting, travel lanes, thermal cover, foraging, brooding, loafing, screening, or escape cover within introduced grass areas. The Houston toad, a species on the brink of extinction, cannot travel more than 50 feet into Bermudagrass stands. Invertebrate abundance, important for breeding bird fecundity, has been shown to be lower on introduced grass sites compared to native grass areas. Breeding birds have been shown to select native prairie sites more than introduced grass sites for nesting.</p> <p>The majority of non-native grasses for livestock forage are often managed as monocultures that resemble ecological deserts, not functioning ecosystems, and require annual fertilization to maintain productivity. Annual applications of fertilizer and herbicide become incorporated into rainwater runoff, leading to significant water quality issues. Properly managed native grasses do not require annual fertilization; highly palatable native grasses (i.e. Yellow Indiangrass, Little Bluestem, Big Bluestem, Switchgrass, and Eastern Gammagrass) provide high protein levels required for livestock and hay production. These factors make native grasses a sustainable option for Texas’ rangeland and wildlife.</p> <p>In addition to terrestrial and aquatic wildlife benefits, pasture conversion back to native grasslands reap public benefits through improved water quality, groundwater recharge, carbon sequestration, erosion control, outdoor education, and recreational opportunities.</p>
Non-native Animal	<p>This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these “boundaries” is particularly relevant. There are several issues, one of which is feral pets.</p> <p>FERAL HOGS</p> <p>Red Imported Fire Ants (RIFA)</p> <p>introduced fishes and mollusks - freshwater springs, streams and marshes</p> <p>Baitfish released by anglers and “aquarium dumping” by hobbyists</p> <p>House sparrows, starlings</p>	<p>Free ranging pets (cats, dogs as individuals and as packs) are introduced predators which primarily adversely affect small mammals, small reptiles, and birds; in packs, can also adversely affect larger mammals and ground-nesting birds; also contribute pathogens and diseases. It is estimated that 60-100 million feral cats reside in the US and another 60 million pet cats are allowed to roam outside. “Neuter and release” programs only address fecundity in a limited way, and do not address the impact to natural resources. The number of birds preyed by feral cats in the U.S. is annually is more than 1 Billion; numerous SGCN are affected. The IUCN ranks feral cats as one of the world’s worst invasive species. (see The Wildlife Society, Wildlife Professional publication, 2011).</p> <p>Feral hogs decimate important and fragile habitats (e.g. springs, seeps, riparian areas, wetlands), degrade instream water quality, change topography and runoff/collection patterns, and decrease hardwood seedling viability (rooted up, eaten) and vegetation community composition. Can be particularly detrimental to some prairie plants which are intolerant to soil disturbance. Hogs also decimate new restoration sites, making recovery expensive or even untenable.</p> <p>RIFA are a predator to all ground-nesting and some shrub-nesting birds, small mammals, reptiles and amphibians; RIFA will invade and destroy/eat a nest of eggs and/or young</p> <p>Within streams, zebra mussels compete with native freshwater mussels, many of which are listed as state threatened. May also be gill parasites on certain fishes, unknown if they adversely affect any SGCN freshwater fishes. Small mouth bass are voracious non-native predators taking a toll on smaller fishes in these systems. Non-native baitfish and aquarium species releases compete with native fishes in many habitats and can be very detrimental if they are predacious.</p>
Native Problematic	<p>Native shrub (e.g. mesquite, whitebrush, yaupon, juniper) or “brush” encroachment into prairie systems</p> <p>Brown-headed cowbird (BHCB)</p>	<p>Mesquite and juniper invasion of prairies/grasslands throughout ecoregino, yaupon invasion in pine-oak woodlands, whitebrush invasion in woodlands and grasslands to the south</p> <p>Native brush invasion, where these species should not naturally occur or in abundances that are out of balance with the native communities, degrades grassland suitability and hardwood regeneration potential. Most of these “infestations” can be controlled by a restoration plan including prescribed fire or some kind of mechanical/chemical brush treatment, then a maintenance plan to mimic natural processes if the sites are large enough to function as a system on their own. In some instances, prairie restoration to control brush is more economical than non-native pasture conversion back to native grasses.</p> <p>BHCB have proliferated with increased habitat fragmentation and widespread farm and ranch use, congregating in livestock feeding areas. Brown-headed cowbirds are common during breeding bird surveys.</p>
Pests, Parasites, Pathogens		
Pests		

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
Parasites		
Pathogens	Oak wilt, Oak decline Chinquapin wilt	The key woody plant communities in this ecoregion are hardwood dependent – oak savanna, oak woodlands, and bottomland hardwoods – all potentially affected by the wilt and decline pathogens.
Power Development and Transmission		
Wind Power	Wind generation tower siting (“wind farms”) is not an issue in this ecoregion; however, many of the migrants that pass through this ecoregion encounter wind turbines in central and north Texas – it is a concern that needs to be addressed	<i>See north and central Texas ecoregion handbooks and the Statewide Handbook</i>
Hydro (Dam and Reservoir)	There are many dams and hydropower facilities in this and adjacent ecoregions, to the Coast; operations impact downstream aquatic and riparian communities	<i>See also Water Development, Management and Distribution below</i>
Coal-fired plants	Fourteen plants proposed in Texas (citation?), how many in this ecoregion? Map?	Footprint of power plant and adjacent reservoir is direct loss of terrestrial habitat If the water cooling pond is dammed natural waterway, then contributes to loss of instream flows for aquatic SGCN and riparian communities; if cooling pond is “created”, water must still be drawn from existing water budgets which do not adequately account for fish and wildlife needs Coal fired plants are also a source of evaporative loss from the water system – towers and open ponds Mercury releases (citation? How does this adversely affect which SGCN?)
Biofuels	Row Crop (primarily corn for ethanol), Switchgrass, other Herbaceous Rangeland, existing cropland, and other open grasslands converted to fast production, monotypic biofuel production	Loss of native prairie and rangelands which provide habitats for insects, grassland birds, small mammals, reptiles, and the animals, like shrikes and hawks, that feed on them Because these crops are not food sources, chemicals used for pest and weed control and fast growth fertilizers can be used; stormwater or irrigation runoff or overspray into adjacent wildlands from these applications are potentially hazardous to native habitats and in particular native insects.
Transmission	New development and expansion of existing lines/corridors construction of new power infrastructure corridors to meet urban user needs, maintenance and operations maintaining clear right-of-way for vehicle clearance/access, prevention of line and tower danger	Broad, long, linear fragmentation of all habitat types. During route selection, environmental considerations are given secondary consideration to agricultural and developed areas. Contributes to edge through interior habitats (woodlands, forest) in the same way that oil/gas pipelines and road networks for wind generation sites, causing potential for greater predator and invasive species access. While some of these facilities are compatible with grassland and prairie communities in this ecoregion (few species have aversion to tall structures in this region, unlike High Plains or Coastal Prairies), these pathways are not required to reclaim or maintain cleared areas with native seed or plant sources. May hinder daily or seasonal movements and behavior for species which avoid open areas adjacent to remaining woodlands. Transmission lines can be strike hazards for Whooping Cranes and raptors during migration.
Distribution	Development to power grid and retail users: construction of new power infrastructure corridors to meet urban user needs	mowing, trimming (permanent fragmentation, erosion) herbicide application directly takes habitat and species during construction (loss), degrades adjacent habitat (fragmentation), and may hinder movement (daily or seasonal) Migratory bird strikes are more prevalent with distribution facilities than transmission facilities; more careful site selection is important to avoid or minimize impacts when near the coast, along waterways, adjacent to wetlands and throughout the flyway.
Oil and Natural Gas Production and Delivery		
Extraction	Very little occurs in this ecoregion; however, region is crossed with delivery lines (see next)	
Delivery	Pipelines for oil and natural gas delivery cross the area; long, linear cleared swaths through rangelands, native habitats	Similar to electrical transmission lines, communications lines, and transportation corridors, oil and gas pipelines create edge through woodland and bottomland habitats, impact wetlands which are not jurisdictionally protected (isolated bogs, seeps, springs); little to no native reclamation is required. These openings create opportunity for enhanced predator access to interior woodlands, invasive species (many thrive in disturbed sites), and microclimate changes that dry water features.
Lack of Reclamation	reclamation standards vary, requirements limited	Reclamation not required back to NATIVE vegetation (invasive species allowed to colonize or are directly planted for soil stabilization)

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
Mining		
Sand and Gravel - upland and riverine	Occurs in upland sites as well as along and within streams and rivers	http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/gpm01 [need map of sand and gravel mines in TX] lack of reclamation; permitting process does not adequately allow environmental review to require avoidance, minimization or mitigation of impacts to instream and stream-adjacent habitats (riparian, sand hills, and uplands); mining off of water courses do not go through TPWD review for potential natural resources impacts. Not all are required to have stormwater pollution prevention facilities or plans (acreage threshold)
Lignite	Upland sites and drainages affected	loss of vegetation and water resources (dewatering, stream diversion, ponding, wetland fill) during construction and operation over large landscape and long periods of time; complete loss of soil microorganism integrity Environmental review late in process to avoid or minimize impacts, no input into reclamation review or evaluation Reclamation not back to desired ecological conditions (tied to productivity levels in a certain time frame, short, 5-year window for "recovery"), so companies use fast-growing species, not necessarily native seed or plant source materials, usually monotypic instead of diverse natural community
Communications Infrastructure		
Cell and other communication towers	towers need to be limited in height and lit to minimize bird strikes (bird-friendly)	Species impacted by towers include all nocturnal migrants including Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Painted Bunting, Summer Tanager, and other species. In rare instances kills totalling thousands of Longspurs have been found around towers.
Transportation		
road and bridge construction (new)	This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these "boundaries" is particularly relevant. There are several issues, one of which is transportation improvements and new construction	Trans Texas Corridor 35: expansion of IH-35 and creation of new auxillary facilities such as Loop 9 around Dallas, SH-130 around Austin, other surface improvements to existing facilities to widen and upgrade capacity between the Ports of Corpus Christi and Brownsville up to Dallas and Texarkana. Texas Department of Transportation coordinates with TPWD regarding potential natural resources impacts to listed species; however, there is little accommodation for sensitive habitats unless those features are federally protected (federally listed species habitat, critical habitat, jurisdictional wetlands). State-listed species habitats, SGCN, rare communities and the habitats on which they rely are unprotected. The transportation improvements proposed under regional upgrades of existing facilities and new construction may create barriers to fish and wildlife resources' daily and seasonal movements, vectors and opportunities for nonnative species invasions, water quality impacts through stormwater runoff, loss of nonjurisdictional wetlands, and important riparian, bottomland, prairie and savanna habitats that are not protected under regulation. In addition to these larger facilities, local connection transportation projects may also contribute to the same kinds of losses and may require even less coordination regarding environmental impacts from planning to implementation if no federal money is used.
right of way maintenance	maintaining clear right-of-way for vehicle clearance/access, minimizing fire danger, and maintaining driver visibility	mowing, trimming timing (season, frequency) inhibit natural regeneration of prairie plants and don't provide key habitats (tall grass prairie structure, seedheads) at best times of year to accommodate prairie animal and insect needs Most roadside are reseeded after construction with nonnative species or plant materials and regular maintenance activities also provide additional ground disturbance favorable to invasives herbicide application some rare plants are known only from sites in ROW; these are not always adequately protected as staff changes occur, management plans are filed away, information not passed through entire chain of command - needs better communication in some places
Land & Water Mgmt: FARM	See also Water Development section	
Conversion	Cultivation of remaining prairie remnants	Prairie remnants are few, far between and relatively small landscapes. This may be on of the most threatened habitat types in Texas. Conversion is difficult to overcome, even with resources. Aside from the loss of native seed and plant sources, soil horizon disturbance creates unfavorable conditions for some species ever recovering. Chemicals may be latent..
"Clean" and intensive agricultural practices	Little to no field border habitat Herbicide use Intensive haying practices Indiscriminate pesticide use, especially adjacent to or within overspray area of native grasslands, rangelands, woodlands	Agricultural field borders benefit agricultural practices in wind barriers and filtering field runoff; however, they are also very beneficial to SGCN and rare communities (perennial bunchgrasses, woodland and grassland birds, migratory birds, pollinators) by providing cover, seeds and insects Herbicide use reduces herbaceous resources necessary for breeding birds. Pesticides reduce high protein insect forage for grassland birds and affect all insects in the community, including pollinators. Not much is understood about the collapse of certain pollinators. Overspray can decrease or completely wipe out native insect fauna, important pollinators in native grassland and prairie systems Haying practices are commonly detrimental to many SGCN and the rare prairie communities. In the short term, ground-nesting birds are directly impacted through nest destruction or removal of nesting cover during the breeding seasons. In the long term, the historical climax tallgrass community composed of the

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
		big 4 grasses is replaced by low quality habitat and forage. Haying generally starts in early spring to remove cool season grass production. This takes place before offspring are mobile and ground nesting birds have fledged young. Often, the structure necessary to nest is removed before migratory birds arrive or residents initiate nesting activities. Repeated haying takes place throughout the growing season on numerous properties, large and small. Undoubtedly, many pastures are hayed only to retain open space agriculture tax valuation. Haying mines fields of nutrients and often costs more than it yields. Also, repeated haying at the same time every year reduces little bluestem, switchgrass, big bluestem, indiagrass and eastern gamagrass that are required components of prairie wildlife habitat. Haying in the late summer and fall removes herbaceous structure for winter migrants. Thus, thermal and escape cover is unavailable for most overwintering species. That said, some winter migrants (plovers, hawks) find these cleared areas for resting favorable to invaded grasslands, woodlands or riparian areas; so, some may serve a purpose. Overall, however, the bottom line is that over utilization of herbaceous resources through mechanical cutting or non rotational, overstocked grazing has and continues to be a negative factor causing declines of SGCN.
Lack of soil and water management/conservation practices	Chemical-laden (pesticide, herbicide, fertilizer) irrigation water runoff Lack of streamside management zones	Insufficient stormwater controls between agricultural production and waterways (or dry drainages that lead to waterways during rain events) adverse lead to chemical impacts to sensitive aquatic insects, freshwater mussels, riparian invertebrates, freshwater fishes, amphibians, and eventually bay and estuary systems – invertebrates, fishes, and birds. Streamside Management Zones are important buffers between agricultural practices and aquatic impacts, and these riparian areas serve as important habitats in their own right for many forest and woodland dependent SGCN. Riparian and floodplains are frequently cleared for agricultural production because they are relatively flat, have access to water, and soils are productive.
Clearing and loss of important natural sites/habitats	Local surface water development: small impoundments on tributary creeks, streams, springs, seeps to form stock tanks, ponds, private lakes	Similar to reservoir development on mainstem rivers, negative impacts caused by impoundments on creeks and springs are just at a smaller scale: loss of instream habitats, loss of wetlands, loss of riparian habitats and natural floodways. The replacement value – still deeper water for flowing waters, pond for stream – is not ecologically synonymous. This may be more of an issue in the emerging “urban/suburban” areas.
Landowner/land management incentive programs working at cross-purposes	Farm Bill programs not competitive (conservation vs. ethanol) Farm Bill penalty insufficient to deter short term conversion	See <i>Biofuel</i> section Using Farm Bill programs can be one of the best tools to engage private landowners in longterm conservation practices; however, must be market-competitive and contract-savvy to be effective as a conservation tool.
Economy – Farm	Market forces incompatible with natural resources conservation incentives	Recently, small grain crops have been replaced by cotton and corn due to demand and market prices. Relative to many other land uses, row crops are more compatible with managing for grassland birds and could be enhanced more easily than introduced grass pastures or overgrazed pastures. However, low adoption rates for practices and programs that benefit natural resources and SGCN need exist for our area relative to other parts of the Texas and other states, such as Kansas and Nebraska. Farm Bill Conservation Title programs and other landowner conservation incentive programs are not competitive, monetarily, with values gained from other land uses.
Land & Water Mgmt: RANCH	See also Water Development section	
Incompatible stocking practices	In some areas, working lands are still recovering from historic uses, out-of-date stocking and grazing practices (prior to soil, native vegetation, and water conservation knowledge we have today) on the advice of county tax appraisers rather than range scientists or ecologists historic and/or current range-intensive livestock operations “continuous” even if rotational; out of sync with land capacity landowners may not be aware of potential benefits of wildlife valuation for recovery, rest, or native habitat conversion non-native hoofstock for hunting operations	Promotes conversion of native grassland to non-native (Bermuda, other sod-forming grasses) Intensive grazing degrades native plant communities and contributes to the need to supplemental feed livestock, which then introduces exotic seedstock into remaining native plant communities Concentrated supplemental feeding of livestock herds attract large numbers of brown-headed cowbirds which are parasitic nesters to a number of SGCN birds. Livestock can be one of the best tools for wildlife management on native grasslands. Native prairie under long-term conservation easements often lacks the proper disturbance regimes necessary to produce suitable habitat conditions for resident and migratory wildlife. In the absence of grazing, habitat structure, namely bare ground, is largely unavailable on highly productive blackland soil types. Grazing increases bare ground foraging and traveling habitat. Also, sunlight reaching bare mineral soil will promote annual forb production released from perennial canopy cover competition. However, grazing can be a double-edge sword when managing for wildlife. Many ranches with cattle operations are utilizing non rotational, year-round livestock grazing. Additionally, stocking rates are often above the carrying capacity of the land. Therefore, the most palatable grasses (i.e. Indiagrass, little bluestem, big bluestem) decrease and are replaced by increasers that do not provide equitable wildlife habitat. Tallgrass communities will transition to a midgrass-dominated community under the stresses of improper grazing management. The first species to decrease in dominance will be the most palatable and/or least grazing tolerant grasses and forbs (e.g. switchgrass, Indiagrass, big bluestem, and Engelmann’s daisy). These species that decrease under this grazing regime provide required habitat for grassland wildlife. As improper grazing management continues, little bluestem will decrease and midgrasses such as silver bluestem and sideoats grama will increase in composition. Stocking rates are generally 3 times higher than what is recommended. Subsequently, herbaceous species composition, diversity and structure become inadequate for productive wildlife habitat. Tall bunchgrasses are eliminated under this scenario and this lack of suitable nesting cover is the one of the most ubiquitous limiting factors in grassland bird production across the blackland prairie. Rotational grazing systems are more sustainable for forage production and wildlife populations. Properly implemented rotational grazing creates structural and floral diversity relative to year round grazing and allows rangelands to rest, mimicking historical patterns of disturbance. The bottom line is that over utilization of herbaceous resources through mechanical

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
		cutting or non rotational, overstocked grazing has and continues to be a negative factor causing declines of SGCN.
Landowner/land management incentive programs working at cross-purposes	single-objective management such as all-game, all-livestock, all-recreation incentive programs, technical guidance, and management assistance "menu" is pre-limited for the landowner in the first contact, landowner should be able to choose from a full menu of land and water management options Landowners do not have a one-stop shop to choose best management practices for their site, for their goals	single species or single habitat type management; e.g. grasslands instead of mosaic and patchy habitat values, productivity vs. diversity? Ranching with associated livestock grazing can be beneficial to SGCN. Many variables effect the pros and cons of each ranching operation. Need site-specific assessment and recommendations which include a community-approach to fish and wildlife resource management, including SGCN and rare communities in management plans Recommendations for pasture improvements include nonnative grasses, could better improve all habitat values with recommendations for native seed mixes and plant materials, appropriate rotational grazing and haying cycles Streamside Management Zones (riparian conservation, riparian BMPs) need to be a priority in landowner incentive programs
Clearing and loss of important natural sites/habitats	conversion of native grasslands to nonnative "improved" pastures riparian and floodplain clearing for livestock watering access Small impoundments on tributary creeks, streams, springs, seeps to form stock tanks, ponds, private lakes.	Impoundments: similar to reservoir development on mainstem rivers, negative impacts caused by impoundments on creeks and springs are just at a smaller scale: loss of instream habitats, loss of wetlands, loss of riparian habitats and natural floodways. The replacement value – still deeper water for flowing waters, pond for stream – is not ecologically synonymous. This may be more of an issue in the emerging "urban/suburban" areas.
Lack of soil management and conservation practices	lack of soil conservation (vegetation conservation/restoration) along stream courses (Streamside Management Zones, Streamside Best Management Practices/Buffers) Overgrazing (see above) "Clean Pastures"	Hydrology and streamside vegetation are altered, soil and vegetation is lost in upland areas, water quality is degraded through sediment-laden runoff; dealing with historical and contemporary issues, need, in some instances, different approaches for recovery/restoration Similar to clean farming, clean pastures are a widespread problem for species with long term population declines. This practice looks as if all tall grasses, beneficial bunchgrasses, and every woody species which could provide cover have been removed. Desired ecological condition, even in prairies, has dense diverse woody species in the drainages and deeper swales. A mixture of woody brush, vines, and trees along fencerows, drainages, and scattered around fields is paramount for many SGCN. Streamside management zones, retaining riparian forest, are often not a consideration within cattle and hay pastures. Scattered woody growth provides escape cover, thermal cover, loafing areas, nesting substrates, foraging areas, and display areas for SGCN. Increased structural diversity equals increased wildlife species diversity or a higher return of species per unit area. In times of drought, woody cover may be the only structure available.
Subdivision of larger lands into smaller parcels ("ranchettes")	Ownership changes in values, approaches to management (not always a detriment to conservation practices) Subdivided lands create many more land management philosophies, approaches in one area	While not all land subdivision is necessarily a negative event for conservation, subdivision typically brings with it very diverse land ownership styles and objectives, increased potential for feral animal and escaped non-native landscaping, additional surface and groundwater demands on regional resources, and loss of habitat for homesite development and "ponds" Landowners bring their vision of manicured and "tamed" landscaping to suburban and rural areas, overcutting native prairie, removing brush and woodlands from drainages, clearing fencelines, and installing turf grasses. Typically, these sites also apply fertilizers and herbicides at unspecified rates, causing issues in riparian areas and aquatic habitats from runoff. Forage production is not a consideration in these locations. Most of these sites are too small to qualify for technical assistance or landowner incentives. Outreach, technical guidance and incentive programs have a more difficult time serving this constituency because the effort and resources required are multiplied, but no more service resources (people, time, money) are available. Additionally, it is difficult to provide conservation services that are of value to the ecological needs of the area with many fractured landscapes and objectives. Some tools (e.g. RX fire) and incentive programs are not available for use at smaller scales or cannot be effective to improve conservation values.
Fire suppression and lack of or inappropriate application of Rx fire	reduced or no efficacy of applied fire - scale of application does not match ecological need	Native prairie plant and wildlife species are adapted to periodic fire disturbance and its effects are necessary to create the habitat requirements of many species. During a small window of time, prairies are often invaded by woody shrubs, leading to further changes in water infiltration, herbaceous cover, and erosion. Additionally, annual wildflower and grass species' production is often lost without disturbance due to dense, matted perennial herbaceous cover and ground litter. Furthermore, habitat suitability for many prairie-dependent wildlife species will significantly decline because they rely on disturbance to create their habitat requirements. Fire can increase plant diversity, create weedy areas for upland birds and ungulates, maintain wildlife cover requirements (i.e. nest, escape, brood, fawn, and thermal), produce nutritious regrowth for ungulates, enhance structural diversity, maintain or set back successional stages, increase forbs, alter insect type and abundance, prevent woody invasion, alter the distribution of ungulates, reduce the risk of wildfire, increase nutrient cycling and microbial activity, improve forage characteristics for grazers, browsers and foragers. The lack of fire and excessive grazing during drought has resulted in mesquite and juniper encroachment in many areas.
Land & Water Mgmt: Municipal	See also Water Development section	This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these "boundaries" is particularly relevant.
"Park" land management	Opens space, park lands, water quality lands, Habitat Conservation Plan preserves and set asides, and recreation lands within or	All of these greenspaces within an urban context may have potential to function as stepping stones (woodland mottes) or pathways (riparian areas) during migration; additionally, some of the larger spaces could function as connections between/among natural landscapes outside of the city limits, demonstration

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
	adjacent to urban areas have unique management challenges.	areas to connect urban populations with natural area conservation concepts (what prairie is, how we impact it, how it serves that particular population with ecological services, particular regional conservation actions that would benefit specific habitat, species, communities).
Lack of Zoning and Planning Sprawl and Conversion	Throughout this and adjacent ecoregions, urban expansion, sprawl, and suburban development into the outlying counties to escape city jurisdictions is an evergrowing issue. Most of this area is part of many of the emerging communities, identified in the Texas State Forest Resources Strategy	<p>Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Councils of Government, Regional Transportation authorities, and other planning entities which encompass emerging and outlying communities rarely consider fish and wildlife resources, rare communities and habitats as part of their constraints process. Additionally, more of a burden is placed on county resources to deal with environmental issues outside of city jurisdictions in many of these areas; however counties rarely have such authority to require stormwater pollution prevention, flood control projects, appropriate road development, conservation of nonjurisdictional wetlands, open space planning, or water or other conservation measures from developers. And, even those authorities which have this ability rarely use it during planning processes to set aside, plan around, or plan to mitigate for areas important to fish and wildlife resources – floodplains and riparian areas (intact and those with restoration potential), prairies and other grasslands, wetlands of all kinds.</p> <p>Urban sprawl, bedroom communities, suburban commuter communities all continue to contribute to prairie loss, woodland clearing, filling non-jurisdictional wetlands, and degradation of instream and stream-adjacent habitats from water quality and quantity impacts. This is not just an issue for fish and wildlife resources, but also for prime farmland and rangeland in these areas.</p> <p>From 1982 to 1997, the conversion of rural land to urban use in Texas was reported to exceed 2.6 million acres. Prior to urban development, these lands had wildlife habitat management and restoration potential. Zoning current agricultural or ranching lands for future commercial or municipal use removes the opportunity to restore these lands to functional habitats and contributes to their disconnection/fragmentation.</p>
Water Demands	Dallas – Fort Worth and emerging areas (Tyler, Temple, Waco) San Antonio and emerging areas Houston	<p>These growing metropolitan areas and their outlying emerging communities continue to seek water resources outside of their basins: reservoir development, interbasin transfers, groundwater development and pipelines. Water costs are related to what ratepayers will pay and not related to the water development impacts – mitigation for resource loss under reservoirs, to groundwater, and to estuaries, is insufficient and rates do not replace ecological values.</p> <p>More locally, residential areas are planting introduced grasses and using high volumes of water to irrigate their yards. Water usage rates should have incremental cost increases to curb waste of water resources.</p> <p>See also the WATER sections in this document and in the Statewide handbook</p>
Land & Water Mgmt: Conservation & Recreation		
Restoration Barriers	Lack of locally adapted seed/cultivar sources	Lack of native seed and plant material sources for blackland prairie restoration within the savanna: species adapted to low pH sandier soils need to be made available commercially at affordable prices (e.g. broomsedge where forage is not a consideration, as it is the backbone of good quail and grassland bird habitat in the southeast); species such as splitbeard bluestem, pinehill bluestem or cultivars of the big 4 prairie grasses that are adapted to local ecotypes need to be collected and increased at plant material centers.
Inadequate/Inappropriate Management	Prescribed fire	<p>This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these “boundaries” is particularly relevant. There are several issues, one of which is the difficulty in applying prescribed fire in urban-wildland interface or recreation areas for prairie restoration</p> <p>Unlike farming or ranching lands, many conservation lands lack active management. For example, lands enrolled in CRP within the blackland prairie are not burned, grazed, disked, or shredded following BMPs. This lack of disturbance lowers the quality and suitability of the habitat for wildlife.</p> <p>Regional conservation service providers do not have enough RX fire certified leaders and teams to provide this as a landowner incentive service, even if the demand could be enhanced</p>
Inappropriate Recreational Uses	ORV use in sensitive areas (stream beds, wet soils of all types, drainages)	Water quality degradation, instream habitat loss (substrates disrupted or lost), riparian loss, slope vegetation loss or impact, human disturbance in nesting or roosting areas
Paucity of Conservation Lands	Lack of conservation lands – public or private – for certain habitat types at a meaningful scale, longterm	In this ecoregion, and in the East Central Texas Plains (Post Oak Savanna) adjacent, lack of lands managed for conservation of key habitat types – tall grass prairie, riparian corridors and bottomland hardwoods, wetlands with rare communities – at scale/duration that is meaningful for longterm sustainability and resiliency of these community types
Not all "public" or "managed" lands are "conservation" lands	Recreation at cross purposes with conservation needs	While most public lands in this region are managed for recreation compatible with wildlife and fisheries resources, some improvements could be made to trails and recreation facilities to prevent soil erosion and water quality impacts, vegetation loss (especially near water resources), reduce human disturbance in roosting or breeding areas
Lack of long-range conservation planning and cohesive land conservation/management	Lack of ecological connectivity between/among existing public and private conservation lands: land and water trusts, NGO preserves and conservation easements, Habitat Conservation Plan lands,	While fee-title or easement protections “fenceline to fenceline” are not necessarily needed in this region, largescale conservation benefits could be realized by mapping existing conservation lands and practices, reviewing opportunities to share resources and improve land management through shared guidance, and identifying landowners and sites which could benefit landscape and conservation management connectivity in the long term through landowner incentive

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
strategies in each ecoregion	wildlife managed lands for conservation, parks and wildlife management areas	programs – riparian, prairie.
Water Development, Management and Distribution	SEE ALSO STATEWIDE HANDBOOK – connectivity between surface and groundwater issues	
Surface Water Planning	Natural resources not well-defined or required as a "constraint" in Regional Water Planning (RWP) processes	<p>This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these “boundaries” is particularly relevant. There are several issues, one of which is surface water demand, use, development and distribution – all addressed through various water planning processes.</p> <p>Natural resource professionals, both terrestrial and aquatic, need to be consistently involved in RWP processes</p> <p>Large municipalities' demands in this region are affecting surface and groundwater development outside of the region/basin</p> <p>TMDL recommendations need to consider fish and wildlife resources needs as well</p> <p>Instream flow recommendations need to be stepped out from headwaters to estuaries to influence regional water planning processes</p> <p>Overallocation/dewatering and damming of region's principle rivers</p>
Reservoir Construction and Operation	<p>At least five large reservoir sites in this region in the 2007 State Water Plan, all on important regional resource streams; creation of new and modification (expansion) of existing reservoirs</p> <p>Invasive species</p> <p>Shoreline development - vegetation removal for viewshed, recreational access; hardening and armoring banks</p> <p>Timing/Periodicity/Intensity of Water Releases releases are unnaturally intense, in the "wrong" season to mimic natural flooding processes, and change water chemistry and sediment load in all areas downstream, to the estuaries</p>	<p>See also Statewide Handbook for this issue</p> <p>Unnatural hydrograph scours instream and stream-adjacent habitats, shifts vegetation communities out of sync with other riparian communities where flooding is more "natural", vegetation communities and instream animal (invert, fishes, etc.) cannot "rely" on the seasonal changes under which they evolved.</p>
Flood Control	Changes to natural stream courses to block or convey floodwaters	Levees, bank armoring, culverts all remove instream and stream adjacent habitats, contribute to unnatural sediment and nutrient loading downstream and to estuaries
Groundwater Planning and Distribution	<p>Not all aquifers in the region are addressed by current groundwater conservation districts; in those, the rule of first capture is the “management plan”</p> <p>Groundwater districts in this region are political subdivisions, not aligned necessarily with aquifer boundaries</p> <p>Extraction: groundwater pumping without full accounting for natural resources as a "use"</p>	<p>This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these “boundaries” is particularly relevant. There are several issues, one of which is groundwater demand, use, development and distribution – all addressed through various water planning processes.</p> <p>Aquifers continue to drop and several segments are unmanaged. Groundwater conservation districts would allow management for conservation, preservation, recharging, and prevention of waste of groundwater resources. SGCN and rare communities needs are not addressed in most groundwater management planning efforts. SEE STATEWIDE HANDBOOK FOR MORE DISCUSSION/ACTIONS.</p> <p>Subirrigated, instream and stream-adjacent and isolated habitats which rely on groundwater are adversely affected by dry conditions, some of which are permanently impacted after drought periods; overpumping lowers water table and and changes instream and wetland conditions such as temperature, oxygen availability, and other nutrient and chemical factors on which aquatic life relies</p> <p>In some instances, a significantly low water level can decrease and degrade aquifer recharge capacity ("drying out the sponge " at certain levels within the aquifer can affect the flow quantity and quality into the aquifer from recharge events)</p>
Other Water Source Developments and Technologies	<p>Interbasin Transfers (Surface and Groundwater)</p> <p>Reuse</p> <p>Water Treatment Wetlands</p>	<p>Interbasin transfers are a significant concern with several of the large urban areas in Texas seeking water outside of their basins. What is the impact to SGCN?</p> <p>Water Reuse reduces available water at any particular time (needs to account for instream flows) and can change the chemistry (temperature, oxygen, and other characteristics) from the discharge.</p> <p>While a useful tool and potentially a benefit to some wildlife and fish resources, Water Treatment Wetlands are not typically managed as natural systems (e.g. vegetation homogenous, not natural habitats for local wetland dependent SGCN)</p>
Lack of Information & Resources	One response stated this is an issue, but did not provide additional information	

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
Many SGCN in this region lack updated status or any information from which to determine status, recovery, or management	Without full accounting of species distributions, habitat needs, and range, it is difficult to make accurate management recommendations, apply landowner incentive programs for best conservation benefit	<p><i>Information and Research Needs by SGCN – SEE ACTION SECTION</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Black Bear</i> see Black Bear Management Plan 2005-2015 (need citation or website) ▪ <i>Rafinesque’s big-eared bat</i> and <i>Southeastern myotis</i>– determine potential for new roost locations ▪ <i>Eastern spotted skunk</i> – survey to determine status ▪ <i>Houston Toad</i> – survey in historic range ▪ <i>Texas Horned Lizards</i> – identify areas of suitable habitat and survey to determine status in these areas; coordinate with RIFA evaluation/survey to determine impact ▪ <i>Amphibian and Reptiles</i>: need status update on all of these, including Timber Rattlesnake, Alligator Snapping Turtle, Softshell turtles. ▪ <i>eastern gamagrass-switchgrass-yellow Indiangrass-Maximilian sunflower (G1/G2) and little bluestem-Indiangrass-big bluestem (G1/G2) prairie types</i> – survey and revisit database accounts to ensure data is relevant and up to date. ▪ <i>Painted Bunting, Scissor-tailed Flycatcher</i> – large % of global breeding population, need to identify and publish Best Management Practices; also evaluate STF use of urban areas (sink populations? Reasons for expansion into these areas? Management needs?) ▪ <i>Bachman’s Sparrow</i> –Increase survey efforts along western edge of range to identify boundary and suitable occupied habitat, such as within Red River County ▪ <i>Freshwater Mussels</i> – Continue documentation of distribution and status for all SGCN mussels, identify areas where most impacted and by what, craft management plans
Lack of Processing Existing Data	Where census, survey, records and collections are documented, this information is frequently not forwarded to centralized collection databases (Texas Natural Diversity Database, Texas Natural History Database, Texas Fishes databases) OR if it is forwarded to these entities, there are inadequate staff or other resources to enter the data in a timely way.	<p>Species and rare communities information is key to be able to detect trends and causes for upward or downward shifts.</p> <p>Without this information, it is difficult to focus or prioritize management objectives or share information with private landowners about the importance of some sites, populations or communities. Sharing this information with landowners is crucial as most of Texas is privately owned and conservation must occur with their stewardship help.</p> <p>If we don’t know where important priorities lie, we cannot effectively use the resources we have to reverse downward trends, recover and delist species, and ensure that we are making conservation progress.</p>
Best Management Practices	Best Management Practices need to be regularly reviewed and updated; more effectively distributed to targeted audiences who can implement them in crucial areas	In this region, primarily riparian and streamside buffer zones, wetland and wetsoil, and stormwater pollution prevention BMPs need review and distribution
Urban information about natural resources benefits	This ecoregion intersects three of the five most populous metropolitan areas in Texas. Urban/suburban impacts to conservation activities and natural resources even outside of these “boundaries” is particularly relevant. Outreach and education efforts in some instances are not targeted to particular urban audiences to <u>effectively</u> make a difference in regional conservation issues.	<p>See also Land and Water Management – Municipal and Actions proposed for Urban Planning efforts.</p> <p>Urban audiences in this region need specific programs about the value and natural heritage of native prairies and grasslands, drainages and floodplains, aquifers and surface water quality and quantity, stormwater pollution prevention, and impacts outside of this region’s water planning efforts on other areas (“walk a mile in their shoes”).</p>
Inadequate Policies, Rules, Enforcement		
Voluntary Mitigation	Little guidance or incentive exists for voluntary mitigation of important, unregulated resources	Prairies, isolated wetlands, riparian zones and drainages do not require mitigation in most instances; however, these are crucial habitats to SGCN and rare communities in this region. Guidelines and encouragement to use them are needed in advance planning stages of all development projects.
Ineffectual Mitigation	Mitigation can be haphazard and an afterthought, rather than part of the advance planning process	Piecemeal mitigation and mitigation after development has made impacts is ineffectual for ecological restitution. It would be helpful to have large areas identified where mitigation dollars would best be spent to offset particular types of impacts in the region: wetlands, water diversions, prairie loss, riparian loss. A network of potential areas in a north-south trajectory in the region may be most helpful to create “stepping stone” prairie connectivity, but sites should be large enough to function sustainably. Mitigation banking could be another type of landowner incentive.
Wildlife Tax Valuation	Lack of regionally specific guidance template	A continuing trend is the growing number of new to the land, absentee landowners purchasing small acreage for recreation within the blackland prairie ecoregion. Many of the landowners are converting from primarily Ag use under the 1-D-1 Open Space Tax Valuation to primarily Wildlife Use. Requirements for converting to Wildlife Tax Valuation include the implementation of a wildlife management plan that includes at least 3 out of 7 management practices. TPWD endorsed regionally specific guidance would be helpful as a starting point. The department should consider developing Wildlife Tax Valuation plans tailored to each ecoregion’s priority actions.

General Issue	Ecoregion Issue Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)	Description of Adverse Effects Identified in Workshops (2010) and Surveys (2011)
Non-jurisdictional Wetlands	Loss of and impact to "non-jurisdictional" wetlands and jurisdictional wetlands on non-federal, non-state lands and projects (lack of awareness, no regulatory nexus or enforcement opportunity for protection on these sites)	private lake/stock pond construction, control structures, fill and conversion for agriculture and other development, mining: bogs, seeps, marshes, forested wetlands, and other intermittent and perennial waterways affected;
Sand and gravel mining	Lack of stormwater pollution prevention Lack of reclamation	lack of reclamation; permitting process does not adequately allow environmental review to require avoidance, minimization or mitigation of impacts to instream and stream-adjacent habitats (riparian, sand hills, and uplands); mining off of water courses do not go through TPWD review for potential natural resources impacts. Not all are required to have stormwater pollution prevention facilities or plans (acreage threshold)
Lignite and other surface mining in the region	Lack of Reclamation appropriate to the desired ecological condition of the site	lack of reclamation or reclamation that does not require native seed and plant materials in context with desired ecological condition; permitting process does not adequately allow environmental review to require avoidance, minimization or mitigation of impacts to instream and stream-adjacent habitats (riparian, sand hills, and uplands); Not all are required to have stormwater pollution prevention facilities or plans (acreage threshold)
Other Cross-Cutting Issues		
	Climate Change isolated habitats are more at risk than others: wetlands, prairie grasslands Riparian habitats and instream habitats may also be at risk	See CLIMATE CHANGE SECTION in Statewide handbook Climate change models, GIS analysis of land conversion and change overtime, species specific information, community-specific information all needed
	Economics Working Lands	See Statewide Handbook for more discussion on this issue Landowner incentives cannot compete currently with market forces; market forces in some areas do not support large acreage ownership without intensive use

CONSERVATION ACTIONS

“Like the resource it seeks to protect, wildlife conservation must be dynamic, changing as conditions change, seeking always to become more effective.” – Rachel Carson

To make conservation progress, we need to work with the information we have, document our progress, share lessons learned, and adapt our approach when necessary. Conservation actions in this handbook are aimed at reducing the negative effects of issues that affect SGCN, rare communities and their habitats at various scales. [Broad actions categories](#) are defined to help organize handbooks. For information about how the Actions framework was developed and for definitions of Action categories, see the *Overview Handbook*.⁴

Actions proposed for the TBPR Ecoregion ([Table __](#)) state what we need to work on, where, and why (what problem we can solve with that action). Actions lay out how that work contributes to a specific desired effect –progress and success.

It is important to acknowledge that one conservation action typically does not solve one conservation problem. There may be several actions employed over time to achieve a conservation goal. In some instances, defining the conservation goal *is* the action – for some things, we don’t yet know enough to define what successful conservation looks like for that SGCN population, rare community, or habitat.

It has become increasingly important to determine if the work we do is actually leading to the overall conservation outcomes we desire – **restoration, recovery, sustainability, and resiliency**. As conservation practitioners, we can use milestones (or intermediate results) and reporting to communicate our progress and leverage future conservation action, partnerships, policy changes, and funding.

From [project inception, well-crafted monitoring and evaluation](#) (cost effective, answers key questions) informs management and allows conservation practitioners to “course-correct” as necessary for effective conservation (CMP 2007, Salzer and Salafsky 2006). With the need for Action Plans to take advantage of several “pots of conservation money,” the people we serve and those who govern private and public conservation funds demand reporting, transparency, and *demonstration* that projects are *positively impacting the conservation of species and habitats*. To get beyond reporting that money was spent and projects were done, AFWA TWW convened a committee in 2009 to craft “effectiveness measures” for the conservation actions across all Plans. A [toolkit for classifying and measuring conservation action effectiveness](#) was produced in 2011, approved by AFWA TWW Executive Committee comprised of state fish and wildlife agency directors and others. These measures will be an important part of moving the plans and conservation forward.

With this revision, the TCAP becomes more involved in a national movement to track conservation actions and progress across local, state, regional and national levels. As with the 2005 Plan, actions presented in this edition vary in detail, scale, and duration; however, this edition encourages the use of the incremental measures of success for conservation projects’ development, implementation, and tracking. To that end, the toolkit in [Measuring the Effectiveness of State Wildlife Grants](#) (AFWA TWW, 2011) is **strongly recommended** to define projects, target audiences and partners, identify desired step-wise intermediate results, and collect the “right” data to report our conservation achievements.

⁴ The category “*Data Collection, Analysis, and Management*” meets Action Plan Required Element 3 – “priority research and survey”. Many of the proposed actions include a monitoring component (Action Plan Required Element 5).

Table 7. TBPR Conservation Actions

Note: Table is formatted 11" x 17", landscape orientation – SEE ALL OF THE [EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES](#) FOR EACH OF THE OVERALL ACTIONS TO ESTABLISH FINER DETAIL IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Surface water management is a key issue in this ecoregion, which covers many municipalities and watersheds, feeding many of our coastal estuaries. Identify a coalition or natural resources advisory group of terrestrial and aquatic ecologists across natural resources management entities for the ecoregion by basin. Craft SPECIFIC recommendations based on available science and regionally specific information about terrestrial and aquatic concerns, instream flow needs for fish and wildlife (including estuarine health), sensitive and unique areas to avoid reservoir development, opportunities for water quality improvement (see TMDL recommendation) to conserve SGCN and rare communities and priority habitats related to surface water management. Support the conversion or transfer of existing unused water rights to the Texas Water Trust to protect instream uses. Develop a means to aid in funding the transfer of unused water rights to TWT. Study current water use and rates paid in large urban areas, versus the cost of longterm ecological loss from reservoirs or other water development projects. Convey the findings to regional surface water planning groups and make recommendations for changes to accommodate realistic mitigation. Additional recommendations for accurate and complete water accounting would be useful for all planning processes. Given small budgets for time and travel, elect a spokesperson (or rotating spokesperson) to attend and participate in Regional Surface Water Planning meetings and convey the group's recommendations.</p>											
<p>Groundwater management is a key issue in this ecoregion, which covers many municipalities and watersheds, related to surface waters which contribute to our coastal estuaries.</p> <p>Support the establishment of groundwater conservation district(s) that align most closely with the aquifer boundaries and use areas in and out of these basins to support management for conservation, preservation, recharging, and prevention of waste of groundwater resources.</p> <p>Identify a coalition or natural resources advisory group of terrestrial and aquatic ecologists across natural resources management entities for the ecoregion by aquifer. Craft SPECIFIC recommendations based on available science and regionally specific information about terrestrial and aquatic concerns, groundwater-surface water connection for instream flow needs for fish and wildlife (including estuarine health), sensitive and unique areas which may be adversely affected by groundwater withdrawals to conserve SGCN and rare communities and priority habitats related to groundwater management. Additional recommendations for accurate and complete water accounting would be useful for all planning processes. Given small budgets for time and travel, elect a spokesperson (or rotating spokesperson) to attend and participate in Regional Surface Water Planning meetings and convey the group's recommendations. Evaluate the effectiveness of this activity and share lessons learned in other regions which could benefit from this experience..</p>											
<p>Work with Texas land trusts and other public and private lands partners (e.g. North Texas Prairie Coalition) to identify blackland prairie priority conservation areas for</p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>long-term rotating and/or perpetual conservation that have high native prairie species diversity, are large functional blocks which could be networked for system function, could serve as a seed source for local restoration projects, are adjacent to existing managed conservation lands (e.g. The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) Clymer Meadow Preserve, TNC's Tridens Prairie, TPWD's Cooper WMA, TNC's Mathews Prairie, City of Paris' Gambill's Goose Refuge, Peters Prairie in Collin County, Lehman's Prairie, Wieting Prairie, Drews Prairie, TNC Lindhart Prairie, Camp Maxey, Simpson Prairie, or Smiley-Woodfin). Restoration sites on agricultural lands need to be identified and networked to existing conservation lands to enhance the sustainability of the restoration and the resiliency of the intact prairies. Given the regional growth and pace of development, conservation easements need to be high priority; area from Camp Maxey alongside the western edge of Paris and traveling east toward the TNC Clymer Meadow Preserve as a priority for conservation because many remnants already under conservation are present and use by SGCN birds is documented.</p> <p>High priority bird species conservation goals using Oaks and Prairies BCR information on current population estimates, percent global population, research on area sensitivity or acreage required for minimum viable populations, daily metabolic requirements for breeding and wintering species, ranges of seed/insect (kilocalorie etc.) production per acre made available from various prairie types, generation of grassland bird use days (similar to duck use days), land use changes over time, and population trend data is our best first estimate for a conservation acreage target; starting point: 240,000 acres per year for the next 10 years).</p> <p>Regional conservation targets: eastern gamagrass-switchgrass-yellow Indiangrass-Maximilian sunflower (G1/G2) and little bluestem-Indiangrass-big bluestem (G1/G2) prairie types, which would support Eastern Meadowlark (High, G5,S5), Henslow's Sparrow (High, G4, S2/3), Northern Bobwhite (High, G5, S4), Northern Harrier (High, G5,S4), Loggerhead shrike (Medium G5,S4), Painted Bunting (Medium G5, S4), Dickcissel (Low, G5, S4), Grasshopper Sparrow (Low, G5, S3), Lark Sparrow (Low, G5, S4), Scissor-tailed Flycatcher (Low, G5, S3), Sedge Wren (Low, G5, S4), Bachman's Sparrow (High, G3, S3), Field Sparrow (Low, G5, S5), Cassin's Sparrow (Medium, G5, S4), Rufous-crowned Sparrow (Low, G5, S4), Bell's vireo (Low, G5, S3), Black-capped Vireo (High, G2G3, S2, FE, SE), Bewick's Wren (Medium, G5, S5), Eastern Spotted Skunk (Medium, G4T, S4), Texas Horned Lizard (High, G4, S4, ST), Western Slender Glass Lizard, and Ornate Box Turtle (High, G5,S5).</p> <p>Another criteria may be for geographical locations within 1 hour of urban hours so they could serve as locations for education, outreach or demonstration. See urban recommendations.</p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Conservation practice providers need to identify a suite of native plant species for each priority habitat type which can be promoted with one voice to plant materials centers and commercial distributors. Engage Master Naturalists, Native Plants Society of Texas, Native Prairies Association, land trust and NGO volunteers in coordinated/targeted seed and material collection. Assess success of these programs and the use and success of the materials over time to determine if this is an effective approach or whether on-site or nearby collection on a project-by-project basis is more effective (conservation and costs).</p>											
<p>Conservation assistance programs (Farm Bill Conservation Title, USFWS Partners Program, Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, TPWD Landowner Incentive Program) to private landowners are one of our best tools to engage working lands, active stewardship, and best practices for SGCN and rare communities improvement and resiliency. Some criteria and/or targeted actions are recommended in this region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve agricultural field borders and farming practices to benefit grassland wildlife, soil and water resources – retain perennial bunchgrasses, forbs and woody fencerows; ▪ reduce “clean farming” and “clean pasture” practices with alternative management to benefit migratory birds and pollinators, retain fallow areas, islands and edges of native vegetation; ▪ encourage (or require if receiving state or federal funds) streamside management zones ▪ where adjacent to natural areas or native prairie, provide technical guidance on less toxic methods to control pests, weeds ▪ incorporate SGCN fish and wildlife habitat values and recommendations in rotational grazing system recommendations (Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative) ▪ Work with NRCS to locate CRP and CP-33 cooperators that are due for mid-management practices to which could be identified for dove leases <p>See recommendation about market analysis</p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Form multi-partner working group(s) to establish scientifically sound best management practices for prescribed fire application for the ecoregion (timing/season, period/duration, intensity, parameters for RX) for the restoration of prairie grasslands</p> <p>Work with Rx fire technical experts and SGCN/rare communities experts to identify concerns, barriers, and solutions. Explore the barriers to applying this tool on private lands and make recommendations to overcome these barriers (policy? Targeted outreach? Technical workshops? Where are the most important areas, audiences?).</p> <p>Review existing successful practices: The Western Navarro County Bobwhite Quail Restoration Initiative and Red River County Eastern Turkey Coop are both models for deployment of a fire initiative within the blackland prairie. Landowners enrolled in programs such as CRP, PUB, EQIP or WHIP that have native prairie habitats would be prime candidates for prescribed burn management. The FWS, NBCI, NRCS, NPAT, TPWD, NWTf, TFS, TNC, and OPJV are organizations tackling this issue within parts of the state. Funding needs to be directed towards this initiative.</p> <p>Identify <u>key</u> SGCN from a variety of taxa and rare communities in the recommendations for monitoring to determine effectiveness of the applied practices. Identify the data repository for this monitoring information so that practitioners can share lessons learned. <i>See note at end of table about conservation effectiveness tracking.</i></p>											
<p>Form multi-partner working group(s) to establish scientifically sound best management practices for chemical/mechanical brush control for the ecoregion and specific watersheds. Work with brush control technical experts and SGCN/rare communities experts to identify concerns, barriers, and solutions. Identify <u>key</u> SGCN from a variety of taxa and rare communities to monitor to determine effectiveness of the applied practices. Identify the data repository for this monitoring information so that practitioners can share lessons learned. <i>See note at end of table about conservation effectiveness tracking.</i></p>											
<p>Form multi-partner working group(s) to establish scientifically sound best management practices for riparian restoration, including timing, water needs, reasonable recommendations for initial planting diversity, ways to encourage full complement of desired ecological condition of community, how to prevent or control specific invasives without negatively impacting restoration, locally sourced seed and plant materials for the ecoregion (and finer scales if needed). Work with riparian restoration technical experts and SGCN/rare communities experts to identify concerns, barriers, and solutions. Identify <u>key</u> SGCN from a variety of taxa and rare communities to monitor to determine effectiveness of the applied practices. Identify the data repository for this monitoring information so that practitioners can share lessons learned. <i>See note at end of table about conservation effectiveness tracking.</i></p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Work with the Native Prairies Association's ongoing current effort to identify scientifically sound best management practices for different types of prairie restoration, including timing, water needs, reasonable recommendations for initial planting diversity, ways to encourage full complement of desired ecological condition of community, how to prevent or control specific invasives without negatively impacting restoration, locally sourced seed and plant materials for the ecoregion (and finer scales if needed). Work with prairie restoration technical experts and SGCN/rare communities experts to identify concerns, barriers, and solutions. Identify <u>key</u> SGCN from a variety of taxa and rare communities to monitor to determine effectiveness of the applied practices. Identify the data repository for this monitoring information so that practitioners can share lessons learned. <i>See note at end of table about conservation effectiveness tracking.</i></p>											
<p>Create a multi-disciplinary ecology committee to identify three to five years of highest priority research projects (actual projects, not just concepts) that can be rolled out to universities and colleges to collect the information most needed at the PRACTICAL level for management and conservation improvement on the ground.</p> <p>Identify the data repository for results so that practice can be shared and lessons learned. <i>See note at end of table about conservation effectiveness tracking.</i></p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Technical Guidance FOR/WITH Conservation Service Providers (Audubon, NRCS, TPWD, TNC, NPAT, NPSOT, FWS, NWTf, OPJV and NBCI) specific to the issues and resources of this region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land conservation tools: conservation easements, fee title, donations, mitigation banking, Safe Harbor, Candidate Conservation Agreements, Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances, stewardship/management incentive programs; include how priorities for action are determined, which are most successful and why, best practices – timelines, documentation, monitoring; lessons learned; and how to measure effectiveness of the tool used. Wildlife Tax Valuation – benefits, best practices to benefit SGCN and priority habitats; barriers to implementation and lessons learned to overcome barriers; monitoring recommendations Landowner Education: how to deliver the best message, what kinds of tools and support landowners expect, how to select and target your audience, levels of response based on type of outreach, how to measure effectiveness and application of the training, costs-benefit analysis, lessons learned. Prescribed Fire: technical training requirements, time, and costs for an effective program; how to develop a program and what partner resources are available; how to engage private landowners in Rx fire application; how to best deal with urban – wildland interface issues (what stakeholders need to be involved); how to generate interest in burn cooperatives to enhance the scale of fire application; lessons learned over time in this region; how to measure effectiveness of Rx Fire application (site specific and programmatically). Brush Management: where appropriate/inappropriate, current state of the science and practice, best tools for certain soils/substrates and brush species, how to develop a program and roll it out to private landowners, potential partners; lessons learned over time in this region; how to measure effectiveness of brush treatment application (site specific and programmatically). Same kinds of training programs for prairie restoration and riparian restoration. See Best Management Practice development recommendation above. <p>Identify a host website to share ecoregional practitioner (not novice, not landowner, but professional) cross-training opportunities for RX fire, stream rehabilitation, reintroductions, brush management, GIS and corridor identification, other ...</p>											
<p>Establish a regional <i>public lands</i> management experience cooperative to identify restoration needs and sites, invasive species removal priorities, trail development and recreation planning improvement, and management practice improvement opportunities. Work together to pursue restoration funding and volunteers to share (e.g. burn teams, burn trailers/equipment, trail teams, riparian restoration teams, go in together on equipment and/or plant materials, schedule) among priority projects to benefit SGCN and rare communities, improve water quality, and provide demonstration areas for public and private landowner outreach. <i>See also public lands management recommendations in the Statewide Handbook.</i></p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Landowner Incentive and Education Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify key areas for the restoration and protection of blackland prairie (e.g. see priority areas for northern bobwhites and other grassland birds have been identified by biologist working in the blackland prairie at http://www.bringbackbobwhites.org/), riparian buffers and streamside management zones, water quality with the greatest potential for longterm ecological desired condition, connectivity to best managed areas, and connectivity in a network of managed lands (public and private) throughout the region (these are areas for your target audiences) Conservation easements – specify management (prescribed burn every 2-3 years, rotational grazing, patch burn grazing, field borders, streamside management zone protection, or share cropping) and monitoring targets/frequency/reporting Prescribed fire or brush management – large sites or cooperatives with willingness to commit to appropriate term management (one burn without followup wastes resources) Management Plans – in addition to landowner objectives, review opportunities for SGCN and rare community habitat conservation; data collection; and monitoring (see effectiveness comments) Riparian Conservation and Restoration – Ecologically Significant Stream Segments to their headwaters, streams and rivers with groundwater interconnectivity, undammed stretches with direct contribution to estuaries Other conservation instruments – Safe Harbor Agreements, Candidate Conservation Agreements, others – to dispel myths about regulatory constraints. Showcase specific studies and examples from the region (or adjacent ecoregions) for better relationship building. Document through conservation practice and partner surveys over the course of three to five years whether the workshops increase opportunities for these tools to be used and the SPECIFIC barriers to their use Urban/suburban landowners – specific programs which can connect urban users of resources to native wildland resource conservation efforts outside of urban areas to maximize conservation benefits; if in schools, create curricula for others to deliver. <p>Monitoring of key species (to be identified) must be a part of these projects. Information about methods, short and longterm success (or failure) need to be shared through conservation networks.</p>											
<p>Many SGCN in this region lack distribution and POPULATION status information; more information and cooperation from private landowners may reduce the risk of listing, enhance recovery options, and contribute to conservation of many sensitive habitats just through awareness and documentation.</p> <p><i>Species-specific needs (several of these may be tied to other actions in this list, review for connectivity)</i></p> <p><i>Black Bear see Black Bear Management Plan 2005-2015 (need citation, website?)</i></p> <p><i>Rafinesque's big-eared bat and Southeastern myotis– continue monitoring roosts and identify new roosts. Support long-term conservation of bottomland hardwoods.</i></p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Increase awareness among forest managers and owners. Promote BMPs for species among stakeholders. Retain large hollow trees, such as blackgum and water tupelos. Identify protect roosts in artificial structures. Support WRP and similar programs. Perform hardwood restoration.</p> <p><i>Eastern spotted skunk</i> – determine status</p> <p><i>Houston Toad</i> – Continue release at suitable sites and monitor survival. Develop BMPs for raise and release. Identify new conservation lands for release. Implement long-term conservation within critical habitat areas. Work with Farm Bill to implement beneficial practices on suitable lands. Continue monitoring known and identify new locations. Survey more private lands. Cooperative efforts.</p> <p><i>Texas Horned Lizards</i> – raise awareness of beneficial native ants. Combat indiscriminate use of pesticides and buildup within ecosystems. Support native prairie restoration and long-term conservation efforts in areas of suitable habitat. Identify existing populations. Identify expansive suitable habitats under conservation for release and on landowner cooperators.</p> <p><i>Amphibian and Reptiles:</i> Survey private landowner cooperators to update data sets and monitor populations.</p> <p><i>Timber Rattlesnake:</i></p> <p>Limit road construction near and within suitable habitats. Utilize strategies similar to black bear and bottomland hardwood bat spp. for habitat conservation. Implement awareness campaign to landowners and public lands in occupied habitat. Limit human related mortality. Increase data gathering.</p> <p><i>Alligator Snapping Turtle</i> – Status determination and key locations. Raise awareness among outdoor users.</p> <p><i>eastern gamagrass-switchgrass-yellow Indiangrass-Maximilian sunflower (G1/G2) and little bluestem-Indiangrass-big bluestem (G1/G2) prairie types</i> – Monitor and update sightings. Revisit database accounts to ensure data is relevant and up to date. Promote long-term conservation. Harvest seeds and utilize for local restorations and/or send to plant materials centers for field trials and increasing production.</p> <p><i>Painted Buntings</i> – large % of global breeding population. I feel that most of breeding habitat has either too much brush or not enough brush. Individuals are found within dense growth along drainages and edges, but appear to prefer diverse woody mottes made of multiple woody vines, shrubs, trees that offer structural diversity from the ground up. A snag for a singing perch in the middle is the cherry on top. Intensive farming and grazing. Pesticide use around ag areas. Increase SMZs within pasturelands.</p> <p><i>Scissor-tailed Flycatcher</i> – large % of global breeding population. I have concern about these birds utilizing commercial and residential lands. I commonly observe individuals foraging around gas stations and other areas where toxins or pesticide use is common. Individuals could be in sink habitats. Pesticide use around ag areas. Increase fencerows, SMZs, scattered brush within pasturelands.</p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p><i>Bachman's Sparrow</i> – short-leaf pine savanna restoration in northeast Texas could increase suitable habitat. Start initiative similar to longleaf alliance. Build off Lennox woods project area. Increase use of prescribed burns on private lands. Increase survey efforts along western edge of range to identify boundary and suitable occupied habitat, such as within Red River County. Promote BMPs within forest management agencies and industries.</p> <p><i>Northern Bobwhite, Dickcissel, Eastern Meadowlark, LeConte's Sparrow, Short-eared Owl, Loggerhead Shrike, Northern Harrier, Swainson's Hawk, Henslows Sparrow</i> – Time is of the essence. Prairie restoration, conservation and mangement. Promote rotational grazing, fallow fields, delay haying on some fields until after breeding season.</p> <p><i>Interior Least Tern</i> – new reservoirs could be engineered to provide small island habitat at varying reservoirs levels. The islands would surface during lower water levels in the summer so that they would be devoid of vegetation.</p> <p><i>Swainson's Warbler, Kentucky Warbler, Louisiana Waterthrush, Prothonotary Warbler</i> – Reduce water consumption in the urban areas that leads to destruction of bottomland hardwoods for reservoir development. Identify high priority conservation areas for bottomland hardwoods. More conservation lands protecting intact bottomland hardwoods are needed in northeast Texas. Promote BMPs for this habitat among agencies and cooperators.</p> <p>Freshwater Mussels – Additional distribution and habitat requirements information are needed to identify instream flow standards, recommendations for water conservation areas, sites to protect from reservoir development, outreach and activities to prevent zebra mussel spread, greater water quality protections in mussel watersheds to prevent pollution and sedimentation</p>											
<p>Climate Change</p> <p>Climate change models and effects on isolated habitats, riparian areas, and springs/groundwater resources</p> <p>Form a working group with adjacent Texas Blackland Prairie and Gulf Coastal Prairies and Marshes aquatic and terrestrial ecologists to identify river rehabilitation goals in/adjacent to undammed stretches below last impoundment to the estuaries to evaluate/implement instream flow recommendations; improve the quality, timing, and seasonality of releases, improve riparian restoration, and increase connectivity to improve resilience to climate</p>											
<p>Determine market values that are driving agricultural conversion (biofuels? crop prices?), livestock production, hunting and other recreation, and land subdivision in this region. Craft a recommendation to landowner incentive program providers that can be used to index conservation practice incentives in ecoregions. Monitor whether this approach was effective to change the conservation program values AND landowner participation in those programs before & after the change.</p>											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
Work with private landowners and conservation partners to minimize feral hog populations through hunting and trapping (aerial shooting is not a good technique in this area given the amount of closed canopy). Provide technical guidance and educational programs about the impact and management of feral hogs to benefit ground nesting birds, small mammals, aquatic species. Evaluate technical guidance programs with effectiveness measures.											
Identify specific areas for TXDOT Districts, county road managers, power delivery providers, and oil/gas pipeline managers to improve right-of way (ROW) restoration and management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Post construction, restore sites with native seed sources and materials ▪ Remove invasive species and restore tallgrasses on existing ROW ▪ Terms of easement need to include native prairie restoration and management (landowner cannot convert these areas to nonnative grasses for grazing) ▪ On roadways, enforce public right of way (prevention of private maintenance, overmowing, clearing) ▪ When mowing along roadways, mow approximately 15 feet from the shoulder within undeveloped areas ▪ In areas beyond 15 feet and on ROW through rural lands (Tlines, distribution lines, pipelines), do not mow between April and October in order to allow ground nesting birds to produce and native prairie plants to seed out.; mow on a 4-year cycle at an 8-inch height (if roadway, both sides of the road are not mowed in the same year, saves significant dollars for mowing costs and reduces accidents). ▪ Provide interpretive signage re these practices and outreach to neighboring properties so this can serve as a demonstration. ▪ Identify monitoring sites which can serve as mitigation as long as information is shared through a public database and conservation practice networks. 											

Conservation Action Editor's Note: There may be many of these actions which appear to duplicate recommendations. This draft is an opportunity to review those actions and hone them into regionally cohesive actions.	Direct Mgmt of Natural Resources	Species Restoration	Creation of New Habitat	Acquisition, Easement, or Lease	Land Use Planning	Training, Technical Assistance	Data Collection, Analysis, Management	Conservation Area Designation	Education, Targeted Outreach	Environm Review	Mgmt Planning
<p>Conservation service providers and ecologists need to engage with urban biologists to convey conservation needs and priorities to urban planning efforts through Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Councils of Government, Regional Transportation Authorities, Parks Boards, Counties, and others in current and emerging urban areas. Every conservation organization cannot attend every meeting (see the recommendations above about surface and groundwater advisory roles). Key issues may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Park and open space planning for habitat connectivity (daily and seasonal movements), riparian and streamside protection, water quality protection, floodplain set asides, mitigation banks for in-jurisdiction projects ▪ Water quality protection through stormwater pollution prevention plans and facilities even where not required by regulation, leaving natural floodways intact rather than armoring ▪ Prairie conservation and mowing practices ▪ Water conservation practices ▪ Invasive species prevention and removal in public land, rights of way, planned developments (e.g. encourage native plant use in new housing areas, incentives for landscape conversion to natives especially in areas near waterways) ▪ Collaboration with counties for environmental protections (stormwater, invasive species, reclamation, dumping, other?) ▪ Tax incentives or disincentives for open land conversion, restoration, conservation planning <p>Identify sources of volunteers and/or funding which could help municipalities employ conservation practices.</p> <p>As with any outreach program, these efforts need to have reporting objectives and monitoring of sorts to determine effectiveness, share lessons learned and hone approaches for future and emerging areas which will be experiencing these issues in the future.</p>											
<p>Where wildlife and fisheries management are not the primary objective and where livestock production is the primary objective, refer landowners to partners who can assist them with best management practices for rotational and site-appropriate grazing management</p>											

NOTE: Almost all of these actions would benefit from more regular cooperation among conservation practitioners in the region. A share-site for conservation practice would be a useful tool. See Statewide/Multi-region handbook AND the [Effectiveness Measures](#) report's evaluation of existing conservation practice sharing tools (Appendix IV). This will go a long way toward landscape-level planning and shared priorities.

CONSERVATION PARTNERS AND PROGRAMS

This section to be developed following all Actions, prior to USFWS review in August 2011

RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

Resources and References will be finalized after the handbook has been completely drafted. These and other resources will be compiled into one large document on the website after USFWS review.

- Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA). 2006. National Fish Habitat Action Plan. http://www.fishhabitat.org/documents/plan/National_Fish_Habitat_Action_Plan.pdf (accessed November 2009).
- — — Teaming with Wildlife (TWW). 2011. Measuring the Effectiveness of State Wildlife Grants (*conservation actions*) Final Report. http://www.fishwildlife.org/files/Effectiveness-Measures-Report_2011.pdf
- Baydack, R.K., H. Campa III, and J.B. Haufler (eds.). 1999. Practical approaches to the conservation of biological diversity. Island Press, Washington D.C. and Covelo CA. 313 pp.
- CEC. 2011. <http://www.cec.org/atlas/>.
- Conservation Measures Partnership. 2007. [Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation](#) (accessed 2009 – 2011).
- Diamond, D.D. *n.d.* "Grasslands" in Handbook of Texas Online (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ggg01>), accessed April 26, 2011. Published by the Texas State Historical Association
- Esselman, P.C., D.M. Infante, L. Wang, D. Wu, A. Cooper, and W.W. Taylor. 2010. An initial assessment of relative landscape disturbance levels for river fish habitats of the conterminous United States. http://www.nbii.gov/far/nfhap/data/NFHAP_Initial_Assessment_Report_Esselman_et_al_2010.pdf (accessed 2010 – 2011).
- Gelbard, J.L. 2003. Grasslands at a Crossroads: Protecting and Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change in Buying Time: A User's Manual. <http://assets.panda.org/downloads/buyingtime.pdf> (World Wildlife Federation) (accessed April 2011).
- Gould, F.W., G.O. Hoffman, and C.A. Rechenthin. 1960. Vegetational Areas of Texas. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Leaflet 492. Texas A&M University, College Station TX. http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/publications/pwdpubs/media/pwd_mp_e0100_1070ac_24.pdf (accessed October 2008).
- Griffith, G. 2010. Level III North American Terrestrial Ecoregions: United States Descriptions. Prepared for the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation (www.cec.org), version May 11, 2010. Corvallis, Oregon.
- Griffith, G.E., S.A. Bryce, J.M. Omernik, J.A. Comstock, A.C. Rogers, B. Harrison, S.L. Hatch and D. Bezanson. 2007. Ecoregions of Texas. R.S. Geological Survey, Reston VA. http://www.epa.gov/wed/pages/ecoregions/tx_eco.htm (accessed May 2009).
- Hayes, P.T. 1964. Geology of the Guadalupe Mountains. Geological Survey Professional Paper 446. U.S. Geological Survey. 68 pages. http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/cave/446/contents.htm (accessed 2011).
- Hill, Carol. 2000. Overview of the geologic history of cave development in the Guadalupe Mountains, New Mexico. Journal of Cave and Karst Studies, August 2000 pgs. 60-71. <http://www.caves.org/pub/journal/PDF/V62/v62n2-Hill.pdf> (accessed 2011).

- International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), Species Survival Commission. 2008. Strategic planning for species conservation: an overview. Version 1.0. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. 22pp.
- and the Conservation Measures Partnership 2008a. [IUCN – Conservation Measures Partnership Standard Classification of Conservation Threats](#) (accessed 2010).
- . 2008b. [IUCN-Conservation Measures Partnership’s Standard Classification of Conservation Actions](#) (accessed 2010).
- LBJ School of Public Affairs. 1978. Preserving Texas’ Natural Heritage. Policy Research Project Report 31. University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX.
- National Council on Science and the Environment. 2010. [Our Nation’s Wildlife Habitats](#): completing an integrated system for conserving habitat values and benefits in a changing world (accessed 2010).
- National Fish Habitat Partnership. 2009. Fish Habitat Partnerships (map). http://fishhabitat.org/images/M_images/New_NFHAP_Maps_2009/nfhap_fhp_and_cand_map_09_1.pdf (accessed November 2009). Produced October 2009, revised as part of the National Fish Habitat Action Plan.
- National Park Service. n.d. Guadalupe Mountains National Park: Geology. <http://www.nps.gov/archive/gumo/gumo/geology.htm> (accessed 2011).
- National Park Service. 2011. Guadalupe Mountains National Park: History – People and Places. <http://www.nps.gov/gumo/historyculture/people.htm> (accessed 2011).
- National Research Council. 2002. Riparian Areas: Functions and Strategies for Management. Committee on Riparian Zone Functioning and Strategies for Management. National Academies Press. 428 pgs.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 1996. Riparian Areas Environmental Uniqueness, Functions, and Values. RCA Issue Brief #11 (August 1996) <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/rca/ib11text.html> (accessed 2011)
- . 2006. Land Resource Regions and Major Land Resource Areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NSSC/Ag_Handbook_296_low.pdf (accessed November 2009). Produced by the US Department of Agriculture NRCS, Handbook 296.
- NatureServe. 2009. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application], s.v. “Texas”. Version 7.1, last updated February 6, 2009. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer> (accessed: July 22, 2009).
- North American Bird Conservation Initiative (NABCI-US). 2004. Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) (interactive map). <http://www.nabci-us.org/map.html> (accessed October 2009).
- Pimental, D. 2007. ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC COSTS OF VERTEBRATE SPECIES INVASIONS INTO THE UNITED STATES in Managing Vertebrate Invasive Species, University of Nebraska USDA National Wildlife Research Center Symposia, Lincoln NB. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nwrcinvasive/38> (accessed 2010).
- Salzer, D. and N. Salafsky. 2006. Allocating resources between taking action, assessing status, and measuring effectiveness of conservation actions. *Natural Areas Journal* 26(3): 310-316.

- Sanderson, E.W., K.H. Redford, A. Vedder, P.B. Coppolillo, and S.E. Ward. 2002. A conceptual model for conservation planning based on landscape species requirements. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 58:41-56.
- State Energy Conservation Office (SECO). 2009. Texas Renewable Portfolio Standard. http://www.seco.cpa.state.tx.us/re_rps-portfolio.htm (accessed July 2009). Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Austin TX.
- Teaming with Wildlife. 2007. Dedicated Federal Funding for Wildlife. http://www.teaming.com/funding/wcrp_funding.html (accessed December 2010).
- Texas A&M University. 2011. Groundwater Information. <http://texaswater.tamu.edu/groundwater/717> (accessed April 2011)
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD). 2005a. Texas Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy 2005 – 2010. http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/publications/pwdpubs/pwd_pl_w7000_1187a/ (accessed 26 May 2009).
- . 2005b. Land & Water Resources Conservation and Recreation Plan. http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/publications/pwdpubs/pwd_pl_e0100_0867/ (accessed May 2009).
- . 2009. Endangered and threatened species list (last modified May 15, 2009, 8:27 a.m.). <http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/huntwild/wild/species/endang/index.phtml> (accessed July 2009).
- . 2010. Land & Water Resources Conservation and Recreation Plan. http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/publications/nonpwdpubs/land_and_water_plan/ (accessed January 2010).
- . in progress. Plant Conservation Strategy. Austin, TX.
- and Texas Natural Resources Information Service (TNRIS). In progress, 2005 – 2012. [Ecological Systems Classification and Mapping Project](#) (accessed 2010). Austin TX.
- TPWD. http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/publications/pwdpubs/media/pwd_bk_p4000_0038.pdf
- TPWD. 2004. http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/publications/pwdpubs/media/pwd_br_w7000_0306.pdf
- TPWD. 2005. Eds. <http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/huntwild/wild/birding/migration/>
- The Nature Conservancy (TNC). 1999. TNC Ecoregions and Divisions of the Lower 48 United States (map). <http://gis.tnc.org/data/MapbookWebsite/getimage.php?id=9> (accessed December 2009).
- and World Wildlife Fund (WWF). 2006. Standards for Ecoregional Assessments and Biodiversity Visions (January 26, 2006). <http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/cbdgateway/era/index.html> (accessed 15 April 2009). The Nature Conservancy, Arlington VA.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2000. Eight Required Elements of State Wildlife Action Plans. FY 2001 Commerce, Justice, State and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. PL 106-553, codified USC 16(2000) 669(c). [http://www.fws.gov/r5fedaid/swg/TWW%20Working%20Group/3\)%20Eight%20Elements.pdf](http://www.fws.gov/r5fedaid/swg/TWW%20Working%20Group/3)%20Eight%20Elements.pdf) (accessed 2009).
- . 2006. National Advisory Acceptance Team (NAAT) Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy Review Summary for Texas. Received by TPWD, 14 February 2006.

- . 2007 Administrative Guidelines for State Wildlife Grants (effective January 1, 2007). FWS/AWSR-FA: 027804. <http://wsfrprograms.fws.gov/subpages/toolkitfiles/swg2007.pdf> (accessed 2009). Issued October 18, 2006.
- . 2009a. U.S. Joint Ventures (map). (Division of Bird Habitat Conservation). <http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/JointVentures/Map.shtm> (accessed October 2009).
- . 2009b. Proposed Landscape Conservation Cooperatives FY2010, Coterminous United States (map). http://www.fws.gov/science/SHC/pdf/FWS_LCC_48.pdf (accessed December 2009). Produced by IRTM, Denver CO, December 2009.
- . 2009c. Federally listed candidate, threatened and endangered species in Texas. <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/EndangeredSpecies/lists/ListSpecies.cfm> (accessed July 2009).
- . 2009d. Species reports, s.v. “candidates”. http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/pub/SpeciesReport.do?listingType=C&mapstatus=1 (accessed July 2009).
- . 2009e. A System for Mapping Riparian Areas in the Western United States. 42 pgs. Division of Habitat and Resource Conservation, Branch of Resource Mapping and Support. Arlington, VA.
- and Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA). 2007. Guidance for Wildlife Action Plan (Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy) Review and Revisions. <http://wsfrprograms.fws.gov/subpages/toolkitfiles/NAATgde.pdf> (accessed 2009). Issued July 12, 2007.
- U. S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1991. Data Standard: Codes for the Identification of Hydrologic Units in the United States and the Caribbean Outlying Areas. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 878-A.
- Williams, J.E., C.A. Wood, and M.P. Dombeck, eds. 1997. Watershed Restoration: Principles and Practices. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.