

PRIORITY SPECIES POOL

From among the breeding avifauna, a pool of species may be derived that represents priorities for conservation action within the physiographic area. Note that a species may be considered a priority for several different reasons, including global threats to the species, high concern for regional or local populations, or responsibility for conserving large or important populations of the species. The different reasons for priority status are represented by levels or tiers. Our primary means of prioritizing species is through the PIF prioritization scores generated by Colorado Bird Observatory (Hunter et al. 1993, Carter et al. 2000). This system ranks species according to seven measures of conservation vulnerability. These include four global measures (i.e., they do not change from area to area), as well as threats to breeding populations (TB), area importance (AI), and population trend (PT), which are specific to each physiographic area. A total rank score is then derived, which is a measure of overall conservation priority.

Explanations of the tiers, or entry levels into the Priority Species Pool are as follows:

- I. High overall (global) priority** -- species scoring = 22 in the PIF prioritization system. Indicates high vulnerability of populations throughout the species range, irrespective of specific status in this physiographic area. Species without manageable populations in the area (peripheral) are omitted.
- II. High physiographic area priority** -- species scoring 19-21 in the PIF system, with either (IIa) AI + PT = 8 or (IIb) a high percentage of the global population breeding in the physiographic area. Tier IIa indicates species that are of moderately high global vulnerability, and with relatively high abundance and/or declining or uncertain population trend in the physiographic area. Tier IIb signifies that the area shares in responsibility for long-term conservation of those species, even if they are not currently threatened. Percent of population is calculated from percent of range area, weighted by BBS relative abundance (see Rosenberg and Wells 1999). A disproportionately high percentage of global population is determined by considering the size of each physiographic area relative to the total land area of North America, south of the open boreal forest.
- III. Additional Watch List** -- species on PIF's national Watch List that did not already meet criteria I or II. Watch List species score = 20 (global scores only), or 18-19 with PT = 5. These species are considered to be of high conservation concern throughout their range, even in areas where local populations may be stable or not severely threatened.
- IV. Additional listed** -- species on federal, provincial, or state endangered, threatened, or special concern lists that did not meet any of above criteria. These are often rare or peripheral populations.
- V. Local concern** -- species of justifiable local concern or interest. May represent a geographically variable population or be representative of a specific habitat of conservation concern.

Species that are federally or state listed are noted on the Priority Species Pool by country and/or state using the following codes: E = Endangered, T = Threatened, SC = Special Concern, V = Vulnerable.

Note: the Priority Species Pool and Priority Habitat-suites are excerpted from the associated Physiographic Area Plan.

Priority species pool for Area 18 (updated 8/2000). PIF regional and global scores from CBO (Carter et al. 2000). Percent of population calculated from percent of range area, weighted by BBS relative abundance (see Rosenberg and Wells 1999).

Entry level	Species	Total score	% of pop.	AI	PT	Local status ^a
I						
	Piping Plover (US-E)	28	< 1?	2	5	B (ext)
	Henslow's Sparrow (CAN-E,NY-T)	27	< 1?	2	5	B
	Golden-winged Warbler (NY-SC)	24	7.7	4	1	B
	Cerulean Warbler (CAN-V, NY-SC)	24	< 1?	2	3	B
	American Woodcock	23	5.6	5	4	B
	Upland Sandpiper (NY-T)	23	2.2	3	5	B
	Sedge Wren (NY-T)	23	< 1	2	5	B
II						
a	Eastern Wood-pewee	21	2.3	4	5	B
	Brown Thrasher	20	1.2	3	5	B
	Killdeer	20	2.3	5	5	B
b	Bobolink	20	15.6	5	2	B
	Black-billed Cuckoo	19	5.2	5	2	B
	Veery	19	5.1	5	2	B
III						
	Canada Warbler	20	< 1	3	2	B
	American Black Duck	19	3.4	4	2	R?
	Black-throated Blue Warbler	19	1.8	2	1	B
	Wood Thrush	19	2.1	3	2	B
IV						
	American Bittern (NY-SC)	19	3.6	5	2	B
	Short-eared Owl (NY-E, CAN-V)	19	< 1	2	3	B
	Red-h. Woodpecker (CAN-V, NY-SC)	19	< 1	2	3	B
	Whip-poor-will (NY-SC)	19	< 1	2	3	B
	Peregrine Falcon (CAN,US-T, NY-E)	18	< 1	3	3	B
	Northern Harrier (NY-T)	18	1.5	4	2	B
	Sharp-shinned Hawk (NY-SC)	18	2.2	5	3	R
	Northern Goshawk (NY-SC)	18	< 1	3	3	R
	Loggerhead Shrike (CAN, NY,VT-E)	18	< 1	1	5	B
	Grasshopper Sparrow (NY-SC)	18	< 1	2	5	B
	Red-shouldered Hawk (CAN-V; NY-SC)	17	< 1	2	3	B, R
	Common Loon (VT-E; NY-SC)	16	1.0	3	1	B
	Least Bittern (CAN-V; NY-T)	16	< 1	1	3	B
	Black Tern (ON-V; NY-E; VT-T)	16	< 1	2	3	B
	Vesper Sparrow (NY-SC)	16	< 1	2	5	B
	Long-eared Owl (VT-SC)	16	< 1	2	3	R
	Pied-billed Grebe (NY-T; VT-SC)	15	< 1	2	4	B
	Cooper's Hawk (NY, VT-SC)	15	< 1	2	3	R
	Osprey (NY-SC; VT-E)	15	< 1	2	3	B
	Bald Eagle (US-T)	15	< 1	1	3	B
	Sora (VT-SC)	14	< 1	2	3	B
	Horned Lark (NY-SC)	14	< 1	2	5	R
	Common Nighthawk (NY-SC)	14	< 1	2	3	B
	Common Tern (NY-T; VT-E)	13	< 1	2	3	B

^a Local status: B = breeding population only; R = found year-round, although breeding population may differ from wintering population; ext = extirpated.

^b Relative abundance (from BBS) is highest of any physiographic area in North America.

Priority habitat-species suites for Area 18 (updated 8/2000). TB (threats breeding), AI (area importance), PT (population trend), and total PIF scores from CBO prioritization database (Carter et al. 2000). Focal species for each habitat appears in boldface.

Habitat	Species	Total score	TB	AI	PT	Action level ^a
<i>Agricultural Grassland</i>						
	Henslow's Sparrow	27	4	2	5	II, V
	Upland Sandpiper	23	4	3	5	III
	Sedge Wren	23	4	2	5	III
	Bobolink	20	3	5	2	III
	Short-eared Owl	19	4	2	3	III
	Loggerhead Shrike	18	4	1	5	II
	Grasshopper Sparrow	18	3	2	5	III
	Northern Harrier	18	4	4	2	III
	Vesper Sparrow	16	3	2	5	III
	Horned Lark	14	3	2	5	VI
<i>Shrub-early successional</i>						
	Golden-winged Warbler	24	3	4	1	II, V
	American Woodcock	23	3	5	4	III, V
	Brown Thrasher	20	3	3	5	III
	Common Nighthawk	14	3	2	3	VI
<i>Riparian-deciduous and mixed forest</i>						
	Cerulean Warbler	24	3	2	3	II, V
	Eastern Wood-pewee	21	3	4	5	III
	Canada Warbler	20	3	3	2	IV
	Veery	19	2	5	2	IV
	Black-billed Cuckoo	19	2	5	2	IV
	Black-throated Blue Warbler	19	2	2	1	IV
	Wood Thrush	19	2	3	2	IV
	Red-headed Woodpecker	19	3	2	3	III
	Whip-poor-will	19	3	2	3	IV
	Sharp-shinned Hawk	18	3	5	3	IV
	Northern Goshawk	18	3	3	3	IV
	Red-shouldered Hawk	17	3	2	3	IV
	Long-eared Owl	16	3	2	3	IV
	Cooper's Hawk	15	3	2	3	IV
<i>Freshwater wetland, Lakeshore and River</i>						
	Piping Plover	28	5	2	5	I
	American Black Duck	19	3	4	2	III, V?
	American Bittern	19	3	5	2	IV
	Short-eared Owl	19	3	2	3	IV
	Least Bittern	16	3	1	3	IV
	Northern Harrier	18	3	4	2	IV
	Common Loon	16	3	3	1	VI
	Black Tern	16	3	2	3	III
	Pied-billed Grebe	16	3	2	4	IV
	Bald Eagle	15	2	1	3	VI
	Osprey	15	2	2	3	VI
	Sora	14	3	2	3	IV
	Common Tern	13	2	2	3	IV

^a Action levels: I = crisis; recovery needed; II = immediate management or policy needed rangewide; III = management to reverse or stabilize populations; IV = long-term planning to ensure stable populations; V = research needed to better define threats; VI = monitor population changes only.

Literature Cited

- Carter, M. F., W. C. Hunter, D. N. Pashley, and K. V. Rosenberg. 2000. Setting conservation priorities for landbirds in the united states: the partners in flight approach. *Auk* 117:541-548.
- Hunter, W. C., M. F. Carter, D. N. Pashley, and K. Barker. 1993. The Partners In Flight prioritization scheme. Pp. 109-119 in D. Finch and P Stangel (eds.), *Status and management of Neotropical migratory birds*. U.S.D.A. General Technical Report RM-229, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Rosenberg, K. V. and J. V. Wells. 1999. Global perspectives on Neotropical migrant conservation in the Northeast: Long-term responsibility vs. immediate concern. In R. E. Bonney, D. Pashley, R. J. Cooper, and L. Niles (Eds.). *Strategies for bird conservation: The Partners in Flight planning process*. Cornell Lab of Ornithology.