

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: Portland
Workshop Date: 1-10-11
Table Leader Name: Jim Ringelman

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.	Reaching out to youngsters who are would be hunters but don't live in households where their parents hunt. Encouraging women to hunt. Maintaining opportunity by having places to go hunting. It takes a critical mass of waterfowl hunters to ensure that hunting is a socially acceptable activity. Changing the image of hunting to appeal to women. The motivations are different with women. Appeal to the food value of waterfowl (i.e., locally harvested, healthy food) makes people more accepting of hunting. The meal as the "endgame". Have to have enough quality places that attract birds that hunters are satisfied. Mentoring programs could be very important, both for hunters hunting in new areas and also new hunters. Make hunting the "whole experience". Important to retain current hunters by avoid placing impediments in their way. Measureable attributes: number of hunters, hunter-days, surveys of hunter satisfaction, funding for conservation.
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	May not be distinct from hunters, i.e. older hunters may now be viewers. Non-hunters have had a major impact in some areas (example: Yolo WMA in California). Having quality places to go is very important. Encourage user-pay. Federal refuges balance hunting and viewing appropriately. More emphasis on conservation mission so viewers understand the role of hunting in conservation. Perpetuating tradition means cluing non-hunters into benefits of hunting. Measurable attributes: user-days, fine-tuning H-D surveys (ask people if they view waterfowl), financial support provided by hunters.
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels	"Healthy" could be defined as sustaining sport harvest at levels that satisfy hunters. Some people would be happy with 5 splash limit; others want max bag size. A population

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above) and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	size that would allow a simple bag would may be desirable. Being in "harmony" with their ecosystem creates habitat for many species. Should be phrased "in harmony with natural ecosystems", recognizing that man-made habitats complicate assessment of whether people or waterfowl caused the problem. Has to be in the context of "why" you want a certain population size (for people). Distribution is an issues (avoidance of disease, food depletion). Measurable attributes: K of habitat, an average BPOP, over a period of time (10 yrs) based on an objective assessment of how many birds are needed for human uses.
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	Should be net change in habitat, not just what habitat is put in place by conservation. "Conserve" should ideally be in the form of permanent protection or land use regulation. Permanent securement is the "gold standard". Realization that shorter-term conservation will always be part of the mix. Ag lands are part of the conservation picture. Measureable attributes (1) would be net change in critical habitat features, (2) use of habitat by waterfowl, (3) amount of habitat in perpetual protection

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	See above
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	See above
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.	See above
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2 above) in perpetuity.	See above

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

Capture table discussion of values once individuals have completed their forms. Thought provoking exercise. Most had initial fundamental weights about equal among landscapes, hunting and populations; substantially less on viewing. After point deductions for linkages, in general the greatest number of points remained in the hunting category.

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes
Starting with obvious examples. Within FWS, ES doesn't talk to Refuges. State wildlife managers might have different objects than other agency employees. State waterfowl managers have no direct connection with state property managers. Some JV plans are referenced in law, which gives them teeth. Might this be emulated at a national scale as one way to bring greater coherence and effectiveness? NAWCA scoring criteria might be used to help address other objectives... for example, higher scores (an presumably greater funding likelihood) if access for hunting or viewing is part of the project. Another example would be the Farm Bill, which has the Open Fields provision. Could more be done in this area? Public access is really key to broadening the scope of conservation. The water issue will be huge. We need public support to ensure there will be water, for waterfowl, in the future. Right now, endangered species considerations are sometimes in conflict with wetlands management for waterfowl (i.e., fish vs ducks). Has the expansion of JV's (number, spatial extent, all bird) been positive or negative for waterfowl? A: a bit of both. Additional partners have helped with public support and some funding. However, breadth of taxonomic interest has caused some internal conflicts or softened policy positions. Would it be a positive step to have the NAWMP refocus on certain JV's, or geographies within JV's, that are of greatest value (demographically) for waterfowl? Perhaps, especially if the refocus is on wetlands. What about recommendation from the NAWMP Assessment that additional focus be placed on the breeding grounds (PPR)? Yes... that re-emphasis would be good. But also need to consider interest in ensuring habitat work addresses other parts of the life cycle and addresses areas where threats are high. Flyway system... discussion of whether it could be streamlined, if too much time spent formulating regulations. No clear consensus. Updating management plans (i.e., for geese) might be a better use of time than annual regulations setting. Most like how flyways operate (science-based management). Managers are not well informed about the desires of those using the resource, and this is an area that needs additional emphasis.

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: Portland
Workshop Date: 1/10/11
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"> - sustain - perpetuate seems minimal - really want it to be more than just maintaining a minimum level of hunters - recruitment - enhance - encourage and increase with emphasis on increasing waterfowl hunting
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustain is status quo and really want to see increased - sustain opportunities to participate - how do you measure opportunity - get into measuring access, (how many places are there and how many people are using those places) - outreach? May have access - but not using it - ultimate goal is participation - - opportunity and participation - could have lots of opportunity with no users - broad group of users, not - wetlands or land and waterscapes instead of "waterfowl landscapes"
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"> - more than ducks - what does healthy mean - more ducks or healthy ducks - the right amount of healthy ducks - don't like the word harmony - disagree biologically with the term; harmony implies all good, happy word - anthropomorphic - perhaps in balance is a better term - don't need the word healthy - distribution is a part of this - not just how many but where are they - this becomes a social science e.g. cackling geese - lower numbers but increased conflict - also public tolerance - again at upper end of the

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
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"> - very related to what talk about with balance within ecosystems - land and waterscapes instead of landscapes - capable of achieving rather than "sustaining" - aren't three and four the same really?

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - percentage of general population that hunt (maintain or increase) - number of licenses sold - hunting days - HIP - level of hunter satisfaction - records of people who have quite hunting and ask them why - people who identify themselves as hunters
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how many places are there and how many people are using those places - measureable at refuge - in terms of number of users - could adapt refuge system planning to look at types of use - access measure - access to viewing areas on public land/NGO/easements e.g. wetlands within certain distance of urban areas -
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"> - best science objective - what do people agree is balance e.g white goose populations impacts on artic tundra - number that any given habitat can sustain - becomes a habitat metric; - population measures - - degradation of habitat and agrigultural lands will always be a trigger of upper population limits - public tolerance - farmer complaints, cost/benefit - goal that takes in population, habitat, public tolerance and education is a bridge -
4. Conserve landscapes capable of sustaining waterfowl populations at levels sufficient to satisfy human desires (#1 & 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - amount of land in landscape (acres) - net loss of wetlands/habitats - easements

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
above) in perpetuity.	

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

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

- didn't really do anything different than in first round of workshops when did hierarchies
- healthy populations a given if had landscape so it became 0
- one had more value on viewing than hunting given 40 million - lots of influence
- varied views - fewer waterfowl hunters but more active.
- habitat has high value to the refuge manager, lower value to the bird person;
- if have healthy landscapes, healthy populations are a given

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

- Everytime think about big questions, think about what trying to achieve in this plan - go back to the fundamental goals. Is the main goal to enable harvest to continue without negatively impacting populations.
- or to provide habitat to enable the above? Is it to promote hunting or is it landscapes
- has evolved into more habitat - JVs are now all bird habitat focus
- plan wouldn't exist without harvest, but want to see habitat in the plan as a starting point
- If we have a different reason in the first place
- hunting is not an issue for JV's - doesn't even come up in the discussions. Discussions focus on habitat and acres.
- how might we recognize a desire with barriers - JV's trying to get additional habitat - a way of acquiring more lands in public trust for landscape and waterscape protection
- sometimes an educational process to educate hunters to tell them where hunting opportunities are at.
- Vehicles are media, joint ventures, duck stamp as raises awareness; these are examples of systems in place that are effective
- LCCs and other efforts can be an assistance to goals at a different scale than a refuge scale - a sympatric relationship. These efforts are right.
- Status quo seems to be adequate and new national inventory and monitoring program/LCCs
- current infrastructure is adequate but can be improved eg. jvs work more closely with flyway tech committees and tech committees can provide guidance to JVs. Would like to see rejuvenation in the revision in the marriage of jvs and flyway tech committees. That may encourage flyway tech committees to think more about habitat needs and less about harvest need. Tech committees need to think habitat first then harvest
- Paradigm of improvement is that science should have management implications - jvs and others need information. LCCs will help with this, help ensure best science
- Who is steering, who is responsible for seeing objectives are met, when tie LCCs, JVs, flyways? This could be addressed in jv strategic plans
- LCCs responsible for everything including insects and may not look at waterfowl at all
- Above LCC responsibilities informs waterfowl pops - e.g. what are eider ducks eating? If phrased in those terms, doesn't matter if waterfowl biologist or someone else.

- lacking balance in local monitoring and may be due to organizations doing similar things without communication with others. e.g. in wintering grounds - can information be gathered and be reliable.
 - Multi-stock - what is that? Not sure what that means. Willamette Valley example in terms of which species managing for in habitat and harvest where species are mixed in wintering grounds.
 - How decide appropriate approach - tech committees are looking at that;
 - venue would be flyway council which tend to look at populations goals for each sub-species and these are adequate to sustaining harvest - can ball all those together and use that for a period of time. Only works if have confidence in population numbers and that are above a threshold that can be okay for several years without monitoring every year.
 - a Power analysis would also be a tool to use to determine the frequency and timing of surveys.
 - Second series of questions regarding who makes decisions? Does there need to be a NAWMP oversight committee that - NSST does this for JVs. Nothing like that exists for flyways (more political). Probably should be something similar for Flyways.
 - JVs are grassroots - based on funding and availability so may never do #1 priority e.g. lacking condemnation authority. JV's have to be opportunistics
 - Budget processes are a hindrance
 - processes are there but in a democracy doesn't work
 - existing scientific and technical teams, and LCCs as they evolve work but how/who ensure communication? That could be better. Perhaps a national oversight team, which is the NSST - they are heading in the right direction and may be the group to provide the oversight to ensure communication/coordination:
 - enhanced role of NSST
 - enhanced role of landscape group science advisors e.g. LCCs
 - NSST makes recommendations but no authority. FWS can't make it stick due to political.
 - consolidate best science on public lands, and add perpetual easements.
- Do current institutions allow moving people or resources? NO The institutions and processes are in place, but broken. Even within the service programs don't communicate with each other.
- could get along with fewer population people - need more into habitat
 - until there is/are collaborative objectives, unlikely for institutions to work together. So the institutions are there, but have differing objectives and need to create those common/collaborative objectives - NAWMP?
 - Also has to be a science group with teeth with truly sound science

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: Portland
Workshop Date: 1-10-2011
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.	Perpetuate at some level This needs some additional specificity - at or above levels observed during the period ____?
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	Need for a quantitative objective rather than "opportunity" perhaps consider some period of benchmark 1. Define waterfowl landscapes - what about corn and beans as waterfowl landscape 2. need to connect with this larger potential base of support for waterfowl 3. And there may be a potential risk of going down this path 4. Pacific Flyway - most have been in position for 20+ years 5. Question whether achieving # 1 and #2 would not be achieved by achieving #3 and #4 - or is it really the other way around. 6. It's more than about hunting (cited the common goals between hunters and nonhunters in the Netherlands have not been well accepted) 7. Some critical mass of participants (hunters) necessary to maintain hunting 8. IS "OPPORTUNITY" REALLY WHAT WE'RE AFTER? maintain at some level 9. Likely will continue to see a decline
3. Maintain healthy waterfowl populations in North America at levels sufficient to fulfill human desires (#1 and #2 above)	1. "In harmony" with ecosystem - is this really related to carrying capacity ... humans desires at which the ecosystem can sustain (however, does this accept the declines) - there is a trap in asking what the ecosystem can support 2. Is this about over-abundant or expanding range

Fundamental Objective	Notes and phrases
and in harmony with the ecosystems on which waterfowl depend.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. "Healthy" populations - may not need "healthy" 4. Does this need to be benchmarked 5. Is this really - as currently worded - really a means objective to achieve 6. Could reduce to "Maintain and conserve sustainable waterfowl populations in NA. (Could include habitat)
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"> 1. There's a lot of "eye of the beholder" here 2. Landscapes for ducks as well as landscapes for users 3. Is this really a means to achieve #1 and #2

Step 2 – List the most important measureable attributes

Fundamental Objective	Measureable objectives
1. Perpetuate waterfowl hunting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duck Stamps \ Active hunters Measures of youth hunters
2. Sustain opportunities for the public to view and enjoy waterfowl and waterfowl landscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depends on scale - numbers of users especially at local scales 2. Membership in organizations (2 million out of a 16 million population) 3. "Sustain opportunities" for use is different than some level of use - need for a benchmark measure 4. National survey with a measure every 5 years 5. In the Netherlands birds shot can be sold ... but can't do that here.
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"> BPI is the obvious metric Average environmental conditions - which suggests that we don't use annual population levels as the metric ... instead, use e.g., 7 out of 10 years Acknowledges that habitat is very dynamic Use a 10-year "trend" as success
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"> Remote sensing - acres of habitat by marsh type - winter flooded Habitat features measured Net change - gains less those acres lost This costs a lot however. This implies a distribution component (sufficient to satisfy humans)

Exercise 2 – Valuing Fundamental Objectives

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

Question about the direction of arrows - most point to users (hunters and viewers) indicating that these may be the only 2 most "pure" objectives.

Heavy value placed / retained in "conserve landscapes" because of an acknowledgment that landscapes are important for reasons beyond waterfowl

High value was placed on viewing objective compared to hunting objective - often equal or greater.

Should there be an additional value attributed from waterfowl hunting to healthy populations

Exercise 3 – Institutions and Processes

Capture table discussion of institutions and processes

A new business model might be necessary: here though, we're talking about a NAWMP enterprise... and a new institutional model might be necessary to achieve this.

We do not have the capabilities / skills necessary to accomplish this

Need to employ consultant - we've been masquerading as HD staff

Most of those we're trying to consult do not have an idea of NAWMP

Who are the stakeholder?

Hunters would be the easy part ... hunters are not a homogeneous group ... we do not have a good idea of the make up the waterfowl hunting community - the people really engaged will be pretty limited - best group to start with might be avids

I get the same seven people each year in a meeting of waterfowl hunting - they may not be the influence leaders

Multi-stock plans might increase awareness of ducks and duck management, whereas a 5-splash limit might recruit more hunters

Multi-stock management has both a biological element and also a social implication with issues of complexity and satisfaction inferred

Multi-stock management may not be an issue as we engage broader audiences

There may be an internal issue (with waterfowl management community) with regard to a willingness to engage in this discussion

Need to strive for "enlightened self interest"

We need to acknowledge the small proportion of people who apparently are concerned

Public perception ... i.e., social license

Other organizations

Broader support for waterfowl conservation - we're not able to engage hunters very well leave alone begin to engage the broader constituency

Support for the waterfowl and wetlands conservation versus support for NAWMP might be different

Is the waterfowl support community as aware of the values that are derived from waterfowl conservation as are waterfowl hunters

What would the institution look like in the future?

Is a different institutional support model needed as well.

Non-consumptive users may need to be at the table

May need a continental management board - analogous to JV Management board
Representatives could include the broader representation
Question the nature of authority of what essentially would be involved in a broader NA
Plan Community
Unclear where the technical support - especially from the HD aspects
Someone (or some group) needs to have the broader view - how will coherence occur
without the broader perspective
Increased ownership occurs with de-centralization and specialization - however, the
potential for integration is eroded without some degree of "command and control"

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