

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops
Table Leader Notes

When completed, save file as <city last name date> and email or transfer on USB drive to DJ Case BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.

Workshop Location: Denver 2-3-10

Workshop Date: 2-3-2011

Table Leader Name: Humburg

Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	1. some view this as the primary fundamental objective 2. should numbers of hunters vs. satisfaction be seaprated? 3. is this a perpetuation of the NA Model? 4. a lot of hunters are necessary to maintain the model 5. Note that we have considerable information in place to test this. 6. this begs for a formal process of developing the
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	1. "watefowl landscapes" is not very satisfying 2. not sure how we would measure this 3. are we measuring birders or something else 4. a lot of this is viewed as a means objective 5. a lot of interest in EGS especially in Canada - however, concern about this going beyond the sideboards of a "waterfowl plan" 6. a discomfort with "opportunities" 7. the strategies for addressing this would be a lot different depending on the distribution of areas relative to people - yet there is the need to acknowledge the tradeoffs represented when both hunting and other uses are presented 8. there are specific local examples that demonstrate this but more difficult on the broader scale 9. "sustain public viewing of waterfowl" 10. waterfowl and wetlands viewed as essential to the quality of life
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the	

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	

Step 2 – List the most important measurable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measurable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. number of participants necessary to perpetuate the model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - retention may be a better vital rate - recruitment also may be considered - churn rate - and measure variables that are responsible for change in vital rates - diversity of hunters allows for a resilience or "healthy" - diversity of strategies will be needed in different regions and social landscapes - the scale at which you measure these is important 2. satisfaction is an explanatory variable 3. hypothesis - retention is a function of satisfaction 4. satisfaction is probably not the basic measure 5. satisfaction is a result of a number of influences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - numbers of ducks seen - numbers of days hunted - numbers of ducks harvested 6. need to link these measures into behaviors and how these behaviors can be affected by strategies we would employ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - link identity to behavior - question about the degree to which greater avidity and identity leads away from perpetuating the tradition - related to the lack of diversity
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use FWS survey to measure the number of people who travel >1 mile to observe 2. may also want to understand the reasons for why this behavior is perpetuated 3. concern that this group currently do not provide resources at a level desired 4. fundamentally, how is this connected to waterfowl landscapes - this is not park setting 5. what is the fundamental strategy connected to this

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
	<p>6. we may end up having to carve off resources for different landscapes</p> <p>7. this invokes an important discussion of the tradeoffs of habitat for ducks versus habitat for hunters versus habitat for viewing waterfowl.</p>
<p>3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.</p>	
<p>4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.</p>	

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms.

1. General view that most of this is fundamentally linked to people
2. populations guide our work
3. hunting is the source of our support
4. fundamentally, the values are personal values that are almost equally valued with professionally linked to our job.
5. Hunting is a difference with the waterfowl plan that draws an important distinction to other groups of species that are not hunted - we have hunting as an added fundamental goal - without hunting our valuing would be quite a bit different - this is a signal for how we might view interests from other non-hunters
6. are waterfowl hunting fundamental objectives also important as a means to other fundamental goals than conserve landscapes - e.g., light geese or resident Canadas
7. Could a negative feedback need to be considered between hunting and viewing
8. Also relates to how this will relate to 2 decades down the road

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

General comments – enter any comments or reactions you want to record

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops
Table Leader Notes

When completed, save file as <city last name date> and email or transfer on USB drive to DJ Case BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.

Workshop Location: Denver 2-3-10

Workshop Date: 3 February 2011

Table Leader Name: Boomer

Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<p>As written: some angst with the fact that it does not really sound like a fundamental objective... "misses the mark" "opportunities" too vague, too passive, does not reflect active participation... "view and enjoy" too narrow "involve" does not include a direction or intended purpose...</p> <p>Suggested Changes 1) Expand citizen support for the perpetuation of the waterfowl resource, 2) Expand overall citizen support for and engagement in the management of waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes</p>
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	<p>use "abundant and resilient" instead of "healthy"</p>
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	1) numbers of waterfowl viewers of waterfowl 2) financial contributions 3) numbers of citizens who consider themselves supporters of the waterfowl resource 4) membership in waterfowl management NGO's, clubs, other ad hoc organizations... 5) increases in alternative funding sources of the waterfowl resources 6) increases in number of citizens that buy duck stamps or otherwise contribute to conservation activities 7) number of citizens that understand and appreciate the ecological goods and services associate with the conservation of waterfowl and their habitats
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	Bpop #'s, Trends, Vital rates - resilience aspect monitoring and assessment programs e.g. mid winters - distribution of wintering waterfowl
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	acres,.. some quantitative measure of quality or ecosystem function... detection of different components of habitat

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms. One member of the group had trouble accepting the linkages between the fundamental objections (thought some connections were missing or needed to be change); in general, the group valued Landscapes more than populations and human use;

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes
 See Ginny's notes: groups were consolidated for group discussion facilitated by Dave Case...

General comments – enter any comments or reactions you want to record

Round 2 – NAWMP Stakeholder Input Workshops
Table Leader Notes

When completed, save file as <city last name date> and email or transfer on USB drive to DJ Case BEFORE YOU LEAVE the workshop.

Workshop Location: Denver 2-3-10

Workshop Date: 2-3-11

Table Leader Name: Wallace

Exercise 1 – Fundamental objectives

Step 1 – Capture succinct notes and phrases that clarify what the fundamental objectives mean to your group

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - perpetuate can mean increasing, maintaining - even dropping but having a few. - quality, quantity, cost, societal aspects beyond our control - Maintain healthy waterfowl hunting communities - strengthen to make it energizing - perpetuate could be very low level - maintain strong waterfowl hunting participation - more energizing and moving - have not set participation objectives to see if we can make a difference in them
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - many of the same actions use to manage for hunters - is this really a fundamental? - rework to communications and marketing - enhance opportunities and to and support from
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reach some threshold that a population can sustain itself, biologically. For waterfowl hunting, would be more than that level, e.g. mallards - healthy conveys population level sufficient to sustain itself - healthy - more common understanding e.g. contaminant, toxic, disease - not unduly putting waterfowl - physical health - Originally look at 10 groups of species - are we looking at each group and managing differently based on different goals - if this plan looking differently e.g. people may be more interested in looking at some species than other - different levels of emphasis based on desires and use - can define healthy many different ways e.g. as hunter very different than as population manager. - healthy also in the sense of populations so high they are damaging their environment. - healthy - social and biological context - hunter, view,

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
	<p>damage e.g. in urban</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - numerical values that accomplish other goals - important to have that to set up tension - in - should it be across to get at distribution issues - could have pops in NA but in one location
<p>4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - habitat management, acquisition, partners work, - regulatory related to ownership/value of wetlands e.g Corps, - sustaining waterfowl populations is only part of it - sustain as populations shift due to climate changes - coming earlier, leaving later, etc - shift in migrations - enough habitat for populations to available to sustain with stressors. - through the annual life cycle - breeding, migrational, wintering - not just fed/state/ngo, need to include landowners - maintain better than conserve - conserve denotes permanence; maintain implies a broader suite of tools - NAWMP, Policy eg. farm bill, etc. all work together to maintain the landscapes. Does conserve restrict us to a stricter set of tools eg. only - but not good to put \$\$ into temporary things - to me conserve is better. Prefer conserve to try to get the more permanent type of things. - This obj and populations interact - have to have the habitat to maintain at least minimal populations - defining this as a biological objective

Step 2 – List the most important measurable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measurable objectives
<p>1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - level of policy support - absolute value - stamp sales; license sales - demographic trends of hunters - e.g. move average age of waterfowl hunters downward - age, gender, location -
<p>2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.</p>	
<p>3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - level of damage - acres damaged - sufficient so public can view - level of hunter satisfactio

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of population with acceptable lead levels - health measure - % of pops classified as threatened an endangered. - numerical population values - bpop surveys, mid-winter surveys - spatial and temporal population distributions - bird watchers value scarcity and diversity, hunters value large populations - at least on the edge - important tension related to how we define and measure healthy populations
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - # acres for breeding, wintering and migrating sufficient for each species - vital rate response where relevant (wintering and breeding) - management capacity to conserve the landscapes (challenged in doing that); management tools not always available eg. fire - infrastructure, funding, management tools - policy programs sufficient to result in landscape conservation (CRP, WRP, etc.)

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms.

- Don't get to conserve landscapes or have populations without buyin so have to give people a reason to value them - put more resources into people thinking if you have their support, have
- started with more in conserving landscapes because landscapes give people those opportunities
- populations - the reason we're driving at healthy populations is to have harvestable surplus
- greater residual value for populations than landscapes because critters more energizing
- bottom line is money - if can't turn
- waterfowl hunting - one reason put few resources from hunting to conserving landscape; enough intrinsic value andn support will happen anyway - as long as there are hunters there will be support
- same residual for all
- one 0 in viewing and enjoyment in context of this enterprise - the North American plan
- the hearts pumping the blood are the emotion - the bottom 2, the lungs keep things moving
- what people care about they protect
- challenge have with this is would put residual values similarly, but because of the interplay I'm devaluing the intrinsic value I would place on each.
- values of boxes add up to less than the boxes of the means - show how tightly
- at 3k level doesn't surprise me the way it turned out - based on the work that we do

- there are probably arrows back and forth between viewing and enjoying and hunting - there are connections there. Hunting recruitment may grow from the excitement of being in marsh and seeing
- university hunts focusing on natural resources students as first natural constituency for those hunts. Get recruitment and they stick. pointing out don't need all the equipment and capital
- industry giving impression need more stuff than really need - contribute to a barrier.
- put on "average" hunts - show people how to do it without all.

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

(whole group discussion) -

By what social process would we go about(1st question). Social processes = interaction, interplay.

What is wrong or right with processes we have now.

- seems like the joint venture process is doing a lot of this
- they do it within the JV; we have 2 systems in place - one for harvest, one for habitat, and don't have an explicit system for the people part of it. We have 2 social processes that need to be integrated better - how could that be done in a future environment. Have leadership in these orgs that would be working more closely to set objectives.
- Q: also have LCCs and are hearing concerns about capacity from states. want to be involved but strapped. Duplicating processes.
- This calls for integrating what are now separate processes; how would the North American Plan committee change with integration
- see a high level council with fingers in existing 2 processes and add 3rd
- things are happening in a number of different places - they already have a lot of angst about overload already and need to be careful not to contribute to that. If you come up with system that would reduce costs, that would be great.
- One efficiency the plan committee would set all the goals and ultimately everything go to the three governments to make decisions.
- how would PC relate to SRC?
- two ways to approach - look at existing systems and try to integrate, or start at top and step down without being constrained by existing groups, committees, etc.
- Ken recommends need to start at the top because if start within, there will be too much turf. Have to maintain the technical capacity we have built
- Coherence - see links of habitat and populations, questions about the 3rd leg of stool. Not sure if should be top down or bottom up. In addressing crises, top down doesn't work, but we're not in a crisis now. Will be many issues from a technical standpoint. If dealing with multiple objectives, and someone is going to have to put weights on those - not sure what kinds of processes and institutions are needed.
- bottom up is consensus model, top down is decision model.
- change is almost always driven by a crisis.
- struggle separating the plan and objective setting with implementation. Objective setting and goal process ought to have strong support from overall enterprise. but the implementation and how plays out on annual basis - there are levels of responsibility -

e.g. as far as setting regulations, will by law always be DOI. But don't want to make system more complex or expensive

- Ken - clarify not advocating a top down approach; technical support will drive this
- have to start with broad objectives
- need to start the discussion/frame the discussion has to be accomplished within the first two years. Will need some framework of where all entities fit - AFWA waterfowl working group, technical committees
- Dale - have we not defined a crisis well. Seems there is a crisis related to capacity - people and resources are all tied up and so who is going to do new stuff. Appears to be a dollar and capacity crisis.
- Paul - was thinking we can get through revision of plan through PC
- is declining habitat and number of hunters the crisis?
- above are signs of potential crisis and the plan is away to avoid it - rather plan to maintain than to restore
- PC can be place where all waterfowl issues come to a point,
- how does the src perceive the plan committee getting into their business? Makes sense to integrate src and pc, are people willing to do that?
- Jeff VS - struggling with visualizing how this will work? At the end of the day you would probably still have the same number of people hours invested, regardless. If merged, would there be a dilution of technical expertise - two entities doing one thing well or one entity doing two things not quite as well
- are we looking at another Minneapolis? A Mnpls 2? Is there a need for another big policy summit to come up with the write construct that we can all do our pieces of?
- integration of src and plan, also JV and flyway councils,
- related to HD, talking about new group - which adds to capacity issues; trying to improve coherence between harvest, populations and habitats. big void is between habitat and harvest. may be a matter of taking nsst and harvest group and improve their
- undergoing the process right now through workshops, input, etc, in terms of looking at the social process.
- has been work on habitat/harvest coherence. What's working or not with that process that could inform the discussion
- has been a lot of thinking about how decisions can be made from a technical standpoint. nsst are thinking about making fundamental changes in how they evaluate. On harvest site, looking at the dynamics of coherent decisions on three species. From policy side, plan revision is providing objectives. Let's say we have an analytical framework to identify what we can expect if we make this habitat management or that harvest management decision - how will the tradeoffs be addressed; who will make those decisions
- struggling with the point on the k, implied social decision that hasn't been included explicitly.
- ultimately decision makers have to weigh value associated with the human objectives which is a way to bring that people factor into the process.
- is hd process similar to jv in the sense of drawing from partners - if there were a guiding body for hd, would it be similar to jv process?

- the one difference is have so much to learn that need a full time body to gather information, similar to population assessment. missing a dedicated institution to think about hd issues every day.
- need an expectation that integration happens not because people have good working relationships, but because it's expected. but want to maintain specialists, not generalists. Want coherent institutions not coherent people.
- do we need a new institution or will grow into existing institutions. if we write a numeric objective for people, is there an institution needed for that?
- At a minimum there is a need for a new commitment to HD, if not a new institution
- JVs evolved from waterfowl to all-bird and have made progress in the people part. if there is somewhat to redefine what jvs and flyway councils are. believe you could have geographically based mergers of jvs and flyways with technical support - take some old parts, retool, and merge together. build on habitat that jv have done, build on what flyways have done, and figure out how to work in hd. most of these groups form to fill a void - e.g. NABCII
- hard to anticipate how things will come together in absence of a framework - process just described would arise naturally with the harvest and habitat folks continuing to work on making linked decision - how would we do what we need to do to get to the consequences. All entities are going to look at what the implications are of any decisions
- institutions will begin to align as look at the implications of decisions.
- have heard three recommendations - modification of nawmp plan committee, to form something for hd, and to form framework for ? Joint Task Force was pretty integrated - a model for how might start. -
- if had some notion of a committed effort or expectation that this will happen, will make it easier
- fws oversees nsst and harvest management group - could nsst include three different entities, subsets of each of the three technical, tie back to flyway councils through membership,
- redefine flyway councils - now state representation. if flyway councils had reps from each jv in their area, or way to connect in more direct way. most people on council are supervising same people as on jv
- it breaks down at the next step - the legal, very structured responsibility of the fws with the need for broad involvement from the habitat side. would have to legally segment your work. marry flyway reps on pc, with flyway consultants. but wouldn't work in regulations setting mode. will need to change hats to change in that way.
- model needs to be developed by people who have a stake in it - facilitated discussion with representatives from all institutions - hand picked to make sure get people willing to make a change.
- once get up and running more with pop objectives and better handle on hd, may get institutionlized into the regs process eventually.
- get community to agree on one decision/portfolio/suite of actions, that all groups then act under. question is who are the people that make the decision to adopt that decision.
- Now take it to international level - will need to synch better with Canadian partners, and this system doesn't do that. Plan is two countries, but regulations is clearly domestic.

General comments – enter any comments or reactions you want to record

- if go back to 1986 plan driven by declining populations - no question about what trying to accomplish then. A lot of what discussing in workshops, moving the deck chairs on the titantic. What's going to motivate people? Why should people change? How are we going to get support for revision of the plan?

- demographics can be spun into compelling story of why proposing change

- its chronic rather than acute

- experience with harvest has been the double loop of the implementation process; issues identified have been the carrot to get the technical community to step back. perhaps that could be scaled up. have info, time to start making progress in these

- frame in the context in greater conservation challenges - decisions with limited resources.

- directors and administrative level people will welcome incorporation of hd, anything we can do to deal with integration, efficiencies and coordination.

- at what point do you start creating expectations of the plan -

- don't want to wait til final comes out and say here it is

- until rprocess plays out and changes are identified, there isn't anything yet to communicate