



**ONTARIO PARTNERS IN FLIGHT**  
**Technical Advisory Committee**  
**Landbird Conservation Planning (BCR 13)**  
**Draft Summary Notes**

**MNR Offices, 300 Water Street, Peterborough, ON**  
**28-29 October 2003**

---

Attendees:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Ken Abraham	Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)
Rhonda Barkley	Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters (OFAH)
Gregor Beck	Federation of Ontario Naturalists
Peter Blancher	Bird Studies Canada (BSC)
Dawn Burke	MNR
Mike Cadman	Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS)
Bill Crins	MNR
Brigitte Collins	CWS
Martin Damus	CWS
Lyle Friesen	CWS
Sherry Hambly	MNR
Jean Iron	Ontario Field Ornithologists (OFO)
Kathryn Lindsay	National Wildlife Research Centre (NWRC)
Marg McLaren	MNR
Julie Simard	MNR
Mark Stabb	Wildlife Habitat Canada – Wetland Habitat Fund
Don Sutherland	MNR
Deb Stetson	MNR
Ken Towle	Ganaraska Region CA
Steve Wilcox	BSC
Steve Wendt	CWS- Partners in Flight National Working Group
Sarah Wren	Canadian Nature Federation

---

## **1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Workshop participants were welcomed by Deb Stetson. The Ontario MNR was happy to co-host (with CWS) this important workshop and thankful for the commitment demonstrated by the participants.

## **2. Partners in Flight, PIF-Canada and NABCI Context**

Steve Wendt provided an overview of the North American Bird Conservation Initiative with specific reference to Partners in Flight and the PIF National Working Group for Canada. Particular areas of emphasis included: 1) a compilation of comments from National Working Group members who had been asked to review the draft North American Landbird Conservation

Plan; 2) “take incidental to other activity” issues associated with the Migratory Birds Convention, and the role that NABCI (and PIF) based planning may play in further managing, sustaining and protecting migratory bird populations.

### **3. PIF North American Plan and Implications for Ontario**

A brief presentation of the PIF North American Plan was provided by Peter Blancher to outline the Plan’s current status, key directions, and implications for Ontario. Key messages were as follows:

As of early November 2003, the PIF North American Plan is in its penultimate stage. At the continental level, the PIF Vision is *“Populations of native birds will occur in their natural numbers, natural habitats, and natural geographical ranges, through coordinated efforts by scientists, government and private citizens.”*

The North American PIF planning approach involves:

- Assessing vulnerability of all landbird species;
- Identifying species most in need of conservation attention;
- Setting population objectives;
- Identifying needs and recommended actions for species and habitats; and
- Implementing through coordinated efforts of partners, regions and countries.

The conservation assessment of species is based on six measures of vulnerability: population size; breeding distribution; non-breeding distribution; threats breeding; threats non-breeding; and population trend. Through this assessment a list of PIF Species of Continental Importance has been developed based on either high vulnerability (PIF Watch List – combination of small population, narrow distribution, high threats, and declining trends) or high responsibility (PIF Stewardship List – high % of global population in a single biome). About 195 species occurring in areas of North America north of the Mexican border are in this combined list.

An overall conservation objective of the PIF North American Plan is to reverse the population declines of priority species based on population trend since the late 1960s.

Key considerations in terms of linkages between the North American Plan and the BCR 13 Plan are: 1) priority species list – should include species of regional concern as well as species of continental importance with high regional area importance; and 2) population objectives – a variety of regional options are possible... a key issue will be modifying continental-scale objectives depending on regional population trends and the feasibility of reversing declines.

### **4. Summary of Species/Habitat Priorities from Other BCR 13 Initiatives**

***Objective: To summarize species/habitat priorities identified through other BCR 13 conservation initiatives and identify possible linkages to BCR 13 Landbird Plan.***

The contributions of a suite of initiatives and programs to the following PIF biological plan priorities were summarized:

- Species (landbird) Prioritization Efforts;
- Identification of Landbird Population Objectives; and
- Identification of Important Habitats or Habitat Objectives.

The programs and initiatives considered during this first effort were:

- NHIC Syntheses
- Wild Species 2000
- COSEWIC / Species at Risk
- Big Picture Initiatives
- Great Lakes Conservation Blueprint Project
- Important Bird Areas
- All-Bird Planning Initiatives led by the Eastern Habitat Joint Venture
- Ontario Shorebird Conservation Plan
- BCR 13 PIF Efforts in Adjacent Jurisdictions
- PIF Efforts in Adjacent BCRs

Additional programs and initiatives that were suggested for future assessment/ incorporation included: the Algonquin to Adirondacks initiative; Fatal Lights Awareness Program; and the Ontario Lands for Life Initiative.

*Action Item:*

- *Update program linkage matrix as appropriate; consider other conceptual models to better illustrate cross-cutting nature of some initiatives like Eastern Habitat Joint Venture.*

## **5. Review of Ontario PIF Tasks and the Role of the Technical Advisory Committee**

***Objective: Obtain feedback regarding the Technical Advisory Committee terms of reference.***

The Ontario PIF tasks and the role of the Technical Advisory Committee were quickly reviewed.

**Key Tasks:**

- Identifying priority landbird species
- Identifying important (priority) habitats for landbirds
- Identifying population and habitat objectives.

**Committee Role:**

- Evaluate and agree on methods and scores for biological assessment of landbirds, selection of priority species, focal species and habitats;
- Evaluate, discuss and agree on methods for defining population objectives for landbirds in Ontario, and for determining habitat (or other) targets;
- Organize and lead technical aspects of workshops designed to generate broader input from other interested parties;
- Review draft BCR biological plans, and any reviews of these plans, and reach consensus on underlying assumptions, presentation of technical material, strategies and recommendations for action;
- Link PIF landbird planning to other relevant conservation plans and initiatives in Ontario and neighbouring jurisdictions;
- Advise on communication materials for PIF Ontario, on partnership-building and fund-raising in support of the program, and on opportunities/strategies for implementation of landbird plans in the context of joint ventures and other initiatives.

The Advisory Committee was in general agreement with the tasks and roles presented. Subsequent discussion dealt mostly with the composition of the Technical Advisory Committee and determining when / how to involve key stakeholders and decision-makers not yet represented. The current stakeholder participation strategy involved inviting individuals and groups to become involved at one of three levels:

- Receipt of information only – newsletters and other information items
- Review of draft plans and receipt of newsletters
- Active participation in technical advisory meetings, review of draft plans, and receipt of newsletters.

*Action Items:*

- *Participation and level of involvement by key stakeholders will be monitored in an effort to ensure substantive engagement as appropriate.*
- *FON to provide assistance as appropriate with efforts to better involve Ontario municipalities.*

## **6. Priority Landbird Species in Ontario BCR 13**

***Objective: to reach consensus on priority species for Ontario's portion of BCR 13.***

A draft priority species list was presented to the Technical Advisory Committee (Table 1), along with information explaining the species assessment factors and the criteria used to develop the priority list. A more detailed list containing the scores associated with each species assessment factor was distributed prior to the workshop and will also be included as part of the completed plan. (A version incorporating the refinements made at the workshop, and noted below, will be distributed soon).

The list is organized according to the five tiers utilized in PIF planning efforts throughout North America to show why a species was placed on the list. These tiers include:

## Priority Species Pool

### Tier 1: Continental Importance (NA Plan)

A – High Regional Importance (Area Importance = 3)

B – Low Regional Importance (Area Importance = 2)

### Tier 2: Regional Concern (Score = 15)

A – Regional Declines (Area Importance + Population Trend = 8)

B – Regional High Responsibility (Area Importance = 5)

C – Regional Threats (Threats Breeding / Threats Non-breeding = 4)

### Tier 3: Regional Stewardship (High % of population)

### Tier 4: Federally Listed

### Tier 5: Provincial or State Listed

**Table 1: Summary of Draft PIF Priority Species in BCR 13 (as presented at workshop – revisions to follow)**

	Season	Score	Comments
<b><i>I.A. Continental Importance, High Regional Responsibility (AI = 3)</i></b>			
Henslow's Sparrow	Br	19	PIF Continental Watch List
Short-eared Owl	Wi	18	PIF Continental Watch List
Golden-winged Warbler	Br	17	PIF Continental Watch List
Blue-winged Warbler	Br	16	PIF Continental Watch List & Stewardship Species
Cerulean Warbler	Br	16	PIF Continental Watch List & Stewardship Species
Wood Thrush	Br	14	PIF Continental Watch List & Stewardship Species
Yellow-throated Vireo	Br	14	PIF Stewardship Species
Willow Flycatcher	Br	13	PIF Continental Watch List
Indigo Bunting	Br	10	PIF Stewardship Species
<b><i>I.B. Continental Importance, Low Regional Responsibility (AI = 2)</i></b>			
Red-headed Woodpecker	Br, Wi	16, 15	PIF Continental Watch List
Short-eared Owl	Br	15	PIF Continental Watch List
Canada Warbler	Br	15	PIF Continental Watch List
Prairie Warbler	Br	14	PIF Continental Watch List & Stewardship Species
Bay-breasted Warbler	Br	14	PIF Continental Watch List & Stewardship Species
Worm-eating Warbler	Br	14	PIF Continental Watch List & Stewardship Species
Louisiana Waterthrush	Br	14	PIF Stewardship Species
Eastern Towhee	Br	14	PIF Stewardship Species
Red-shouldered Hawk	Br	13	PIF Stewardship Species
Acadian Flycatcher	Br	13	PIF Stewardship Species
White-throated Sparrow	Wi	11	PIF Stewardship Species
Rusty Blackbird	Br	11	PIF Stewardship Species
Hooded Warbler	Br	10	PIF Stewardship Species
Red-bellied Woodpecker	Br, Wi	9, 10	PIF Stewardship Species
<b><i>II.A. Regional Concern &amp; Decline (Score = 15 and AI + PT = 8)</i></b>			
Black-billed Cuckoo	Br	17	
Bobolink	Br	16	
Long-eared Owl	Wi	16	
Baltimore Oriole	Br	15	
Rose-breasted Grosbeak	Br	15	
Field Sparrow	Br	15	
Eastern Meadowlark	Br	15	
Belted Kingfisher	Br	15	
Northern Flicker	Br	15	
<b><i>II.B. Regional Concern &amp; High Responsibility (Score = 15 and AI = 5)</i></b>			
<b><i>II.C. Regional Concern &amp; Threats (Score = 15 and TB/TN = 4)</i></b>			
Northern Harrier	Br	15	
<b><i>IV. Federally Listed (either Canada or U.S.)</i></b>			
Kirtland's Warbler	Br	20	

Bicknell's Thrush	Br	17
Loggerhead Shrike	Br, Wi	14, 12
Prothonotary Warbler	Br	14
Northern Bobwhite	Br, Wi	13
Red-shouldered Hawk	Wi	12
Yellow-breasted Chat	Br	12
Bald Eagle	Br, Wi	11, 10
Barn Owl	Br, Wi	10
Peregrine Falcon	Br, Wi	9
<b><i>V.A. Provincially Listed (Ontario)</i></b>		
Golden Eagle	Wi	12
Great Gray Owl	Br, Wi	11
<b><i>V.B. State Listed (either Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio)</i></b>		
Long-eared Owl	Br	15
Sharp-shinned Hawk	Br, Wi	14, 13
Northern Goshawk	Br, Wi	14
Whip-poor-will	Br	14
Sedge Wren	Br	13
Vesper Sparrow	Br	13
Grasshopper Sparrow	Br	13
Osprey	Br	12
Northern Harrier	Wi	12
Cooper's Hawk	Br, Wi	11
Common Nighthawk	Br	11
Lark Sparrow	Br	11
Yellow-bellied Sapsucker	Br, Wi	10, 8
Horned Lark	Br, Wi	10, 9

---

### ***Review of Species Assessment Factors and Refinements to Priority List:***

Time was spent discussing the species assessment factors and debating the merits of various modifications and additions or subtractions to the priority species list. The species assessment factors used in the PIF regional assessment process are as follows:

#### **Vulnerability:**

- global population size (PS),
- global breeding and non-breeding distribution (BD & ND);

#### **Concern:**

- regional population trend (PT),
- regional breeding and non-breeding population threats (TB & TN); and

#### **Regional Responsibility:**

- area importance (AI) e.g., the relative importance of BCR 13 to a species entire range.

These factors are then added together to generate a regional breeding score (PS+BD+PT+TB+AI<sub>B</sub>), and a regional wintering score (PS+ND+PT+TN+AI<sub>W</sub>) as listed above in the summary table.

Given that the BCR 13 Ontario landbird plan is a regional initiative, it was noted that scores (and the resulting species list) could be modified based on expert opinion. However, some participants noted that these adjustments needed to be made with care, since for the most part an objective priority setting process was being followed (except for threat scores) and to deviate too much would be paradoxical. It was suggested that at the very least the Committee needed to consider whether the Priority List contained species that captured the most pressing conservation issues facing BCR 13's landbirds. The main items covered during the ensuing discussion were:

1) Regional Population Trends, 2) Regional Breeding Threats, and 3) Area Importance. Discussion highlights and associated action items are as follows.

### **Population Trends:**

For the draft summary list, population trends for species in BCR 13 are based on BBS data starting in 1968. A score of 5 is indicative of a large decline (50% or more) while a score of 1 is indicative of a large increase (50% or more). Much of the discussion centered on how data from the current Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas could be used to inform the process. Although still early, the Atlas data are suggesting some broad-scale patterns. In particular, there appears to be an alarming decline in the distribution of aerial insect foragers (e.g., Common Nighthawk, Whip-poor-will, Purple Martin, swallows, swifts). There was also some discussion about the weighting of the PT score. Specifically, it was suggested that adequately monitored species with a score of “5” (a decline of 50% or more) should be added to the priority list.

### *Action Items:*

- *Cross reference Atlas data and BBS trend data to see whether the Population Trend score would be affected, and if so, whether the change would affect the priority species list.*
- *Identify critical science needs (including monitoring and science) in the Conservation Plan (aerial insectivore monitoring, understanding the decline in aerial insect foragers, climate change, etc.).*
- *Add Whip-poor-will to the priority list as an “Other Species of Regional Concern/Interest” to capture concern about decline in aerial insect foragers*
- *Review species with PT scores of 5 and explore whether there is merit in adding these species to the Ontario priority list.*

### **Threat Scores:**

It was noted that regional breeding and non-breeding threats for BCR 13 had been assigned by experts from outside Ontario as part of PIF species assessment scoring and that it might be appropriate for Ontario experts to vet the scores. Even though the adjustment of the threat scores for the Ontario portion of the BCR would rarely result in substantive changes to species priority, the merits of ensuring a complete and accurate data set were noted. The threat scores (ranging from scores of 1 to 5) are based on future expected conditions with the scoring criteria being as follows:

- 1 – Conditions expected to improve (e.g., enhanced by human activities);
- 2 – Conditions expected to remain stable;
- 3 – Conditions expected to decline slightly to moderately;
- 4 – Conditions expected to deteriorate strongly; or
- 5 – Conditions expected to deteriorate (extreme or major range contractions).

Much of the discussion focused on appropriateness of threat scores for forest species with the majority having been assigned a score of “2”. It was noted that the challenge was to maintain a BCR-wide perspective. Although in some areas forest fragmentation may still be occurring, in other areas lands are reverting back to forest. It was decided that a subgroup would review the threat scores for forest species and provide recommended changes and associated rationale.

There was also discussion about whether agricultural species were being scored adequately. Although the majority of the species have been assigned a score of “3” (i.e., conditions expected to decline slightly to moderately) it was noted that the impacts of “industrialized” agriculture need to be considered in addition to the natural succession of marginal farmland back to forest. The Technical Steering Committee recommended that the Threat Score for Northern Bobwhite should be increase from “3” to “4”. A number of people remarked that the Northern Bobwhite has virtually disappeared from Ontario and is now pretty well restricted to Walpole Island and the mainland immediately adjacent to the island (within 20 km). As with forest species, it was decided that workshop participants would review the list and submit recommended revisions along with associated rationale.

*Action Items:*

- *Forest species threat scores to be reviewed by a working group of D. Burke, K. Lindsay, and L. Friesen.*
- *Grassland species threat scores to be reviewed by K. Lindsay.*
- *Northern Bobwhite threat score to be increased from a “3” to a “4”.*
- *Threat scores for Barn Owl and Long-eared Owl to be reviewed; Don Sutherland to provide recommended adjustments and associated rationale?*
- *Any other suggested adjustments to threat scores should be forwarded to P. Blancher with a short rationale for the changes.*
- *Need to recognize and incorporate connections to U.S. Wintering Threats.*

**Area Importance:**

For the draft summary list, Area Importance scores are based on BCR wide calculations. Although there was some discussion as to whether the scores should be recalculated to encompass only the Ontario portion of BCR 13, the decision was made to retain the scores at the BCR-wide level. However, for the purposes of an Ontario BCR 13 Priority list, species not occurring in Ontario’s portion are to be removed (e.g., Bicknell’s Thrush, Rusty Blackbird, and possibly Worm-eating Warbler), with the exception of endangered species like Kirtland’s Warbler, which may require future management action depending on their status.

*Action items:*

- *Area Importance scores will relate to entire BCR*
- *Species not present within Ontario portion of BCR 13 will be removed from the Priority List*
- *Endangered species not currently present in Ontario (but for which future management actions may be appropriate, e.g., Kirtland’s Warbler) will be retained on the list*
- *Provincially listed species will be retained on the Ontario Priority list, but State listed species (Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Vermont) will only appear in an appendix to the Plan*
- *A Priority List for ALL of BCR 13 (to allow for cross referencing with other jurisdictions) will be included as an Appendix in the completed plan.*

## 7. Important (Priority) Habitats for Landbirds, Ontario BCR 13

### Objectives:

- reach consensus on priority habitat types
- reach consensus on level of specificity required for planning.

As a starting point, participants were presented with the suite of priority landbird habitats as identified at the BCR 13 All-Bird planning meetings held in 2001. At those meetings, three priority habitats were identified:

- Grassland,
- Shrub / early Successional, and
- Deciduous Forest.

Other important habitats that were discussed at those meetings included: Open Water, Emergent Marsh, Mixed Forest, Artificial Cover, and Fen/Bog. Justification for the three priority habitats was based on the number of priority species utilizing them, and the expectation that other bird initiatives would address priority wetland species.

The Technical Advisory Committee was asked to comment on the appropriateness of these habitat groupings in an effort to develop consensus about which habitats are priorities for conservation planning. Discussion topics ranged from availability of habitat data to implement various planning and management efforts to the appropriateness of expanding or narrowing the habitat categories. General action items arising from the discussion are as follows:

### *Action Items:*

- *Use broad habitat definitions for planning at the BCR-wide scale, but more specific sub-habitats need to be considered during implementation.*
- *Provide an appendix to illustrate how the Plan's broad habitat definitions link to Ecological Land Classification Units; ELC mapping is being increasingly utilized for land use planning. Managers need to see how fine scale efforts contribute to large scale objectives.*
- *Members of the Technical Advisory Committee to identify sources of habitat trend information in BCR 13 (for the purposes of comparing species trends to habitat trends) and forward this information to P. Blancher.*
- *Habitat information utilized for the plan should be based (or linked at the very least) to the Provincial Land Cover Classification System (GIS layers available through OMNR). The plan should also allow for direct links to the developing Southern Ontario Land Resource Information System (SOLRIS).*

After discussion, the Technical Advisory Committee recommended the following priority habitat framework:

- Grassland
- Shrub-early Successional
- Forest
- Shoreline and

- Wetland.

Specific discussion items related to this framework are as follows:

- *Regarding Grasslands, care needs to be taken in terms of distinguishing between “agricultural” grasslands and “native” grasslands. Management actions for these grassland types are obviously significantly different. In terms of the priority species identified, agricultural grasslands need attention if trends are to be reversed.*
- *Care also needs to be taken to distinguish between “intensive” agricultural systems (e.g., corn/soybean rotation), and “less-intensive” agricultural systems (e.g., hayfields, fallow lands).*
- *Important to consider different Grassland habitat types (e.g., long grass/meadow and short grass/pasture) and various successional stages.*
- *Consider “Forest” to be the priority habitat. “Deciduous Forest” is too narrow as a priority habitat association for most of Ontario BCR 13 and would exclude large areas of Mixed Forest habitat (especially in the north and east). Although Mixed Forest could be considered as a separate habitat association, the Technical Advisory Committee felt that little would be gained given the suite of priority landbird species that had been identified (i.e., very few are mixed forest specialists).*
- *Important to consider specific habitat types within “Forest” associations. In particular:*
  - *Mature, closed canopy forest;*
  - *Mature forest with gaps and openings; and*
  - *Swamp forest/riparian areas/ravines.*
- *Within "Wetland" habitats, it is important to consider "Marsh" as a sub-habitat and to include an "Other Wetland" sub-category to capture fens, bogs and other wetland types that are of general conservation interest, but which are relatively rare in the BCR13 landscape.*
- *Recommendations regarding wetland habitats and associated species should be cross referenced with the shorebird and waterfowl plans. It will be particularly useful to identify wetland-associated landbird species, since these species may benefit from wetland projects supported by the North American Wetland Conservation Act (NAWCA).*
- *Open Water should be renamed “Shoreline” since the landbird conservation interest is not pelagic species or bay ducks, but rather those species that make extensive use of shoreline habitats during various stages of their life-cycle (either breeding or migration concentrations). Emphasis to be placed on natural habitats along shorelines.*

- *Artificial Cover won't be treated as a separate priority habitat in the conservation plan.*

## **8. Population and Habitat Objectives**

***Objective: to work toward consensus on an approach to setting population and habitat objectives.***

Considerations regarding population and habitat objectives were summarized in a presentation by Pete Blancher. Key considerations highlighted were as follows:

1) Is the Overall Vision / Goal:

Distribution, diversity and abundance of native populations and habitats are sustained at current levels or recovered to recent historical levels

*Or is it...*

Viable populations of all native landbird species are sustained in Ontario BCR13

2) Why do we need population objectives?

- Marketing tools to motivate action
- Performance indicators
- Basis of establishing other program objectives such as habitat objectives

3) Useful objectives are:

- Easy to communicate – understandable
- Easy to measure and assess progress
- Easily translated into action
- Linked to overall goal / vision

4) Time Frame

- Current or historic (i.e., 1960s/1970s re NAWMP, PIF)
- Based on habitat history (e.g., 1960 in southwest, 1980 in Prairie, current in Boreal, Taiga and Arctic).
- Exceptions for severe past declines? Or where not feasible to maintain current population? (e.g., eastern grasslands?)

4) Types of objectives:

- Numerical Population Targets
- Indices of Abundance
- Population Trends
- Distribution
- Demographic
- Multi-species

- Habitat.

Examples of how each of these objective “types” could be used in landbird planning context were also presented, with the strengths and weakness of each being discussed. Subsequently, participants were asked to express their comfort level regarding the various approaches:

Type of Objective	Positive Votes	Negative Votes
Numerical population targets	7	5
Indices of population abundance	2	1
Population trend objectives	14	0
Distribution	10	2
Demographic (productivity, survival)	2	0
Multi-species (guild)	5	0
Habitat 1 (based on species targets)	7	2
Habitat 2 (based on overall habitat)	14	0

As a whole the Technical Advisory Committee was most comfortable with Population Trend, Population Distribution and Habitat Objectives (based on overall habitat), with some support for multi-species objectives. Numerical Population Abundance Objectives received a mix of support and votes against, indicating some discomfort with these. There was recognition that different objective types would be required depending on the context of the management issue at hand.

In general terms, the following objectives were framed for birds in various habitat types:

- Wetland and Forest habitats – reversal of declining population trends observed in recent decades (through Breeding Bird Survey, Breeding Bird Atlas, etc.)
- Shrub and Grassland habitats – maintenance and/or stabilization of current populations (i.e., declining trends need to be stopped).
- More proactive efforts to be considered for certain species (e.g., Golden-winged Warbler).

There was discussion of setting population objectives below current population levels for shrub and grassland birds, recognizing that current declines are likely to continue before they can be stopped because of agricultural land use trends (i.e., agricultural land is being taken out of production and being allowed to revert back to forest), and to reflect a partial return to pre-settlement conditions for these birds. However, this idea received less support than stabilizing populations at current levels.

## 9. Other

### *Key Issues Affecting Birds*

It is likely that most important conservation issues faced by landbirds in BCR13 will be addressed through consideration of the priority species identified above. However, to be sure,

the group identified key issues affecting birds in southern Ontario and then grouped into the following broad categories.

- Habitat Loss (e.g., drainage, urbanization, agriculture intensification, fire suppression, forest fragmentation, migration area habitat, wintering area habitat);
- Habitat Degradation (e.g., deer / cattle browse, disturbance / recreation, poor silviculture, pesticides, decline of insects, climate change); and
- Other Issues (e.g., disease, invasive species, cats, competition from introduced species, radio and transmission towers).

Recommendations within the landbird plan need to address these key issues.

### ***Information Management Issues***

Information management was discussed, and in particular the importance of ensuring that information used to develop the plan was available to subsequent implementers of the plan was emphasized.

#### *Action Item:*

- *Ensure information management issues are addressed as part of the planning process.*

## **10. Participant Feedback**

At the conclusion of the workshop, participants were asked for feedback regarding the workshop process, adequacy of the background material, etc. to help inform planning efforts for future workshops. Comments include:

- Excel files should NOT be set up with multiple worksheets in one workbook since too many people overlooked them and were thus less prepared than they would have liked to have been.
- All presentations should be given at the start of the workshop so that discussions can be fully informed at the outset. It would also be helpful to return to the prepared material at regular intervals (or as necessary) to help keep discussions on track and to take full advantage of the prepared material.
- It would be useful to provide a list of issues ahead of the workshop so that participants can be more prepared to engage in discussion.
- Habitat trend data should be provided ahead of time, and be available as reference material during the workshop.
- Participants were not in favour of using breakout groups.
- For the BCR 8 / 12 workshops it would be useful to have forestry cut and burn maps available.
- As a whole, the group did not like voting. If votes were necessary, the preferred method involved outlining issues on paper with participants then expressing their preference with positive or negative votes.
- Prior to the workshop, the group thought it would be useful to have knowledge of issues they would be asked to vote on.

