

AMJV Priority Shorebirds

Common Name	AMJV Priority	International Plans ^{1,2}	Regional PIF Plans ^{8,9}	USFWS BMC List ⁵	Listed in Wildlife Action Plans in the AMJV? ⁷												
					AL	GA	SC	NC ⁸	TN ⁸	KY	VA ⁸	WV	MD	OH	PA	NJ	NY
American Woodcock	Highest	MA (b)	IA; 4	BDC	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Upland Sandpiper	High	CR (b); MA (t)	IB; 3	BCC/N			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Buff-breasted Sandpiper	Moderate	IM (t)		BCC/N					X	X							
Least Sandpiper	Moderate	MA (t)															
Lesser Yellowlegs	Moderate	MA (t)								X							
Semipalmated Plover	Moderate	MA (t)															
Solitary Sandpiper	Moderate	MA (t)		BCC/N						X			X		X		
Spotted Sandpiper	Moderate	MA (b)	IV; 1									X		X		X	
Western Sandpiper	Moderate	MA (t)							X	X							
Dunlin	Low	MA (t)								X			X				
Greater Yellowlegs	Low	MA (t)											X				
Semipalmated Sandpiper	Low	MA (t)								X			X				
Stilt Sandpiper	Low	MA (t)		BCC/N					X	X							

¹ Citations for international plans:

Landbirds: Rich, T.D., C.J. Beardmore, H. Berlanga, P.J. Blancher, M.S. Bradstreet, G.S. Butcher, D.W. Demarest, E.H. Dunn, W.C. Hunter, E.E. Inigo-Elias, J.A. Kennedy, A.M. Martell, A.O. Panjabi, D.N. Pashley, K.V. Rosenberg, C.M. Rustay, J.S. Wendt, T.C. Will. 2004. Partners in Flight North American Landbird Conservation Plan. Cornell Lab of Ornithology. Ithaca, NY.

Waterfowl: North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Plan Committee. 2004. North American Waterfowl Management Plan 2004. Implementation Framework: Strengthening the Biological Foundation.

Waterbirds: Hunter, W.C., W. Golder, S. Melvin, and J. Wheeler. 2006. Southeast United States Regional Waterbird Conservation Plan.

Shorebirds: Based on suggestions from Chuck Hunter (USFWS), May 2007, and the AMJV Technical Committee, August 2007. Chuck Hunter currently is revising shorebird scores and shorebird priorities will reflect these scores and partner input once completed.

² Abbreviations from each international plan:

Landbirds: Abbreviations for "status" listed first, and "management action" are listed after the semi-colon. Status Codes: WL = PIF Watchlist species; S = PIF Stewardship species. Action Codes: IM = Immediate Management needed; MA = Management needed; PR = Long-term Planning & Responsibility

Waterfowl: If only 1 abbreviation occurs, it indicates continental priority only (i.e., the Appalachian Waterfowl Conservation Region was not listed as vital for the species). If 2 abbreviations occur, it indicates continental priority and nonbreeding need for each species. If 3 abbreviations occur, it indicates continental priority, breeding need, and nonbreeding need for each species. Codes: H = High; MH = Moderate High; M = Moderate; ML = Moderate Low.

Waterbirds: Tiers (listed first): I = Concern including all species meeting at the regional scale both continental and regional concern criteria, regional concern criteria only, and continental concern only; II = Additional Stewardship including all species meeting stewardship criteria not otherwise already identified in Tier I. Action Codes: CR = Critical Recovery actions needed to prevent likely extirpation or to reintroduce a species that has been extirpated; MA = Management Attention indicates that management or other on-the-ground conservation actions needed to reverse or stabilize significant, long-term population declines in species that are still relatively abundant; PR = Planning and Responsibility indicates that long-term planning and responsibility are needed for species to ensure that sustainable populations are maintained for species for which a region has high responsibility for that species, but not otherwise considered to be of regional concern.

Shorebirds: Action Codes (season of interest): CR (b) = Critical Recovery actions needed for breeding populations; IM (t) = Immediate Management actions needed for transient populations; MA (b) or (t) = Management Attention indicates that management or other on-the-ground conservation actions needed for breeding or transient populations.

³ Citations for PIF Species Assessment Database

Panjabi, A. O., P. J. Blancher, R. Dettmers, and K. V. Rosenberg, Version 2012. Partners in Flight Technical Series No. 3. Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory website: <http://www.rmbo.org/pubs/downloads/Handbook2012.pdf>. Species Assessment Database at <http://pif.rmbo.org/>

⁴ Definition of Regional Concern:

Regional Concern (RC): Within the PIF Species Assessment Database, a species must meet all criteria in the seasons for which they are listed: 1) Regional Combined Score > 13; 2) High Regional Threats (> 3) or Moderate Regional Threats (3) combined with moderate or large population declines (PT > 3); 3) Occur regularly in significant numbers in the BCR, i.e., RD > 1

⁵ Abbreviations for USFWS Birds of Management Concern

Birds with blank cells are considered common throughout their entire range by USFWS. Abbreviations for all others are as follows: federally Threatened or Endangered (T/E); Birds of Conservation Concern at National (BCC/N), Regional (BCC/R), or Bird Conservation Region (BCC/BCR) scales; game/falconry birds Above Desired Condition (ADC) or Below Desired Condition (BDC) across their entire range (but not necessarily true in BCR 28).

⁶ State Wildlife Action Plans in the AMJV

Each state used different methods to assign a status to a species; therefore, this table simply indicates whether or not a species was identified as a "species of greatest conservation need" by the state planning team, regardless of its overall status relative to other species. Citations for each state plan follows.

Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries Division, Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. 2005. Conserving Alabama's wildlife: a comprehensive strategy. Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Montgomery, AL.

Wildlife Resources Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources. 2005. A Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Social Circle, GA.

South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. 2005. South Carolina Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy 2005-2010. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Columbia, SC.

North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. 2005. North Carolina Wildlife Action Plan. North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, Raleigh, NC

Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency. 2005. Tennessee's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, Nashville, TN.

Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources. 2005. Kentucky's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, #1 Sportsman's Lane, Frankfort, KY.

Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. 2005. Virginia's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Richmond, VA.

Wildlife Resources Section, West Virginia Division of Natural Resources. 2005. It's About Habitat: West Virginia Wildlife Conservation Action Plan. West Virginia Division of Natural Resources, Charleston, WV.

Maryland Department of Natural Resources. 2005. Maryland wildlife diversity conservation plan. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Annapolis, MD.

Division of Wildlife, Ohio Department of Natural Resources. 2005. Ohio Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Columbus, OH.

Pennsylvania Game Commission and Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission. 2005. Pennsylvania Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy.

Division of Fish & Wildlife, Endangered & Nongame Species Program, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. 2007 (FEB; Originally published SEP 2004). New Jersey Wildlife Action Plan. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Trenton, NJ.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2005. A Strategy for Conserving New York's Fish and Wildlife Resources. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY.

⁷ Ruffed Grouse and Wood Duck were not listed in NC's Wildlife Action Plan for the Appalachian region, but they were suggested for inclusion for this table (M. Johns, NCWRC, pers. comm.). Northern Bobwhite was not listed in TN's Wildlife Action Plan for the Appalachian region, but was suggested for inclusion for this table (S. Somershoe, R. Applegate, TWRA, pers. comm.). Brown-headed Nuthatch and King Rail (VA) were listed for the region in VA's Wildlife Action Plan, however, further analysis indicates these species are very localized (BHNH) or non-existent (KIRA; S. Harding, VA DGIF, pers. comm.).

⁸ Citations for regional PIF plans:

Robertson, B., and K.V. Rosenberg. 2003. Partners In Flight Landbird Conservation Plan: Physiographic Area 24 Allegheny Plateau. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY.

Rosenberg, K.V., and B. Robertson. 2003. Partners In Flight Landbird Conservation Plan: Physiographic Area 17 Northern Ridge and Valley. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY.

Rosenberg, K.V., and R. Dettmers. 2004. Partners In Flight Landbird Conservation Plan: Physiographic Area 22 Ohio Hills. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY.

Rosenberg, K.V. 2003. Partners In Flight Landbird Conservation Plan: Physiographic Area 12 Mid-Atlantic Ridge and Valley. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY.

Hunter, W.C., R. Katz, D. Pashley, and R. Ford. 1999. Partners In Flight Landbird Conservation Plan: Physiographic Area 23 Southern Blue Ridge. USFWS, Atlanta, GA.

A physiographic plan was never completed for Northern Cumberland Plateau (Phys. Area 21), but 13 priority species were listed in the Executive Summary on PIF's website and were incorporated here.

A physiographic plan was never completed for Southern Ridge and Valley (Phys. Area 13), but 16 priority species were listed in the Executive Summary on PIF's website and 15 were incorporated here.

⁹ Abbreviations from each regional PIF plan:

This column lists the highest tier listed in any plan for each species, followed by the number of PIF plans the species occurred in for the AMJV region. Definitions for each tier follow.

Tier I. High Continental Priority: Species on the PIF Continental Watch List (as published in the PIF North American Landbird Conservation Plan [Rich et al. 2004]), or species of equivalent watch list ranking from other taxonomic groups, which are typically of conservation concern throughout their range. These are species showing high vulnerability in a number of factors, expressed as any combination of high global parameter scores, with $AI \geq 2$ (so that species without manageable populations in the region are omitted). High level of conservation attention warranted.

Tier IA. High Continental Concern + High Regional Responsibility: Species for which this region shares in major conservation responsibility; i.e., conservation in this region is critical to the overall health of this species. These species are on the PIF Continental Watch List with Area Importance of 3 – 5 for this region, or a high percent population (above threshold in IIB).

Tier IB. High Continental Concern + Low Regional Responsibility: Species for which this region can contribute to rangewide conservation objectives where the species occurs. Species on the PIF Continental Watch List with Area Importance of 2 for this region.

Tier II. High Regional Priority: Species that are of moderate continental priority (not on Continental Watch List), but are important to consider for conservation within a region because of various combinations of high parameter scores, as defined below; total of 7 parameter scores ≥ 19 .

Tier IIA. High Regional Concern: Species that are experiencing declines in the core of their range and that require immediate conservation action to reverse or stabilize trends. These are species with a combination of high area importance and declining (or unknown) population trend; total of 7 parameters ≥ 19 , with Area Importance + Population Trend ≥ 8 .

Tier IIB. High Regional Responsibility: Species for which this region shares in the responsibility for long-term conservation, even if they are not currently declining or threatened. These are species of moderate overall priority with a disproportionately high percentage of their total population in the region; total of 7 parameters ≥ 19 , with Area Importance = 5 or % population > threshold.

Tier IIC. High Regional Threats: Species of moderate overall priority that are uncommon in a region and whose remaining populations are threatened, usually because of extreme threats to sensitive habitats. These are species with high breeding threats scores within the region (or in combination with high nonbreeding threats outside the region); total of 7 parameters ≥ 19 with Threats Breeding + Threats Nonbreeding > 6, or local Threats Breeding or Threats Nonbreeding = 5.

Tier III. Additional Federally Listed: Species protected under federal endangered species laws receive conservation attention wherever they occur.

Tier IV. Additional State Listed: Species on state or provincial endangered, threatened, or special concern lists that did not meet any of above criteria. These often represent locally rare or peripheral populations.

Tier V. Additional Stewardship Responsibility: Representative or characteristic species for which the region supports a disproportionately high percentage of the world population (see Appendix), but which did not meet any of the above criteria. Includes moderate- and low-scoring species for which the region has long-term stewardship responsibility, even if these species are not of immediate conservation concern. These species are not included in the table below, but they can be found by reviewing the “% of population” numbers available at <<http://www.rmbo.org/pif/pifdb.html>>.

Tier VI. Local concern: species of justifiable local concern or interest. May represent a geographically variable population or be representative of a specific habitat or conservation concern.