

## US NABCI COMMITTEE – 24 MARCH 2000, CHICAGO

### Attendees:

Co-chairs – Jamie Clark, David Waller

Members - George Fenwick, Jim Kushlan, Gary Myers, Rollie Sparrowe, George Vandell, Alan Wentz, Scott Yaich

Alternates – Jon Andrew (for Stan Senner), Jack Capp (for Val Mezainis)

Coordinator – David Pashley

NGO Subcommittee report – Rollie Sparrowe, George Fenwick, Alan Wentz. Three meetings have been held, and the nature of the group is a work in progress. Differentiating between those issues on which the group can act as a whole and those on which the constituent organizations act independently is an important issue. Long and short-term funding needs and delivery of conservation in Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) are issues. A memo was sent to Federal Subcommittee asking for clarity in budget matters. Two short vision documents were distributed – review comments (on both text and how they should be used) should be sent to the NGO Subcommittee (either George Fenwick or David Pashley) by April 14. A packet of budget information from federal agencies is being compiled, and distributed to networks with hopes that recipients will help assist making those budgets a reality in appropriations. This is just a beginning, with interaction with the federal agency subcommittee a necessity in the near future. Vision documents will be tools in selling the NABCI vision to staffers in Congress.

Vision document – Scott Yaich. The March 20 draft that was distributed includes the few comments received in recent months. Biggest changes were in a strengthened international emphasis. The document is now in two parts, with an executive summary. The Central Flyway Council has approved the document, but is forwarding comments and concerns. George Vandell is not sure of input from the other Flyways, but will know on Monday. The next and final draft will at the least incorporate note of the Flyway Council structure. The vision document should be made more attractive and published. Jamie Clark volunteered USFWS to do this work, and her staff will work on a strategy to make this happen. Scott noted that other funding options from other groups are possible (Arkansas, Ducks Unlimited). A small group will strategize, with USFWS lead (Paul Schmidt). The Committee thanked Scott for his work.

Mapping Team Report – David Pashley. A draft final report from the Mapping Team was distributed. The Committee agrees that a final text should be printed with a final BCR map and widely distributed in order to both publicize NABCI and to replace the out-of-date map still being used by many in the “Proposed Framework” document. Comments are due on the text to David Pashley by April 5. Jon Andrew suggested producing the map as a poster, so that people can put in on walls. David P. will talk with Paul Schmidt and David Smith on a budget and means of producing either this or a booklet. Rex Johnson has an electronic version of the map. Stephen Brown noted that detailed maps of each BCR are available on the Manomet shorebird plan website, with ownership, habitats, etc. – [www.Manomet.org](http://www.Manomet.org) and follow directions to the shorebird plan (work was done by Rex Johnson; David Smith has this on CD for Committee members).

Federal Agency Subcommittee – Jamie Clark. Met last on March 6; also still feeling its way as a group. Agencies articulated greatest challenges facing birds and the needs faced by each agency to link its capabilities to bird conservation issues. It was a learning exercise in how to interact on these issues at this level. The NGO request for budget clarity was considered, and a group will get together to address this. A followup meeting is planned for April 4 to work on the issues developed in March. The tentative Spring Forum of agency heads has been cancelled, with a shorter meeting of bureau heads planned for some time after the April working meeting. Agency involvement is very positive, both in terms of NABCI and interagency interaction. The five areas that summarize the issues raised in the March meeting are habitat conservation (threats, landscapes, activities), conservation of populations and communities, monitoring and assessment (populations and habitats, as well as information management), partnerships, and outreach and inreach (including getting messages aligned on budgetary and other issues).

Monitoring Subcommittee – Marshall Howe. Terms of reference and other documents were distributed. The subcommittee decided to restrict its activities to monitoring, without broadening to include research activities. Composition of group: representatives from each of four bird initiatives plus USFWS and USGS.

Asked for appointment by the representative for each of these by NABCI Committee (David Pashley will solicit this from initiative representatives). A web-based migratory bird population and habitat data center was proposed that would take advantage of resources existing at Patuxent. The subcommittee requests support from USFWS and USGS in getting this data center started. Recent consultation with the Cornell Lab of Ornithology has resulted in a broader vision of the nature of the data center. Ken Williams noted USGS support of the initiative, and the capabilities that USGS has to support it. George Vandel noted that many states have good long-term data sets, particularly on game species; this sort of information is welcome in the national database. Marshall also distributed cost estimates of additional costs, over and above the amount now expended, needed to develop and implement complete monitoring programs for each of the four initiatives – total price tag is between \$5 and \$6 million. Scott Yaich noted that the monitoring needs from this subcommittee are not necessarily tracking the numbers in the recommended needs part of the Vision document, and requested inspection to assure consistency. David Smith asked whether numbers of dollars currently spent on monitoring are available; it would take some investigation to pull this together. Ken Williams expressed skepticism that the amount of money proposed could provide the scale and precision needed to understand the status of the avifauna of this nation. We need to be cautious about claiming what we would get for this amount of new money. The numbers expressed refer to a national level of needs, and not to what is needed at a BCR level, nor does it deal with monitoring of habitats. Paul Schmidt requested more rigorous treatment and precise description of this request by the Monitoring Subcommittee. The Bird Conservation Funding Committee should take these numbers and develop a strategy for raising that money.

International – David Pashley. A Puebla II meeting is being planned for the week of Nov. 13, 2000, in Mexico, probably in Morelia. The National Coordinators and CEC are working on this along with several JV Coordinators from the US and Canada. Current plans are to invite about 40 from each country, starting with the National Committees. Themes will be those issues most challenging from an international perspective. The G-9 and NABCI Coordinators will meet in Montreal on May 11-12 to advance plans for this meeting.

Forum for interaction among initiatives. A suggestion arose from the PIF meetings to begin holding a forum among participants in the four initiatives. This could invigorate a creative process focused on implementation, furthering the initiatives, and serving the national NABCI effort. The Committee agreed to promote this. Jim Kushlan suggested getting JV Coordinators involved in this. David Pashley will work with the four initiative representatives to arrange such a meeting in September in Indianapolis.

Next meeting – David Waller suggested that our next meeting be at the International meeting in Sept. David Waller will work with David Pashley on details for that meeting. The Committee reserves the opportunity to meet sooner if there is a need.