

**OR-WA PIF Meeting
Tues, Oct. 26, 2004, 11-4
McMenamins, The Edgefield**

Participants:

Paula Levin	USFWS	paula_levin@fws.gov
Barb Bresson-Kott	USFS-BLM	bkott@fs.fed.us
Mike Green	USFWS	Michael_green@fws.gov
Jerry Baker	NWC, Inc.	jbaker@ucinet.com
Joe LaTourrette	WDFW	latoujel@dfw.wa.gov
Jaime Stephens (Heinzelmann)	Klamath Bird Observatory	jlh@klamathbird.org
Joe Buchanan	WDFW	buchajbb@dfw.wa.gov
Howard L. Ferguson	WDFW	ferguhlf@dfw.wa.gov
Bob Altman	ABC	baltman@abcbirds.org
Aaron Holmes	PRBO Conservation Science	aholmes@prbo.org
Tim Cullinan	Audubon Washington	tcullinan@audubon.org
Don Norman	Seattle Audubon	donorman@aol.com
Pat Rasmussen	Chelan-Douglas Land Trust	patr@crwnet.com

11 am

Announcements and business -- Mike

A \$10 registration tax was levied against all participants, to pay for the room. Any leftover funds will go to pay for the new domain name of the OR-WA PIF website.

Jaime Stephens was welcomed as the new chair of OR-WA PIF, as I stepped down after 2 years in that role. Jaime comes to OR-WA PIF from the Klamath Bird Observatory, just finishing her Masters Thesis on the response of forest birds to different size patches left after logging operations in the Klamath-Siskiyou forests (under the tutelage of Stewart Janes, from Southern Oregon University, Ashland). Although relatively new to OR-WA PIF, she has for several years been indirectly involved through the activities of the Klamath Bird Observatory and the dynamism of John Alexander. The ever-present and effervescent Barb Bresson-Kott will continue as co-chair, and Aaron Holmes has agreed to assist Barb as an additional co-chair. We all look forward to the new energy this trio will bring to OR-WA PIF!

Upcoming (or recent) Meetings and Events

November 2-4, in Baker City. U.S. Forest Service, Forest Managers meeting.
Forest Plans are being renewed. Dan Casey is

Nov 2-3, Sagebrush Bird Conservation Network meeting in Olympia, WA. The meeting is full. More about this below....

- Nov. 15-16, California All-Bird Workshop. Sacramento, CA. This is one of the IAFWA sponsored meetings being held across the nation, state by state, to inform particularly State Wildlife agency participants about the recent directions in bird conservation by Partners in Flight, the shorebird and waterbird initiatives, and by waterfowl conservation planning efforts. Sessions will be based on biomes in California. PRBO is organizing. More info. at <http://www.prbo.org/calpif/workshop.htm>
- Nov. 18-19, 2004. Community and Corporate Wind Power in the Northwest: A Discussion of Wildlife, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics & Assessment Procedures. Columbia Gorge Discovery Center, The Dalles, OR.
- Nov. 17th, Oregon Habitat JV. The following from Bruce's most recent email -- November 17 at 10 am, Council Annex Room, Metro Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue Portland. -- "I haven't had a chance to put together the formal agenda yet but you can certainly expect some rehashing of the election outcomes and how that might affect our work, and some discussion about partners' plans for 2005, potential funding sources, and projects. As always, this is also just a good opportunity to connect with others involved in cooperative habitat conservation efforts and catch up on what everybody's up to. I will get a formal agenda out early in the week of November 8."
- Nov. 29-30, Oregon bird monitoring workshop. Corvallis, OR. This is also an IAFWA-sponsored event, roughly equivalent to the above meeting, but focused on monitoring only. IAFWA funding for these meetings expires at the end of the year, and this is what could be organized in a short time-frame. By invitation, hitting those most involved in different sorts of monitoring efforts in the State.

Web page & Newsletter

Coming soon, the new OR-WA PIF website. Aaron announced and demonstrated the new website. URL -- <http://www.orwapif.org>
As of Nov. 9 the link took you to the main CAIN server site. This will be remedied shortly, or perhaps by the time you read this. The biggest advantage of this site will be the availability of the 5 conservation plans as pdf files. Dan Barton (PRBO) built the site, and NBII is hosting it. Thanks to Aaron for organizing this, and to Dan Barton for putting the site together. Dan has agreed to maintain the site for two years. Email Dan with suggestions for site improvement when it becomes accessible on the web.

Newsletter: When Jenny Valdivia left the FWS this past summer, we were left without a newsletter editor. At Aaron Holmes' request, Cathy Flick has agreed to compile and edit the newsletter. Dan Barton has agreed to publish the next two issues. Thank you, Cathy and Dan! **Everyone please submit newsletter items to Cathy by November 25th.** cflick@fs.fed.us We'd like to have an issue out by the end of the year. Please make sure submissions are in pretty good shape in terms of editing, spell-checked, etc.

Logo: Mike sent two suggestions around the room for OR-WA PIF logo, one of a Varied Thrush and the other of the Vaux's Swift as the center of the logo. We decided on Varied Thrush as the bird. Mike is drafting a new Varied Thrush to sit in the center of the logo.

The International Migratory Bird Day (IMBD) theme for 2005 will be 'Collisions'. Bob Altman assured us that the graphic for this years IMBD would emphasize the positive rather than negative aspects of working to minimize collisions. More on that soon. Keep up to date by visiting the IMBD website...
<http://birds.fws.gov/imbd/>

Proceedings from the Jan. 2002 International PIF meeting at Asilomar, Monterey, CA will be out in Jan. It is about 1600 pp., and 2 volumes large. Mailed free to participants; a few hundred extra copies will be available (probably for just a short time).

North America Bird Conservation database, housed and maintained by the Rocky Mtn Bird Observatory, will be updated by the end of the month with newly-reviewed scores for all species. It will also include a species assessment database. Check the RMBO website <http://www.rmbo.org/pif/pifdb.html> Arvind Panjabi maintains this db.

PIF Continental Plan. It's been out for about a year, and has gotten quite a bit of review. Planning is beginning for the next issue, and discussions proceed on where to go from here. There is an independent review of the population estimation technique from BBS data (described in the plan) that will appear as a critique in The Auk, probably alongside an article describing the technique itself. The essence of the critique was favorable. The Blancher-Rosenberg model will likely be improved over time by refining some of the assumptions and adding additional correction factors.

Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act – **Proposals due Dec. 3rd**. Improvements in the act were proposed in a rider to a bill that modified the Migratory Bird Treaty Act Regulations – regulations that now protect Mute Swan would be rescinded, with additional language to exempt other non-native spp. from protections in the future. Proposed additions to the NMBCA on the rider are raising the cap to \$10 million in 2007, and to \$15 million in 2008 (current cap is \$5 million); relaxing the 3:1 match down to a 1:1 match, still cash however; and allowing grants to go to work in Canada (currently only allowed to U.S. and countries to our south). Bob is planning on submitting phase 2 proposal for his *Quercus* and *Aves* proposal, funded by the Neotrop. Act 2 (?) years ago. He offered his assistance to anyone wanting to put additional proposals together.

NAWCA Small Grants – Deadline is Dec. 3rd, same as for the Neotrop. Act this year. \$5 million available. Applications should have a 2:1 match, involve 3-4 partners. Land Trusts, small organizations, are often targets for funding. Contact for Washington is Joe LaTourrette (email above), and in Oregon contact Bruce Taylor (BTaylorwet@aol.com).

The Land Managers Guide to Oak Restoration and Habitat Management is in final layout mode, and might be available within a month or two. A Land Managers Guide for Young Conifer forests is in the beginning stages. Joan Hagar with USGS received some Neotrop Act funding, and will be asking for input review as she gets further along. The audience will be land trusts and watershed councils.

Paula Levin offered to distribute The Language of Conservation, TNC's guide to communicating the conservation message to the general public. (She did, and Mike forwarded this to all meeting participants. Contact either Michael_Green@fws.gov or Paula_Levin@fws.gov if you want a copy.)

Updates

Joe LaTourrette updated the group on the IWJV's all-bird plans. Dan Casey (BCR 10 Coordinator) is working for the JV developing the GIS base maps of Bird Conservation Areas for each State plan. Each State has somewhere between 25 and 50 areas designated. There are 43 in Washington. These are based on GAP data, and expert opinion drawing important areas on maps; for JV planning purposes this works well. TNC ecoregional maps weren't used because they will not be complete until 2006, have different objectives and inputs, and thus might not align with JV planning purposes.

Paula Levin asked – what public input and buy-in from the public has there been, and is there controversy from these BCA designations such as the FWS faces when proposing expanded refuge boundaries or having a hand in conservation on private lands. – Since JV's are non-regulatory organizations, with the general public making up their boards of directors, who establish JV priorities, they avoid this kind of criticism to a large degree, however never entirely.

Total acreage managed for conservation purposes will be one of the measurable objectives for Bird Conservation Areas. The hope is that all partners will be able to use these plans, not just for the JV. One purpose will be to use these plans as a tool for evaluating NAWCA proposals. Proposed projects could be more competitive if projects are in those bird conservation areas.

Joe Buchanan asked – how the Bird Conservation Areas are described, and whether they are based on current function or based on potential function after restoration/improvement? They are based on importance of area for 1) Migratory birds, 2) Degree of threat those areas face, 3) Opportunities for conservation, e.g. where money might be available for projects; and 4) Use by priority species. Priority species were derived from lists developed by many agencies, PIF, Audubon, WDFW, FS, everybody.

Check out the IWJV website for the latest State plan updates <http://www.iwlv.org/>

Joe LaTourrette showed a powerpoint on Washington's progress on the State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies (CWCS's). All states are producing CWCS's in order to keep receiving State Wildlife Grant \$\$ from the USFWS; plans are due to the FWS by Oct. 2005. There are 8 elements all CWCS plans must address: Distribution and abundance of species with small and declining populations; identification of habitats and their status; threats that spp. face; habitat threats; priorities for monitoring; plus others. WA is coordinating with the WA Diversity council, using sub-basin plans and ecoregional assessments from TNC, WDFW recovery plans, and gathering info. from other plans as well. Oregon is doing the same.

Species of concern addressed in the CWCS were assembled from many existing lists by other organizations. WA then ranked almost 700 species, terrestrial, aquatic, and marine and has had review from experts on different taxa. These lists will determine where WA puts funding over years. Conservation emphasis will be on the top 200 or so species. Some species on lists are indicators of certain habitats, but don't necessarily have declining populations. There are additional dimensions to this plan and overall planning, including the development/completion of ecoregional assessments, a biodiversity index for the State to be updated every 10 years, and an external advisory committee: made up of NGOs, private companies. Ecoregional assessments will be completed by end of 2005. Internal review is expected by end of Jan. Then review will go to regional offices; regional directors will bring in stakeholders from around region in Feb./March. Final production is planned for June, and available in Aug. The size is expected to be about 80 pp., plus appendices for various lists. Washington is coordinating their CWCS with Oregon, Idaho. U.C. Davis is developing the plan in CA, coordinating huge public meetings all over state -- 12 FTE's working full time. For additional info., check out: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/wlm/cwcs>

Bob Altman, in Holly Michael's absence, gave brief update on the bird aspect of Oregon's CWCS. Basically, the process is similar to WA's. Over 200 species have ended up on the list, divided up by ecoregions. Seven criteria were used to rank species for inclusion on the list, the usual sorts: declining populations, degree of habitat loss, is the range small and disjunct, threats to population, etc. A species made it on the list if it scored 3 out of 7 criteria. Number of species on the lists varied, but approximately 12 for the Willamette, Rogue, Umpqua valleys, 8 for Blue Mtns, etc. Recommendations for land management came straight from the OR-WA PIF bird conservation plans. The next challenge will be to merge those recommendations with those for all other critters in given habitats.

WWG meeting update – in Pacific City, Oct 6-8, 2004. The focus of this meeting continued the new emphasis of the WWG, which is to include the other bird conservation initiatives – shorebirds, waterbirds, and waterfowl. The theme was Coastal, with the first day devoted to Black Oystercatchers. Attendees from Alaska, BC, WA, OR, and CA presented the latest on research and monitoring of Black Oystercatchers, a Bird of Conservation Concern (USFWS), given High Concern status in the U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan. Future research directions, and possible funding mechanisms for research and monitoring were discussed. The second day began with a combined shorebird/other-bird meeting, with updates on waterbird planning efforts in the western region. Oystercatcher folks split off into a separate room for the rest of their agenda, while the rest of the WWG meeting proceeded with examples from a variety of coastal and inland conservation and research projects. The early afternoon was devoted to a variety of important updates from PIF at the National level, and the late afternoon session began our discussion of the latest efforts to derive population and habitat objectives. This theme continued on the final morning, with the group finally coming to some agreement about the process – steps – involved in deriving population and ultimately habitat objectives. In general, we came to agreement about the types of data that could be used at various steps in the process, and the ultimate goal of these sorts of calculations. Meeting notes were mailed out by Carol Beardmore Nov. 2, and should be consulted for more information. Email requests for meeting notes to carol_beardmore@fws.gov

Black Swifts: Bob Altman reported on 2004 results. Approx. 125 people participated in northern CA, OR, WA, BC, and AK, somewhat fewer than in 2003. Together they visited about 100 falls, and identified swifts at 25 -- 20 were unknown or unconfirmed before that. Presence is a good indicator of nesting. Assumption is that presence = nesting. FS in AK had funding, and contributed to staff time in both years. It is tricky in AK, getting close to falls. AK has about 60 sightings. Southeastern AK is about the northern extent of range. Might be done with survey as of this year, but Bob is not sure. Turn out this year was not as good as in 2003, perhaps because Bob didn't remind people. There is a web page with a long URL. **To Do:** Bob, send weblink to Aaron for new orwapif.org webpage.

High elevation on the Okanogan, Barb Bresson-Kott. 2004 was the 3rd year of data collection. 2002 was the 1st year, mostly setting up the project. In year 2 there was a fire that limited access. Data collection will continue in 2005, including veg. There is no regional funding, so this project operated by use of money from the Forest. Bob suggested that funding this project could come through a link with climate change, and then expanded to a west-wide monitoring of alpine birds, not just in OR and WA. Bob has a pretty good start on a proposal, but is not interested in taking it on in terms of leadership. National PIF identified high elevation surveys as one of 8 high priority bird monitoring projects. Ptarmigan, rosy finches, HOLA's, American pipits would be the focus. The proposal would be for multiple years, 3 years baseline, with veg. monitoring, re-sampled periodically down the road. Using pt. counts and transects with distance for target spp. 7,000 ft. elevation and up. [Or, from the alpine/subalpine boundary up. This occurs at about 10,500 – 11,000 ft. in southern Sierra.] BLM has opportunities for funding, but not much alpine habitat, except for Steens. Tim Cullinan reported that flexibility; re: year of monitoring should be a part of protocol – e.g. when extra heavy snow year makes access to high country really difficult. Don Norman suggested asking for 4 years of \$\$ rather than just 3.

Slender-billed White-breasted Nuthatch, Bob Altman. The PCJV provided \$\$ for studying the feasibility of re-introducing slender-billed w-br. nuthatches in WA. Why did it disappear? Gary Slater (Ecostudies Institute) has worked on reintroducing brown-headed nuthatch and eastern bluebird to parts of FL, and is doing the assessment for this reintroduction.

Sagebrush Bird Conservation Network, Aaron Holmes. The SBCN is everyone connected with data collection on shrubsteppe. Visit the (not quite available) website at www.sagebrushbird.org. It will have many links, publications, etc. There is an interactive map with shrubsteppe bird study sites from across the west -- 310 in all. Data from those studies entered into a database, and certain levels of information are available on 30 species of birds. Aaron is hoping to double the number of study sites within a month as researchers continue to contribute data for the database, particularly from ID, UT, & WY. And Aaron will make funding available for those who enter data. Website also putting up free photos in a gallery to be used as needed for shrubsteppe presentations.

Cathy Flick updates, via Aaron Holmes. All of the Columbia Basin was assessed for restoring habitats. Many birds used for riparian objectives. PIF plans are being used as model for planning. **[Who?]**

Wind Turbine development in Klickitat Co. is controversial. The Columbia Hills site is an IBA for wintering raptors. Tim Cullinan conveyed that the boundaries on that project are drawn big, so there are areas within the overall boundary that have high densities of raptors and some parts that don't have many. Audubon has been in discussions with the County about how to draw the overlay zone to minimize impacts with wintering raptors; Audubon is encouraging the County to

set up incentives to develop areas away from bird use areas. Howard Ferguson weighed in that WDFW also provides incentives, a mitigation rate if there are species of concern that might be affected. Also, WDFW gets to review only if the size of the project exceeds 350 MW.

Tim Cullinan mentioned that there is talk at the National level of setting up a revolving bird impact assessment fund. This would provide funding to power companies to hire consultants for pre-construction surveys. If risks are to wildlife from a proposed development are too high, and the development is nixed as a result, then the developer would not have to pay off the pre-construction survey loan. If built there, then they would have to pay off an assessment. This reduces the risk of tower developers in evaluating sites to assess impacts, and encourages pre-construction surveys.

Jerry Baker weighed in regarding the stateline, Vancycle, and Nine Canyon projects. Siting is the most important issue. Pre-construction surveys help identify micro-siting issues, raptor nests, pass-through areas, migration routes. Karen Kronner and other consultants make their living now consulting on wind power projects in the west, and are good at negotiating with companies and making siting recommendations. Bat mortality is the next big issue. Wind developments in the East along the Appalachian chain have killed thousands of bats, might be as significant in the west, but many fewer found in west so far. A meeting Nov. 2-5 in West Virginia will present the latest in bat and bird research and their response to lights, blade rotation, sonar use during migration, etc.

Note meeting, Nov 18-19, at the Columbia Gorge Discovery Center, The Dalles, OR: *Community and Corporate Wind Power in the Northwest: A Discussion of Wildlife, Cultural Resources, Aesthetics and Assessment Procedures* For more information or to register contact CGEI via email: info@gorgeecology.org, or phone 541-387-2274.

Cathy Flick reports through Aaron, continued. Sandy R. delta point counts will be reinstated to monitor bottom land hardwoods, from reed canary grass to gallery forest. Oak thinning and pine-fir removal from oak areas is planned for 25,000 ha over the next 10 years in the Scenic Area. Should there be some bird monitoring associated with this project? Contact Cathy Flick for more info.

Migration Monitoring Network – Jaime Stephens. The objective is to promote cooperation to understand migration. Multiple species and habitats will be served. KBO has one of densest networks in the world. Origins: In 1994 at a US/Canada meeting of the Joint Council, 5 members each from the U.S. and Canada, produced proposals and protocols for a migration monitoring network; CJ was primary mover and author. Additional meetings followed in the US. Implementation has been a challenge. Major partners are Cornell, the Institute for Bird Populations, and the Canadian migration monitoring network. The objectives are to study the importance of stopover habitats as critical and

generally overlooked aspects of migratory bird's natural history; monitor trends, particularly for northern breeders where BBS doesn't go; develop a cooperators network; archive data from migration monitoring stations – CJ estimates that 10% of migration bird banding data is lost; make data available. Migration monitoring is one of the top initiatives needed in Nation according to the PIF Science Support Team. Some money is being made available from BLM's DC and OR state office, for a part-time position working for the Klamath Bird Observatory at the Redwood Sciences Lab, Arcata – initial work will focus on database and archiving issues, and developing and publicizing protocols, procedures and standards for all. On the 3rd week in Oct. there was a meeting at the RSL, with Tom Fredericks from Cornell to discuss database issues. Current thinking is to put these data into a larger network, the Avian Knowledge Network, at present in conceptual form, but designed to be a great tool for data storage and analysis, etc. This is being developed through a partnership, with Cornell as one of the participants. Huge grant to develop. It could eventually include BBS, everything.

Chelan-Douglas Land Trust – Pat Rasmussen. The CDLT was making progress developing on the ground conservation easements with private landowners, but then the County Commissioners were not keen on Federal money being used to set aside land. This slowed down their progress. There was a meeting recently with commissioners, and the CDLT received an extension on their Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act grant for a year to push through more initiatives. Good news was the increased attention at their Spring Leavenworth Bird Fest – doubled in size this year (satisfying the educational outreach part of grant). Displayed t-shirt (available on the web). Those who buy shirt get pamphlet as well. Education will support effort to convince private landowners to conserve habitat. There are some of matching funds in the County from the State from conservation easements for salmon recovery. Money in the County is for conservation easements, and is being used, but they are slow to develop. The Bird Fest has received a lot of great press coverage. Chelan Co. is one County in the State most opposed to growth management – 70% Federal land. Slowly, they are now realizing that wilderness stimulates economy in area. Check out <http://www.leavenworthspringbirdfest.com/>

Washington Important Bird Areas – Tim Cullinan. IBA's are worldwide. They are the most critical sites for bird conservation in World. Audubon is active developing IBA's in about 40 states. They are similar to the JV effort Joe LaTourrette has already presented, but focused at a smaller scale. IBA's are designated on the basis of the birds that use them – bird resources. If the numbers of birds meet or exceed certain criteria, then the site is designated an IBA. 18 months ago the criteria changed as the result of a meeting with Birdlife International. Sites are now selected by a nomination process, which goes to a Statewide committee, an expert team. The WA team is made up of some employees of the WA Dept. of Natural Resources, WDFW, etc. They help develop criteria, review nominations, and designate sites. At a July meeting, they adopted new criteria for sites that qualify as IBA's of global or continental significance. Statewide significance

criteria are still being developed. 58 sites in state are IBA's but some of those were designated under the old criteria and need to be reassessed. Next steps: Develop statewide criteria and finish identifying sites. Then, develop site conservation plans for each IBA. Pilot conservation plans will begin this spring, and will be similar to Canada's. Canada established priorities for sites, gathering together stakeholders to decide on priorities and implement plans. Tim will get help to work with local stakeholders to implement plans.

WA Audubon's *State of Birds Report* (May 2004) became a model nationally. It's a public outreach document to publicize common birds most in need of conservation. Based on other such published lists, then 90+ species were prioritized by a committee. The final product, State of the Birds report, was really successful. National Audubon is having Greg Butcher do one based on this model. The last issue of Audubon had a State of the Birds article.

WA Birding Trails – Tim Cullinan. WA Audubon is working on their 3rd trail, this one on the Olympic Peninsula. And another loop, from Vancouver to mouth of Columbia, to Grays Harbor, to I-5 corridor.

OR Birding Trail update – Bob Altman. Next in line in Oregon will be a Basin and Range Trail, with BLM leading the charge. Also, the coast will be working on three, starting along the north coast. Oregon State Parks is taking the lead for that. All local efforts coordinated under umbrella statewide group that set up standards, including image, format for brochure, etc.

Partners for Fish and Wildlife – Paula Levin. USFWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program and Coastal Program were presented by Amy Horstman at the last Edgefield meeting. This presentation amplified Amy's theme of what opportunities there are within the FWS to fund on-the-ground projects and link to other partners. (Handout list of contacts for Coastal and Partners for Fish and Wildlife). It is not as hard to get funding in the OR-WA Coastal program as it is in some other national funding programs. In the future it might be more difficult. If proposals fall into priority habitat areas then there is a better chance of getting funding. (Handouts for requests for proposals for Coastal and Partners programs). In the Coastal Program, money can go to work on private or Federal land, and can have many partners. Private lands are focus for Partners for Fish and Wildlife program. OR Fish and Wildlife put together Q&A for how to engage in Partners for FW program. And HO for Puget Sound (3 more HOs). In comparison to the Partners for F&W money, money for Coastal program projects can go toward more kinds of work, and include education, monitoring, assistance, and other components. RFPs put out around January – Feb. review. Staff in both programs help proponents develop proposal better. Selection process bet. April and June – obligation in June, may not get funding until July, Aug., Sept.

Find information at the National website for the Partners for Fish and Wildlife program, under the www.fws.gov/fisheries website, under Habitat Conservation <http://fisheries.fws.gov/FWSMA/index.htm>. Or, contact Paula_levin@fws.gov

Partners for Fish and Wildlife can work way into interior. The WA Puget sound program has about 100 – 150K per year. Partners for F&W has about 250k per year for on-the-ground work. OR Programs: mid-coast ca. 100K. Col. Estuary program 180K. P for F&W for OR and WA. Combined about 300-400K to play with. The FWS tries to leverage those dollars. Even small amounts can be requested, particularly as seed \$\$ for larger projects later.

Setting population and habitat objectives – Bob Altman. This is the direction for PIF and other bird conservation initiatives, driven in part by need for measurable outcomes by Federal agencies. Also, objective setting has worked in the waterfowl realm for years. And, shorebird and waterbird initiatives have used population objectives. Everyone in the PIF realm is pretty much in agreement re: the process. Assess the landscape for available habitat – a GIS exercise; refine bird-habitat relationship models; merge those together; estimate densities of birds in landscape; multiply out to see how many you have. Then set some objective for increase or keep stable based on past trends. Then the question is, what do you want? Acres or miles of more habitat? Improve what you have? Then you look for opportunities to implement. The problems with this approach are limitations in the data and the assumptions in the models to derive population estimates. The appeal is that eventually we will be able to evaluate NAWCA and similar proposals as to how many birds they are likely to produce based on these previous calculations. This is already being done in California in riparian systems.

Pat Rasmussen: Susanne Cramer, a student at Evergreen, is doing research on Black oil sunflower seeds and the pesticides that are used on them, for her Master's Thesis. Birds exposed to those pesticides might die or suffer adverse behavioral effects. Contact Pat if you have any information on this topic.

... and

The shade-grown coffee campaign really took off in Leavenworth as a result of the Birdfest and Pat's efforts. Pat found 18 establishments in Leavenworth serving it. There was a swell of interest in Leavenworth to buy and serve it. Check out the Audubon website.

Education and Outreach: Jaime is soliciting ideas for outreach materials that ORWAPIF could use to promote bird conservation more effectively – handouts, pamphlets, and other items. An added bonus of having Jaime as Chair is her link to KBO and their growing staff; currently that includes the multi-talented Melissa Pitkin, now completing a Master's Degree in Environmental Education at Southern Oregon University. Jaime is soliciting ideas for outreach materials, and we should take advantage of this while Melissa is a part of KBO.

Our next meeting will likely be theme-oriented, and planning is going on with California PIF to hold a combined meeting focused on population and habitat objectives for forest birds, in April. More on that later.

We should make an effort to track in some way who is using the Bird Conservation Plans, and how useful they are. We've tried in the past but need to stream-line the tracking process. The suggestion in this meeting was for people to start collecting this sort of information on their own, to be put into some database or spreadsheet at a future date.

Done by 4 pm.