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 Physiographic Area 26, the Adirondack Mountains. Percent of population calculated from percent of range area, weighted by BBS relative abundance (see Rosenberg and Wells 1999). PIF regional and global scores from CBO (Carter et al. 2000).

Entry level	Species	Total score	% of pop.	AI	PT	Local status
I						
	Bicknell's Thrush (NY - SC)	25	??	5	3	B
	Canada Warbler	25	1.2	5	5	B
	Golden-winged Warbler (NY - SC)	25	< 1	2	3	B
	Wood Thrush	23	1.4	4	5	B
	Black-throated Blue Warbler	23	5.1	5	2	B
	Bay-breasted Warbler	23	< 1	2	4	B
	Chestnut-sided Warbler	23	1.7	5	5	B
	American Woodcock	22	< 1	3	5	B
	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	22	1.0	5	5	B
II						
a.	Veery	21	1.7	5	5	B
	Scarlet Tanager	20	1.1	3	5	B
	Black-and-white Warbler	20	1.0	5	4	B
	Olive-sided Flycatcher	20	< 1	3	5	B
	American Bittern (NY - SC)	20	< 1	5	3	B
	American Redstart	19	1.2	5	5	B
	Great Crested Flycatcher	19	< 1	3	5	B
	Eastern Wood-pewee	19	< 1	3	5	B
b.	Blackburnian Warbler	21	2.6	5	2	B
III						
	American Black Duck	20	< 1	3	3	B
	Bobolink	18	< 1	2	3	B
IV						
	Upland Sandpiper (NY - T)	19	< 1	1	3	B
	Common Loon (NY-SC)	18	< 1	3	3	B
	Northern Goshawk (NY - SC)	18	< 1	3	3	R
	Northern Harrier (NY-T)	17	< 1	2	3	B
	Sharp-shinned Hawk (NY - SC)	17	< 1	5	3	B
	Peregrine Falcon (NY-E)	16	< 1	1	3	B
	Spruce Grouse (NY-E)	16	< 1	2	3	R
	Bald Eagle (NY-E)	15	< 1	1	3	B
	Osprey (NY-SC)	15	< 1	2	3	B
	Golden Eagle (NY-E)	14	< 1	1	3	B
	Cooper's Hawk (NY-SC)	14	< 1	2	3	R
	Pied-billed Grebe (NY - T)	13	< 1	1	3	B
	Vesper Sparrow (NY- SC)	13	< 1	1	3	B

Priority habitat-species suites for Area 26. 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	PTDQ	Action level [a]
Mountaintop -- stunted conifer woodland							
	Bicknell's Thrush	25	2	5	3	F	II,V
	Peregrine Falcon	16	3	1	3	F	III
	Golden Eagle	14	2	1	3	F	III
Northern hardwood-mixed forest							
	Canada Warbler	25	3	5	5		III,V
	Black-throated Blue Warbler	23	2	5	2		IV
	Wood Thrush	23	2	4	5		III
	Rose-breasted Grosbeak	22	2	5	5		III
	Veery	21	2	5	5		III
	Scarlet Tanager	20	2	3	5		III
	Black-and-white Warbler	20	2	5	4		III
	Eastern Wood-Pewee	19	2	3	5		III
	American Redstart	19	2	5	5		III
	Great Crested Flycatcher	19	2	3	5		III
	Northern Goshawk	18	3	3	3		IV
	Cooper's Hawk	14	2	2	3		IV
Early successional forest/edge							
	Golden-winged Warbler	25	4	2	3		II,V
	Chestnut-sided Warbler	23	2	5	5		III
	American Woodcock	22	3	3	5		III
	Olive-sided Flycatcher	20	3	3	5		III,V
Mature conifer (spruce-fir) forest							
	Bay-breasted Warbler	23	3	2	4		IV
	Blackburnian Warbler	21	3	5	2		IV
	Olive-sided Flycatcher	20	3	3	5		III,V
	Spruce Grouse	16	3	2	3		III,V
	Sharp-shinned Hawk	17	2	5	3		IV
Grassland/agricultural							
	Bobolink	19	3	2	4		IV
	Upland Sandpiper	19	4	1	3		IV
	Northern Harrier	17	3	2	3		IV
	Vesper Sparrow	13	3	1	3		IV
Boreal peatlands							
	Olive-sided Flycatcher	20	3	3	5		III,V
	Spruce Grouse	16	3	2	3		III,V
Freshwater wetland -- river/lake							
	American Bittern	20	3	5	3		IV
	American Black Duck	19	3	3	3		III
	Northern Harrier	17	3	2	3		IV
	Common Loon	16	3	3	3		IV
	Bald Eagle	15	2	1	3		IV
	Osprey	14	2	2	3		IV
	Pied-billed Grebe	13	3	1	3		VI

[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.