

Managing Conflict and Biotic Diversity in the Prairie Dog Ecosystem

by

Brian Miller and Gerardo Ceballos

The worldwide destruction of habitat and decline in biodiversity have been the focus of numerous publications in the last fifteen years (e.g., Myers 1979; Wilcox and Murphy 1985; Wilson 1988). Environmental degradation in tropical regions has been especially well documented. Yet, the problems of habitat degradation and loss of biodiversity are not confined to the tropics, as the destruction of the North American short and mixed-grass prairies graphically illustrates. This highly specialized ecosystem, which once covered nearly 20% of North America, has undergone a decline for several reasons, including the following: agricultural manipulation, introduction of exotic species, water management, and prairie dog (*Cynomys spp.*) poisoning campaigns. In this paper, the origin of these poisoning programs and their ecological and fiscal consequences will be discussed, and an integrated and ecologically sound approach to conservation of the prairie dog ecosystem will be proposed.

Poisoning Programs

North America is inhabited by black-tailed (*C. ludovicianus*), Gunnison's (*C. gunnisoni*), Mexican (*C. mexicanus*), Utah (*C. parvidens*), and white-tailed (*C. leucurus*) prairie dogs. [*C. mexicanus* and *C. parvidens* are listed as endangered and threatened, respectively, under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).] At the beginning of this century, colonies of these five species of prairie dogs covered over 40,000,000 hectares of native short and mixed-grass prairies across the Great Plains of southern Canada, the United States, and northern Mexico. By 1960, this area had been reduced by 98% to approximately 600,000 hectares (Marsh 1984). State and federally sponsored prairie dog poisoning programs in the United States,

the heart of the prairie dog's range, were largely responsible for this reduction of grassland habitat. These programs were intended to benefit the livestock industry.

Prairie dog poisoning occurred as early as the late 1800s, but was conducted in a haphazard manner. Pressure to eradicate prairie dogs intensified after Merriam (1902) estimated that these animals reduced range productivity by 50 to 75% (an overestimation by an order of magnitude). In 1915, the federal government began appropriating money to the Biological Survey for the purpose of poisoning prairie dogs (Bishop and Culbertson 1976). By 1929, these poisoning activities were substantial enough to merit the formation of a new division—the Predatory Animal and Rodent Control (PARC) division. The Animal Damage Control Act of 1931 provided statutory authority to the poisoning of prairie dogs and sanctioned the partnership between public and private interests in these poisoning efforts. This act remains the primary statute for animal damage control. In 1939, the PARC division was transferred to the newly created U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (DiSilvestro 1985); in 1986, animal control efforts were transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

Current Poisoning Efforts

Millions of acres of North American grassland have been destroyed as a result of prairie dog poisoning programs (Bell 1921; Day and Nelson 1929; Anderson et al. 1986; and Dunlap 1988). Despite studies indicating minimal resource competition between prairie dogs and livestock and economic analyses demonstrating that poisoning programs operate at a net financial loss (Collins et al. 1984), federally sponsored eradication

of prairie dogs continues today. From 1980 to 1984, the U.S. government spent \$6,200,000 to poison 185,600 hectares of prairie dog habitat in South Dakota. In 1986 and 1987, a poisoning program eliminated the largest black-tailed prairie dog (*C. ludovicianus*) complex (approximately 110,000 hectares) in North America (Tschetter 1988).

Only small, isolated prairie dog colonies remain as a result of these poisoning programs. These highly fragmented colonies are susceptible to extirpation by disease, especially sylvatic plague (*Yersinia pestis*), demographic events, genetic problems, and natural catastrophes. In addition, habitat alteration between colonies and loss of sources of immigration have decreased possibilities of recolonization or genetic exchange. Because of these factors, risk of extinction from habitat disruption is not linearly proportional to reduction of habitat, but may in fact increase disproportionately (Wilcox and Murphy 1985; Wilcove et al. 1986).

Effects of Prairie Dog Declines on Other Species

Prairie dogs have been determined to be ecosystem regulators that influence soil chemistry, soil structure, primary productivity, species composition, and species diversity (Sieg 1988; Detling and Whicker 1988; Reading et al. 1989). Compared to surrounding areas, prairie dog colonies support higher numbers of arthropods, small mammals, and terrestrial predators, and support higher avian species diversity and density (Hansen and Gold 1977; O'Meilia et al. 1982; Agnew et al. 1986; Krueger 1986; Reading et al. 1989). Plant diversity also is increased in the presence of prairie dogs.

The presence of prairie dogs is beneficial to livestock for several reasons. First, the nutrient content and digestibil-

ity of forage is greater in the presence of prairie dogs (O'Meilia et al. 1982; Coppock et al. 1983; Krueger 1986). Indeed, domestic cattle and bison preferentially graze in prairie dog towns because the grass is more succulent (Coppock et al. 1983; Wydeven and Dahlgren 1985; Krueger 1986; Knowles 1986; Detling and Whicker 1988). Second, perennial grasses and forbs grazed by livestock are more abundant in prairie dog colonies than in surrounding areas (Bonham and Lerwick 1976). Finally, prairie dogs in the southwest naturally control mesquite (*Prosopis*



Black-footed ferrets (*Mustela nigripes*) depend on prairie dogs for food and habitat. This young male from the wild ferret population near Meeteetse, Wyoming, was photographed in 1985. Photo by Brain Miller.

glandulosa), a plant that reduces the availability of grass for livestock and makes roundups difficult (Miller 1991), and prickly pear cactus (*Opuntia polycantha*), a plant that is not eaten by cattle but that proliferates in areas overgrazed by livestock (Summers and Linder 1978). In fact, recent studies have reported no significant difference between market weights of steers living with or without prairie dogs (Hansen and Gold 1977; O'Meilia et al. 1982), and only a 4-7% level of competition between livestock and prairie dogs (Uresk and Paulson 1989). Thus, conclusions that prairie dogs reduce the

amount of forage available to livestock and result in financial losses to ranchers are simply overexaggerated.

Because their presence and biological activities result in the creation of food and habitat upon which many other species depend, prairie dogs can be considered a keystone species. Loss of prairie dog populations, then, threatens biodiversity throughout the entire prairie dog ecosystem (Clark et al. 1989; Sharps and Uresk 1990). For example, the black-footed ferret (*Mustela nigripes*), a highly specialized carnivore that depends upon prairie dogs for habitat and sustenance, was almost driven to extinction as a result of prairie dog eradication programs. Several other species that utilize prairie dog colonies are currently in the process of being listed under the ESA. These species include the Mountain Plover (*Charadrius montanus*), Ferruginous Hawk (*Buteo regalis*), and swift fox (*Vulpes velox*). The Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*), which also utilizes prairie dog colonies, is listed as rare by several states.

Conservation of Prairie Dogs

U.S. government sponsored prairie dog poisoning programs initiated in an effort to reduce conflict between livestock interests and prairie dogs have served only to destroy habitat and decrease biodiversity in the North American grasslands. As a result, managers are now spending increasing amounts of money and time trying to rescue species that depend on prairie dogs. Unfortunately, these conservation efforts have met with little success, perhaps because they traditionally have focused only on the biological aspects of biodiversity decline. This decline, however, is intricately intertwined with history, economics, politics, and social and cultural attitudes and values. In order to successfully conserve valuable resources, all of these factors must be addressed. In this article, we propose a strategy for conserving biological diversity on the North American grasslands that employs legal action, ecosystem management, sustainable use of protected prairie dog habitat,

Endangered Species UPDATE

A forum for information exchange on endangered species issues

April/May 1994
Vol. 11 Nos. 6 & 7

R. Lynn Gooch Editor
Terry Root Faculty Advisor
Ruth E. Polk Editorial Assistant
Matthew Schlesinger Editorial Assistant

Instructions for Authors:

The *Endangered Species UPDATE* welcomes articles related to species protection in a wide range of areas including but not limited to: research and management activities and policy analyses for endangered species, theoretical approaches to species conservation, and habitat protection. Book reviews, editorial comments, and announcements of current events and publications are also welcome.

Readers include a broad range of professionals in both scientific and policy fields. Articles should be written in an easily understandable style for a knowledgeable audience. For further information, contact the editor.

Subscription Information:

The *Endangered Species UPDATE* is published approximately ten times per year by the School of Natural Resources and Environment at The University of Michigan. Annual rates are \$23 for regular subscriptions, and \$18 for students and senior citizens (add \$5 for postage outside the U.S.). Students please enclose advisor's signature on university letterhead. Send check or money order (payable to The University of Michigan) to:

Endangered Species UPDATE
School of Natural Resources
and Environment
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1115
(313) 763-3243

Cover: White-tailed prairie dog (*Cynomys leucurus*). Photo by Dean Biggins, U.S. National Biological Survey.

The views expressed in the *Endangered Species UPDATE* are those of the author and may not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or The University of Michigan.

Production of this issue was made possible in part by support from the Chevron Corporation.



 printed on recycled paper

positive economic incentives, education, flexible planning, interdisciplinary advisory groups, and international cooperation (see Miller et al. 1994a; 1994b).

The Law and Ecosystem Management. Legal experts and biologists have recently advocated a move from managing individual species to managing entire systems (Smith 1984; Scott et al. 1987; Rolhf 1991). Historically, protecting each species individually served an important purpose in slowing the decline toward extinction. During the early years of environmental action, a number of species were already in crisis situations and action was necessary to prevent further loss. However, acting after a full-blown crisis exists diminishes opportunities for success, increases costs, and escalates conflict between conservation and local interests (Wemmer and Derrickson 1987).

Handling species individually is also a slow process. Approximately 650 species currently are listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA; another 600 U.S. candidate species are being reviewed for possible inclusion on the list (U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO] 1992). Because the USFWS has placed an average of only 44 species a year on the list, it could take years to individually address these candidate species even if no other species are added (U.S. GAO 1992). Additionally, according to available data, between 3000 and 5000 other species in the U.S. may be threatened (U.S. GAO 1992). Managing entire systems would handle plants and animals in groups and speed the process of protection. However, this assertion necessitates a caveat. Ecosystem management is a current "buzzword," but what will be managed, how, and by whom is rarely defined. Implementation of a poorly defined management approach could weaken single species protection without providing an adequate substitute.

The prairie dog, as a keystone species, provides an excellent opportunity to forge a transition from traditional single species management to management of a system (Miller et al. 1994a).



The Mountain Plover (*Charadrius montanus*), a species that utilizes prairie dog colonies, is currently in the process of being listed under the Endangered Species Act. Photo by Fritz Knopf, U.S. National Biological Survey.

The ESA can play an enormous role in broad scale preservation of biodiversity by offering some level of protection to keystone species, and consequently, to species dependent upon the keystone animal (Rolhf 1991).

Protecting a threatened keystone species would provide educational, biological, and fiscal benefits. By focusing educational efforts on keystone species, managers would have a means of teaching the public about the value of ecosystem conservation and the links between animals and their habitat. The biological integrity of ecosystems would quickly benefit from protection afforded keystone species. Also, the federal government would be spared the financial burden of maintaining an expensive support system for other species that would become imperiled if keystone species continued to decline.

Protection of a keystone species, no matter how politically controversial the situation, would be far more cost-effective than trying to protect each individual species that depends on it. For example, the government financially subsidizes both the poisoning of prairie dogs and the preservation of species dependent upon the prairie dog for survival. As a result of expenditures in the former category, expenditures in the latter category will continue to rise as more species reach threatened status.

Habitat Protection and Sustainable Use. Conservation of most species depends on more than legal action. Habitat conservation and sustainable use of that habitat are also necessary

components of any species conservation effort. The value of initiating sustainably usable areas on the grasslands of Canada, the U.S., and Mexico cannot be overemphasized. Currently, plans exist to establish a protected area in northern Chihuahua, Mexico. This area would include a 55,000 hectare black-tailed prairie dog complex, the largest colony remaining in North America (Ceballos et al. 1993).

Habitat conservation and protection does not preclude human land uses. Arid grassland regions can be sustainably used for economic benefits by harnessing the potential as it exists rather than trying to impose exotic agricultural techniques or over-exploitive practices (Cloudsley-Thompson 1988). With an integrated plan, the economic needs of local populations and preservation of biodiversity could both be balanced.

Establishing sustainably usable areas of protected habitat on grasslands could prevent further decline of the prairie dog ecosystem as well as integrate ecologically sound agricultural opportunities with conservation goals (Miller et al. 1994a). This proactive integration could address both long-term resource preservation as well as the present economic needs of the local human population, and could be a large step in the elimination of conflicts that arise when legal protection is initiated after a species is on the verge of extinction (e.g., the Northern Spotted Owl, *Strix occidentalis caurina*).

Positive Economic Incentives and Education. Protected areas alone are not sufficient to preserve most declining species. Reduced habitat and effects of fragmentation often do not permit the existence of viable populations of large or highly specialized species (Ceballos and Navarro 1992). An alternative to the conflicting directives of federally sponsored prairie dog poisoning policies and endangered species management has been proposed that is designed to restore ecological integrity without harming local livestock interests (Miller et al. 1990). This proposal basically calls for

the conversion of U.S. federal funds allocated to the poisoning of prairie dogs into a positive incentive for ranchers who manage for both wildlife and livestock. If a provision for this incentive were written into the ESA, managers could supply a level of "user-friendly" legal protection to the prairie dog and its ecosystem.

Education is another important component of conservation plans. However, because the attitudes of the western agricultural community are entrenched in the issue of prairie dogs, a positive incentive will be necessary before educational efforts can be successful. In Montana, Reading (1993) demonstrated that knowledge was only one part of attitude, and that different levels of knowledge alone did not change negative perceptions of black-footed ferrets and prairie dogs. Similar results were obtained from other wildlife studies (Arthur et al. 1977; Kellert 1990).

The traditional agricultural community holds strong beliefs about competition between prairie dogs and livestock, but another important factor influences those values—federally sponsored poisoning programs. Education efforts will not be able to address misconceptions about the prairie dog ecosystem while the U.S. government continues to subsidize prairie dog poisoning. By providing poison to ranchers, the U.S. government is reinforcing misconceptions about the prairie dog ecosystem. The continuation of federally subsidized poisoning programs will undermine all other efforts to conserve biological diversity on the western grasslands (Miller et al. 1994a).

Planning, Interdisciplinary Teams, and International Cooperation. Just as political, social, economic, legal, educational, and biological features are important to conservation efforts, so are the organizational aspects of management bodies. Addressing all variables in conservation requires an efficient, flexible, and effective planning process. Switching the emphasis from individual species to the ecological system allows us to rethink traditional procedures for conserving biodiversity.

We propose establishing advisory

teams that integrate the best expertise into the conservation planning process. Representatives from the biological disciplines can contribute technical skills to the team, but equally importantly, social scientists can assess attitudes, economists can predict economic benefits and costs, and education/public relations experts can present the program to the public and raise necessary funds. Responsibilities should be dispersed from a national level with contractual accountability for actions undertaken by implementing organizations (Miller et al. 1994b). Although decisions may be made across a broad geographic area, local goals and circumstances differ. Formation of policies should not exclude local concerns, but rather integrate them into a national and international context.

Because the prairie dog ecosystem spans two international borders, international cooperation will be necessary in conservation planning processes. Indeed, the many sensitive species presently managed separately in each country could all benefit from the cooperative bonds formed from this single venture. Many people now recognize this fact; thus, the opportunity has never been better to jointly promote preservation of hemispheric biodiversity.

Conclusion

Conservation is a multi-faceted discipline that extends far beyond the mere technical aspects of biology. Without addressing social, attitudinal, political, and economic issues surrounding destruction of the prairie dog, we will only continue to degrade the western grasslands, reduce biotic diversity, and impose unnecessary expenses on government budgets. Protection of the prairie dog, a keystone species, will provide a gradual and defined transition from single species management to management of all animals and plants dependent upon the prairie dog ecosystem.

However, management of this system will fail unless the conflict between prairie dogs and livestock interests is adequately addressed. As long as the government subsidizes prairie dog poisoning programs, any attempts at educa-

tion will fail, negative attitudes toward the prairie dog ecosystem will remain unchanged, and the conflict between ranchers and prairie dogs will continue.

Literature Cited

- Agnew, W., D.W. Uresk, and R.M. Hansen. 1986. Flora and fauna associated with prairie dog colonies and adjacent ungrazed mixed grass prairie in western South Dakota. *J. Range Manage.* 39:135-139.
- Anderson, E., S.C. Forrest, T.W. Clark, and L. Richardson. 1986. Palio-biology, biogeography, and systematics of the black-footed ferret, *Mustela nigripes* (Audubon and Bachman), 1851. *Great Basin Nat. Mem.* 8:11-62.
- Arthur, L.M., R.L. Gunn, E.H. Carpenter, and W.W. Shaw. 1977. Predator control: the public view. *Trans. North Am. Wildl. and Nat. Res. Conf.* 42:137-145.
- Bell, W.R. 1921. Death to the rodents. *USDA Yearbook* 1920:421-438.
- Bishop, N.G. and J.L. Culbertson. 1976. Decline of prairie dog towns in southwestern North Dakota. *J. Range Manage.* 29:217-220.
- Bonham, C.D. and A. Lerwick. 1976. Vegetation changes induced by prairie dogs on shortgrass range. *J. Range Manage.* 29:221-225.
- Ceballos, G. and D. Navarro. 1992. Diversity and conservation of Mexican mammals. In: *Topics in Latin American Mammals: Ecology, Evolution, and Education*, pp. 167-198. M.A. Mares and D.J. Schmidly (eds.). University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, OK.
- Ceballos, G., E. Mellink, and L.R. Hanebury. 1993. Distribution and conservation status of prairie dogs (*Cynomys mexicanus* and *Cynomys ludovicianus*) in Mexico. *Biol. Conserv.* 63:105-112.
- Clark, T.W., D. Hinckley, and T. Rich (eds.). 1989. *The prairie dog ecosystem: Managing for biodiversity.* Montana Bureau of Land Management Wildlife Technical Bull. 2. Billings, MT.
- Cloudsley-Thompson, J.L. 1988. Desertification or sustainable yields from arid environments. *Environ. Conserv.* 15:197-204.
- Collins, A.R., J.P. Workman, and D.W. Uresk. 1984. An economic analysis of the black-tailed prairie dog (*Cynomys ludovicianus*) control. *J. Range Manage.* 37:358-361.
- Coppock, D.L., J.K. Detling, J.E. Ellis, and M.I. Dyer. 1983. Plant herbivore interactions in a mixed grass prairie: I. Effects of black-tailed prairie dogs on intraseasonal aboveground plant biomass and nutrient dynamics and plant species diversity. *Oecologia* 56:1-9.
- Day, A.M. and A.P. Nelson. 1929. *Wildlife conservation and control in Wyoming under the leadership of the United States Biological Survey.* U.S. Biological Survey, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Wyoming Department of Agriculture. Cheyenne, WY.
- Detling, J.K. and A.D. Whicker. 1988. A control of ecosystem processes by prairie dogs and other grassland herbivores. In: *Eighth Great Plains Wildlife Damage Control Workshop*

(continued on UPDATE page 6)