

October 27th, 2021 (Forum Day 1) Breakout Group Notes
Feedback From Small Groups on Species Matrix

Overview

There was overall support expressed in breakout groups on Wednesday, October 27th, that this species list will catalyze collaboration, with only a small handful rating the species list as neutral (neither catalyze nor stifle collaboration), and one view that the list would stifle collaboration. The themes here pulled from comments regarding opportunities and challenges might help to further contextualize the list and provide perspective on how to improve it, how to use it, and how to communicate about. Several themes not provided here (species suggestions, criteria to add etc.) were adjusted right into the species matrix itself and can be seen in the new iterations that have come out since the workshop integrating the great feedback provided.

Themes of Opportunities List Provides

Provides Continuity across orgs and efforts, collaboration: Focal resource for fundraising, cross-jurisdictional and national coordination (accountable to a higher level of collaboration), articulates the shared responsibility to stabilize or recover these species, broad nature of the list allows us to engage more broadly

Increases Sharing: Explore innovative techniques/methods for better understanding species' response to intervention: forum for sharing new info/research of species on the list to a broad audience (indv, pop, spatio-temporal movement, etc.), [e.g. 1) Expand human dimensions of raptor conservation program from the intermountain west to the grasslands // 2) As a modeler I work on many of these species already. I work with FSA to develop models to prioritize CRP enrollment for wildlife. This would be in line with that endeavor. // 3) Work on specific project monitoring some of these species that occur in my area like Mountain Plover, Burrowing Owl, Northern Strike]

Strengthens Conservation Delivery: Targeted geographies for delivery/capacity

Affirmation for Diversity in list: Appreciate selection of species that represent the range of habitat structures and geographies, Appreciate selection of seasonal nomads (Cassin's sparrow, Lark bunting), as these might have unique responses to fluctuating climate and habitat use

Will help highlight gaps in knowledge: motivates & justify new research

Can be used as a conversation tool with landowners: X number of "priority" species on their land, use of grouse beneficial to working with landowners/state agencies

Helps with existing work: ties in our work with private lands grassland conservation work in the U.S. and Mexico, our full annual cycle research and monitoring on grassland birds

Themes of Challenges List Might Cause

Landowners Might See Potential Threats with List

- T&E listing can make it more challenging to work with private landowners for fear of accidental take (U.S., CA)
- Some species require habitat conditions that may not be desired by landowners/range managers (bare ground, disturbance)
- Some species require changes to crop harvest approach to avoid nest mortality - could be undesirable for farmers
- Some species may not inspire conservation among landowners as they are not “flagships”
- Need to be very strategic in terms of conserving habitat as well as populations of species considering the view and interests of land owners including Indigenous communities

Inconsistencies in Monitoring

- Monitoring approaches will be varied (cost, logistics)
- Having monitoring data that can adequately detect trends across range (breeding to wintering) ... some species may be more challenging as they may not live their full lifecycle in this biome, so our actions may not be as effective
- Some species have existing monitoring protocols, others do not
- Some jurisdictions may need to develop new monitoring programs for certain species on the list
- Main challenge in Mexico would be to increase the survey effort to those areas with gaps and to work with local landowners to do so
- Several species with similar habitat types, others with more unique habitat requirements ... might be useful to group and reduce list

Could Create Gaps for Organizations Working on the Ground

- Organization buy-in can be challenging (bird list burn-out)
- Possibly diverts funding away from other species of concern
- Having enough money to meet habitat goals to meet population targets
- Need to ensure viable actions are tied to the list
 - Accomplishing conservation actions needed for the species at appropriate scale
 - Some species may not benefit from our prescribed management*

***Need to re-elevate the fact that the Roadmap is not going to be prescribing management or conservation delivery as that must be done at the local and regional scale**