

USSCP Teleconference Notes – 28 December 2016

Present: Stephen Brown, Catherine Hickey, Matt Reiter, Sara Schweitzer, Brian Smith, Bill Vermillion, Brad Winn; Brad Andres

A. Comments on the *Draft 2017-2021 Strategic Plan for the U.S. NABCI Committee*.

Overall, the plan seems ambitious. Perhaps the work plan will provide the details needed to evaluate potential for success. We are also a bit confused by the numbers of different scales discussed in the introductory text (e.g., tri-national, U.S., continental, full life cycle). Perhaps a statement such as “US-NABCI is a USA-focused group with a hemispheric perspective for bird conservation” would be useful. It seems like the widespread use of action verbs, such as “enable” or “facilitate” would be clarified with some specific examples (e.g., add something specific like the Myers Award in 1Biii). There was some heartache about the use of “science-based” throughout, mainly because of overuse and misuse; delete term or use “science or scientific” instead (e.g., communications about science products vs. science-based communications).

1A. We believe the priorities will be “developed” by the plans and partnerships and integrated through NABCI rather than NABCI developing priorities of the partnerships.

1A ii. Seems like it is “among” JVs and BCPPs, but some important issues (e.g., sagebrush obligates) might be restricted to one JV or BCR/MBCR.

1A iii. Might also add a component about identifying new revenue streams beyond Federal and State pots.

Goal 2. We believe that the State of the Birds should provide the framework for strategic implementation and targeted investment. If NABCI doesn’t align with the SOTB reports, what is the value of the effort to produce it? What are the measurable outcomes of the report? Similarly, based on past NABCI activities, we would like to see stronger language on the need for monitoring and evaluation in this section. Lastly, too many “and”s in the 2A sentence.

Goal 3. Overall needs to be more active with some tangible examples. For example, planned one-on-one meetings with agency leaders to make measurable progress on specific tasks or initiatives. We also believe that policy is often related to budgets, so the funding part should not be excluded, with the caveat of not all NABCI Committee members will engage in this aspect.

3A. Add “that should be tied to common priorities”. Also, shouldn’t we add Plan Partnership funding/support to the standard list of NAWCA, NMBCA, SWG, Farm Bill, & JVs?

Thanks to Stephen for carrying our comments forward to Judith & NABCI!

B. TriST/TrUST

Bill represented the USSCP at the “Unified Science Team” meeting in Texas in early December. Three of the main projects that were discussed were 1) Net Landscape Change, 2) TrUST priorities, and 3) Avian Conservation Assessment Database. The net landscape change is moving

ahead with identifying needs for forests, shrublands and grasslands, and wetlands and shorelines. Matt has been participating on this team. The Avian Conservation Assessment Database is being updated with waterbird and shorebird scores. There is a current discussion about scoring taxa below the species level, which the shorebird community has been doing since the initiation of the Shorebird Plan. Brad A. is involved with this effort. There is likely a need to recruit another JV Science Coordinator or other partner to think about shorebirds within the context of the Unified Science Team priorities. Population objective setting remains a priority, and we should have a full discussion of this for shorebirds at the spring meeting. Minutes will be provided when completed.

C. PRISM meeting – Matt and Brad are organizing a PRISM+ meeting to discuss further development of a more uniform approach to monitoring nonbreeding shorebirds. The meeting is planned for 21-23 March in Denver. Invitation will go out the first week of January.

D. USSCP update – There was consensus that we should produce some sort of update for the Plan. Brad will resurrect and circulate the outlined he previously prepared to begin the process in early 2017. The idea of a face-to-face mtg of Council members was floated to consider for 2017, to be discussed via email or on our next call.