

**2010 Atlantic Coast American Oystercatcher Working Group Annual Meeting**  
**Final Meeting Notes**  
**12-14 October 2010**  
**Wellfleet Wildlife Sanctuary**  
**South Wellfleet, Massachusetts**

*Note: full names and affiliations of meeting participants can be found at [http://www.ncsu.edu/project/grsmgis/AMOY/AMOYworkinggroup\\_2010.htm](http://www.ncsu.edu/project/grsmgis/AMOY/AMOYworkinggroup_2010.htm).*

**Tuesday, October 12, 2010**

**STATE PRESENTATIONS:**

Scott Melvin (MA): powerpoint

Wendy Green (RI): 20 prs 2010; 24 prs 2009, 20 prs 2008, peaked at 29 prs in 2006

One site monitored; 4 pairs, 1.75 prod. Only 20% of pairs monitored. 20 sites surveyed for pairs.

Todd Pover (NJ): powerpoint. 332 pairs was last state survey but did not cover entire state. Estimated at around 400 pairs. Marsh populations logistically difficult to survey. No money. Working Group decision on periodic rangewide surveys would help them gain support for full state survey. Don't expect population growth on beaches. Would be on marshes or dredge islands. Far less flooding in NJ in 2010 that affected productivity. Predator management efforts were successful at some sites.

Matt Bailey (DE): powerpoint. 2010 was first year of thorough monitoring and first good year of data for DE. Confident that surveys from 2010 documented most of pairs breeding in DE. 15 pairs. Productivity data for 12 pairs. Fledged 8 chicks. 3 areas – atlantic coast, del. Bay, inland coast/bays. All of productivity is at inland bay sites. Other sites have too much predation pressure. Flooding wasn't a problem. Abandonment not a problem. Pilot banding study started in 2010 using 3 character code flags.

Alex Wilke (VA): handout summarizing 2010 productivity for approx. 67% of statewide breeding pairs. Overall good productivity – flooding wasn't a big problem, some sites with effective predator mgt. Survey of barrier islands showed continued population growth on islands.

Sara Schweitzer (NC): powerpoint – surveys .

Jessica Stocking (NC): powerpoint – monitoring.

Felicia Sanders (SC): not as much focus on AMOY in SC now. 400 nesting pairs. Haven't had funding to do state surveys; haphazard winter resightings. Only 121 resights collected this year. 200 pairs in Cape Romaine resighted during breeding season for survival analysis. Roof top surveys found 2 pairs with young – state record. Charleston Harbor. May list AMOY as state threatened in 2011.

Brad Winn (GA): coastwide survey in 2010. Last one in 1999. 86 pairs ('99) to 114 pairs. 271 individuals. Non breeding flock documented – 10 years ago and in 2010 at same location. 40-60 birds. Some areas on beaches have had increased wash over areas that may have contributed to pair increase. Some management strategies as well, e.g. no night driving in some areas.

Jen Hilburn (GA): no production after egg stage. Artificial incubation program with 50% of nests in same habitats. Putting chicks back to nest areas. 3 of 4 of manipulated broods fledged. Outreach at marinas – pointing out habitats to avoid for AMOY protection.

Sue Heath (Gulf coast): Presented on Wednesday. Update on projects on the gulf coast. NFWF grant at gulf coast bird observatory/texas state univ. Update next year.

**STANDARDIZED COLLECTION AND REPORTING OF BREEDING DATA – DISCUSSION**

Shiloh Schulte facilitating. Group discussed a table of proposed definitions for productivity monitoring metrics and proposed list of minimum reporting metrics for productivity by site/state. **Shiloh will present group with resulting definitions and reporting guidelines via list serve to solicit further discussion if needed.** Below are some preliminary notes on definitions.

- Productivity - # chicks fledged/# breeding pairs

- Nest survival or hatching success (apparent): nests hatched/nests found (at least one egg hatched=hatched)
  - Specify nests with known fates; compare with unknown fates.
  - Does one count a pipping or starring egg as “hatched”? Could count them as not yet or unknown if you don’t visit enough. If you use the adjusted survival then you don’t lose that. That will be better nest comparisons across sites anyway.
  - Still need a minimum visit threshold
- Nest survival (adjusted): probability of a nest surviving over a given interval (usually a day or average incubation period); **idea of web seminar to show people how to use Program Mark or perhaps other tools, e.g. R-mark, Winbugs.**
- Chick survival (apparent): # chicks fledged/# chicks hatched
- Chick survival (adjusted): probability of a chick surviving over a given interval (usually a day or average incubation period)
- Fledging: survival to 40-35 days or sustained flight of 100m. Group had lengthy discussion on which age to use for fledging (30-40):
  - Issue with losing chicks at or around fledging. When does juvenile survival period begin? Regional and even site differences in actual fledging age.
  - What about effort for checking chick survival? Certain number of times? Chicks that disappear and reappear? Note that adult behavior can be used as a clue of chick presence instead of actual visuals, but defensive behavior becomes less dramatic as chicks age and adults are different. Chick visuals needed to confirm actual fledging.
  - Calculating daily survival rates, the concern about unknowns will be muted. Fine distinctions won’t matter as much. Same logic applies to adjusted nest survival rates.
  - Presence modeling? Likelihood of detectability? Modeling that can estimate these parameters
  - What is the actual objective? To define fledging age? Or to produce rangewide productivity indices for management.
  - **Cut back to 35 days (or sustained flight) for reporting purposes and for calculating PRODUCTIVITY. Not necessarily fledging. Add 10 days for management purposes and regulatory purposes. More conservative.**
  - Plover guidelines add 10 days to fledge age and report two things.
  - Be sure to maintain temporal data of chick checks.
- Incubation period: 27 days from 2<sup>nd</sup> egg in BNA account.
- Breeding pair: pair that lays at least one egg
- Territorial pair – pair that creates scrapes, engages in agonistic behavior with other AMOY.
  - Add some sort of minimal monitoring threshold for identifying both types of pairs.
- Broods hatched
- Broods fledged
- Reporting of monitoring frequency
- Renesting vs. clutch continuation. How to distinguish between the two. Group did not thoroughly discuss this but did identify differences in how these are identified. Need to identify minimum threshold between laying attempts to warrant classification as a reneest as opposed to clutch continuation.

**Metrics to be included in proposed standard productivity data collection:**

Breeding pairs, Territorial pairs, nests, nests monitored, nests hatched, chicks hatched, chicks fledged, broods hatched, broods fledged, sources of nest loss, sources of chick loss

**Proposed minimum standard reporting metrics:**

Breeding pairs (or territorial) by site then by state, nests monitored, nest survival (apparent)(SE), chicks monitored, productivity (SE), sources of nest loss, sources of chick loss, management actions at individual site (drop down menu?), monitoring frequency

- How detailed to be when defining different management regimes? General categories for each management action (e.g. predator management – complete removal; predator management – partial removal; predator management – minimal removal).

#### **Desired outcomes for standardizing productivity data collection rangewide:**

Archive of breeding season summary data

Comparisons between sites and across years

Feedback mechanism for WG to evaluate success of mgt efforts

More detailed reporting to inform adaptive approaches to conservation and mgt

Faster and more accurate reporting for funding

#### **Google Docs Update**

Ellen Jedrey presented Group with idea of using Google Docs as a short-term solution to getting rangewide productivity data compiled. **Will move forward with options for long-term archiving as they come up – not only for productivity data but for resighting data as well.**

**See below under banding database update for update from Audubon NC.**

User friendly – can link fields in Google Docs to your regular data entry protocols and upload pertinent information.

Need to have some sort of data sharing agreement associated with Google Docs. **Stephen Brown will provide framework based on what he is developing for the arctic shorebird data.** We can modify for the purposes of the Working Group. Should include a minimum of:

- Recommended citation for data and summaries.
- Agreement for use of data.

#### **STRATEGIES SESSION**

Group discussed advances and setbacks with various strategies of AMOY recovery throughout the range. Different facilitators for different strategies. **Notes from smaller breakout groups to be provided by those facilitators.**

#### **PREDATOR MANAGEMENT**

Ted Simons facilitator

Cape Hatteras – updates from Jocelyn Wright. Hasn't been consistent predator mgt in the past. Feb 2010 got full-time trapper, 7 days/week. 2009 AMOY prod. 0.56; 2010 AMOY prod. 1.3. Attributed to increase in pred. mgt. Using cameras to identify predators by nests. Techs report predator sign in real time and trapper responds. Trapping is targeted on an as-needed basis depending on where the activity is. Have had some PR implications, e.g. bumper stickers against the park trapping efforts. Raises a good discussion topic – how to handle beginning a trapping campaign and the PR implications?

Trapping at Hatteras has been low profile and successful. Did EA in the context of performing a research project to obtain results to inform future mgt. strategies, got comments, approval and went ahead with study. Any sort of continuing management effort will need justification with data/monitoring.

Pushback so far has been mostly residents against the park service who already have animosity towards the birds in general.

Note: In NJ, the National Park Service at Sandy Hook decided to do a public meeting and got very little push back. Resulted in moving forward with selective fox removal efforts.

No avian predator mgt at this point on Hatteras. Coons, fox, opossum, coyote hybrid are targets. Each site has specific problems.

Ghost crabs? Wire traps for ghost crabs. Provided relief in small area during sensitive times.

Nantucket – huge population of feral cats. Feeding stations adjacent to nesting areas.

Monomy – intensive predator mgt. program. Seasonal biotech devoted to removal. 3 electric fences – one not electrified. All hatched. Problem protecting them after they hatch. Coyote effective at depredating chicks. Coyote with 70 common tern chicks in its stomach. Have emphasized kid related activities at visitor center, e.g. identifying mammal tracks around a depredated nest.

Recommendations for using electric fences – Mass Audubon group can provide more information based on their experiences. Eg. Coyotes getting in fence, adult AMOY mortality, etc.

Jessica Stocking – Cape Lookout. South core banks. Systematic approach to evaluating the effectiveness of partial raccoon removal to protect the birds – 2 years of ‘before’ data and 2.5 years ‘post’ data. Powerpoint. Two years of increased productivity after removals (2009 and 2010) but is the predator mgt. the reason? Must consider natural annual variability of AMOY productivity and many factors still to be assessed. Complicated interactions of weather, vehicles, human disturbance, predators....makes it difficult to tease out the actual effects of predators.

Mink? No data on mink depredation but mink sign in the area.

Cameras – are they a useful management tool or more of a research tool only? Resource intensive but provides invaluable information. How often to use? How many nests?

**Pam Denmon agreed to write up a summary of Fisherman Island pred. mgt. program that could serve as a template for others to use to document predator mgt. work at their sites.**

#### ORV ACCESS

Jocelyn Wright – Cape Hatteras. Consent decree was a result of the lawsuit. Resulted in additional protection for beach nesters until ORV plan is established. Pre-nesting closures – pre March 15. .

Alternative F. Slightly more protective than consent decree. How is breeding defined? Scrapes. And copulation for AMOYs. Buffers established.

Are there other places with protection measures in place for AMOYs like Hatteras? Lookout will have final ORV plan by 2012. In NEPA process right now. Will adopt many things from consent decree. Haven’t released alternatives to public yet. Lookout is taking adaptive mgt. approach with AMOY as focal species – setting trigger points for mgt. Link mgt. of people, vehicles and predators to specific thresholds of AMOY productivity and pop. size. How do PIPL measures fit into that? Generally, the plovers already have concrete guidelines established.

Other species? Eg. Of special closures on Assateague for skimmers.

GA – changing night driving policies for sea turtle activities. Will benefit AMOYs.

State by state – who can use information from these other states to guide ORV mgt. strategies where it is not currently taking place?

#### BOAT AND PEOPLE ACCESS

Brad Winn (GA) and Felicia Sanders (SC)

Successful measures in GA/SC to protect nesting sites for colonial birds – AMOYs, WIPLs have benefitted. Advice from their experience – know who all the players are. Do your homework about who the stakeholders are at a site that you’re trying to protect. Both opponents and supporters. They succeeded in having 5 sandbars/spits protected with various levels of human use – state owned, but not DNR management. First thing was executive order to transfer management. Two years of meetings with members of stakeholder groups – informed them of the issues. Not only breeding birds, migrating birds. Closed off the 5 islands, complete exclusions for some. Dogs excluded from all five. LE supportive.

Felicia – SC. 3 islands closed a couple of years ago. Had to get a large amount of public support through public meetings etc. Only way it passed. 95 AMOY pairs on seabird, estuarine islands. Closing islands has protected about a quarter of SCs nesting pairs. State lands already.

Important - targeted education to the right stakeholders. Combined with general outreach to public groups.

Weigh out political hotspots vs. biological hotspots to increase chances of success. I.e. don't target the most popular area for recreation if it's not a critical biological hotspot.

On the ground management: signs. To low tide.

Good example of a situation where pre and post monitoring results for productivity and population size would be extremely useful.

How to get the message out? Brochures, posters, powerpoint presentations, on the ground effort every weekend at the locations in question to point out what is being protected, contact leaders of ecotour groups.

DE – issue with closed areas and people using the intertidal zones.

Scott Hecker – e.g. of Plymouth beach ban on dogs and individual who created Facebook page against the new no dog policy. He created a Facebook page in response. Be aware that ignoring the potential of or the need to use that kind of technology may put you behind quickly or result in surprises.

### PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Ways to bring this information to the public more directly. E.g. teaching modules.

NJ Conserve Wildlife has an educator. Is trying to develop this type of interactive program to engage school groups, etc. BNA has huge potential as a public education component – as a living, changing document. Just need someone to use the info and transform it into educational material.

Eg. of MassAudubon efforts in Chatham. Mark Faherty's powerpoint. Website specifically oriented towards Chatham Birds.

Worth the effort to monitor things like facebook pages and fishing websites to see what the local chatter is about.

### **COORDINATED RANGEWIDE SURVEYS**

Lunch meeting with state coordinators and other interested Group members to discuss the need for repeating the rangewide winter survey and for developing standardized breeding season survey methods and coordinating a rangewide breeding season survey.

Definite need for coordinated breeding season surveys and repeating the nonbreeding survey at some point.

Repeat of non breeding survey in particular is needed right now to establish a new baseline for the AMOY population.

Because of the history of the original rangewide winter survey, **Manomet will follow up with moving a NFWF proposal forward for repeating the winter survey.** As a starting point for coordinating rangewide breeding season surveys, **Ruth Boettcher will summarize existing state strategies for monitoring breeding oystercatchers (plovers, colonial birds, etc.) to see where the commonalities are and start to see where we can coordinate or develop a strategy for comprehensive statewide breeding surveys.**

Details of breeding season survey methods and reporting guidelines will still need to be established.

**Wednesday October 13, 2010**

**STRATEGIC PLANNING DISCUSSIONS**

**Presentation by Dan Petit, NFWF**

Powerpoint.

**Funding needs – Shiloh Schulte, Stephen Brown, Group**

Stephen – the Working Group should be thinking about larger foundations different from what we're used to dealing with for funding sources. Need a better understanding of everyone's individual funding needs across the range so that Shiloh, as the recovery coordinator, can know how to help us focus on obtaining needed funding. Will help with current approach to funding on a more regional or site specific basis and also on a more collective effort to get funding for the initiative as whole that would group all funding needs together.

**State-specific funding needs:**

Virginia

Alex Wilke: Need ongoing funding for: (1) annual productivity and resighting surveys, (2) Habitat mgt and predator removal on Metompkin and other VA islands.

Ruth Boettcher: Assessment of AMOY productivity along western shore of Chesapeake Bay

New Jersey

Todd Pover: Full state survey – Breeding season  
More comprehensive monitoring of marsh nesters  
Funding for personnel (Tom Virzi and Todd Pover)

South Carolina

Felicia Sanders: Staff!! Breeding season surveys and productivity monitoring  
Funding for help with rangewide surveys  
Resights  
Other needs: Input from the group on priorities for research, monitoring and management priorities

Georgia

Brad Winn: Current funding: State wildlife grants/Coastal bird initiative  
Research/monitoring needs: Identify limiting factors for food resources at state and regional level.  
Study feasibility of creating additional habitat. Study staging area use throughout the year.

North Carolina

Ted Simons and Sara Schweitzer:  
Resights/winter surveys. Funding for monitoring and mgt on the barrier islands.  
Funding/strategies for maintaining dredge spoil islands. Identify costs of disturbance/displacement  
NC Audubon: Personnel for mgt and monitoring.

Massachusetts

Becky Harris: Staff and budget are declining. Need funds to maintain or expand current mgt. Need funding for education programs.

Delaware

Matt Bailey: Current funding is for initial monitoring, banding and assessment. Need funding for predator/habitat management as required based on current study.

## Rhode Island

Wendy Greene: State breeding survey. Management at key FWS sites

## Florida

Janell Brush (not present):

Funding for personnel for expanded monitoring on the west coast and habitat/disturbance management at key sites. Currently seeking funding for a study of Oyster reef characteristics/AMOY foraging, and later will seek funding for Oyster reef creation. Need funding for state shorebird coordinator.

## Texas

Sue Heath: Current funding is for initial monitoring, banding and assessment. Need funding for predator/habitat management as required based on current study.

## **MORNING PRESENTATIONS**

Tracy Borneman: powerpoint. Impacts of military overflights on nesting AMOY.

Ellen Jedrey, Katy Forgues, Matt Boarman: powerpoint. MA banding update.

## **AFTERNOON PRESENTATIONS**

Ted Simons introduced the idea that moving into the future and managing collective resighting and/or banding databases will take some additional thinking. Also, will need to move from ad hoc resighting efforts into a more detailed, formal study design if the group plans to do any sort of collective analysis with the resighting data. How can the BBL help with managing the data? Institutionalize the management of our banding data – that has been the goal all along. No plan at this point for ways to manage and institutionalize the data.

Audubon NC (Walker Golder) recently met with the database designer and is moving forward with developing the database mentioned several years ago at the meeting in Ocracoke. The designer is reviewing a sample of the database and Walker will arrange a conference call to talk about how the database should look. Currently they are working on the idea that this is a banding database and not a long term solution for productivity data, but we may still be able to combine the two.

## Bruce Peterjohn – BBL

Bruce provided the group with an update on discussions within the BBL about developing a data mgt. system to maintain resighting data from throughout the banding community. Details not worked out yet. Within the next year, details will move concept to system. Looking for representative types of datasets to be used in development of the system. Couple things to note:

- Banding data submitted to lab anyway – that requirement won't change.
- Submission of resighting data will always be voluntary. But need to recognize the benefits of submitting the data. Growing support for developing these types of datasets. Lots of data sitting out there and isn't necessarily protected from loss. BBL offers long-term sustainability.
- Would provided improved management of color marking, particularly flags and markers.

Discussion on the level of interest from the Working Group:

- Real key is developing survivorship estimates. If the group moves forward with this idea, we will be working with much more data and will need a better system to manage the data. Will allow us to key in on certain factors affecting survivorship.
- How would we coordinate an international scheme? Group will need to address this when/if flags are used in greater numbers. May need to move away from the one color/country approach and come up with something more species specific.
- Expertise at the BBL and Patuxent can help the group move forward with efforts like developing rangewide survivorship estimates. Partnership with them initially will facilitate those group-wide efforts in the future.

- Public access? Government database is in the public domain. How will individual projects ‘protect’ their data. Example would be to submit data to BBL after having completed a project. Bottom line though is that BBL would always have to provide data if someone requests it.
- How does Bandedbird.org fit into the BBL idea? Example of what it can do is give you instant response of a bird’s history. **Matt Bailey and Kevin Kalasz (not present) (DE) would like to put together a one-pager regarding the site so that the Group can review.**
- Big difference between BBL and Bandedbirds.org is that the latter has to have the banding information inputted into it in order for that instant return and if the user doesn’t get it, there are no repercussions. The BBL does not have a choice, they are obligated to respond to inquiries.
- How sustainable is Bandedbirds.org?
- Also, BBL has quality control measures in place for any data that goes through them.
- Problems like codes being reported that don’t exist or are backwards, etc. are flagged. Shiloh has remedied some of these errors by requesting photos from reporters. How would BBL handle those types of situations? They have the resources to handle that with higher efficiency than manual techniques.
- What’s the turnaround for getting data in? Right away so the BBL can respond if they get an inquiry.
- Will the BBL process resights from areas where the birds were banded? Yes.
- Data access and sharing? Ted – one of the group’s strengths is that we cooperate and share information. Data sharing agreement could be used. Could the BBL provide an “advisory” when providing data to someone? Possible but BBL still will have to provide data to whoever requests it. One idea is that the peer-review process will be somewhat of a filter, e.g. an editor shouldn’t ever agree to publish something that has obviously not been handled ethically.
- Potential benefits of sharing all this data outweigh the minor chances that something unethical and damaging would happen.
- If the group is interested in participating in developing a test version, how to begin engaging the group or representatives of the group?
- Can they except thousands of records at one time to archive? Yes, small numbers relative to what the BBL handles on a regular basis.
- How would people request data? Those are details to be worked out.
- Can you make/distribute records/announcements that data has been requested? Or let the bander know? Yes, it’s possible.
- What are our next steps as a group then? **Review the details of Bandedbirds.org first. Discussion will be continued via list serve.**

## **BNA DISCUSSIONS**

Alan Poole and Ted Simons presented a summary of the status of the BNA update. Alan answered various questions about completing the section reviews.

Would like the BNA to become and remain a living, changing document for future audiences.

Allen:

- Accounts will become available for update by the authors as often as they want. The Group will serve as a new model for how to update these accounts.
- Some sections don’t need to be done if we don’t want to. BNA has an editing staff for systematics, Peter Pyle is doing molts and plumages. Some sections won’t need too much. Core sections will be breeding section, demography and populations, distribution changes.
- Don’t be afraid to comment on what we don’t know. Identify what we still need to learn. Those all get condensed into the final section of “directions of future research needs”.
- How can we use unpublished data? Definitely use it, but judiciously. Comb through published literature and extract what is most important.
- Don’t need to copy writing style.

- How to incorporate hemispheric conservation plan information, i.e. information outside of north America? Lean towards opening it up instead of totally restricting to North America.
- Pictures and sounds – Cornell has lots of information already. When accounts are revised, that is a focus, updating photos. Video can also be used.
- Appendices are possible – just keep them short.

#### Author updates

Tracy Borneman – characteristics. Not really much to update

Shiloh Schulte – migration. General update on existing data to describe migratory movements. Not a formal analysis. Wants to relate history of mark-recapture effort, has that info through 2008. Would like to update that.

Jessica Stocking – habitat. Lit. review in progress. Would general habitat use in breeding/winter be available from all states?

Jon Altman – food habits. SC studies.

Pam Denmon – sounds.

Alex Wilke – behavior. Will particularly want input on video and flush distance info.

Tom Virzi – breeding.

Brad Winn – conservation.

Sara Schweitzer – appearance. Peter Pyle. Incorporate eye coloration and change in bill color information.

Stephen Brown – future research. Provided handout with starting point based on info gathered from existing plans, etc. for AMOYs. Will send reminder email to group for input.

Ruth Boettcher – Working Group. Basically done based on white paper that the group worked on for a couple of years. Need to shorten.

Ellen Jedrey – Lit Cited. Will need to gather all this info from all authors.

#### **AFTERNOON PRESENTATIONS**

Samantha Collins: powerpoint. SC headstart program.

Matt Bailey: powerpoint. Pilot study using flags to band in DE.

#### **FINAL DISCUSSIONS**

Initiative coordination and do we need an executive committee? If so, what would we get out of this group?

Stephen Brown – simple proposal. Most meetings have been planned and hosted by one organization. We have become more complicated with more ongoing issues. Need a small committee that would help plan meetings, ensure continuity between meetings, help lighten the load of the meeting host, etc. Eg. from shorebird council where they created slots to fill certain representations of certain regional groups.

Feedback – everyone agrees that it's a good idea. Need to move forward with generating ideas on how to structure it and engage participants. **Stephen will circulate proposal for moving forward on the list serve.**

Next year's meeting – Florida for 2011? **Need to confirm with Janell Brush.** Then South Carolina.

#### **ACTION ITEMS AND FOLLOW UP**

##### Productivity metrics

- Shiloh Schulte will present group with resulting definitions and reporting guidelines via list serve to solicit further discussion if needed
- Follow up with idea of web seminar to show people how to use Program Mark.

##### Google Docs and collective databases

- Will use Google Docs as a short term solution for summarizing rangewide productivity information.

- Stephen Brown will provide framework for data sharing agreement to be associated with the info in Google Docs.
- Will continue discussions of options for long-term archiving of banding and/or resighting data – BBL, bandedbirds.org. Begin with update from bandedbirds.org.

#### Strategies

- Pam Denmon agreed to write up a summary of Fisherman Island pred. mgt. program that could serve as a template for others to use to document predator mgt. work at their sites.

#### Coordinated rangewide surveys

- Manomet will follow up with moving a NFWF proposal forward for repeating the winter survey.
- Ruth Boettcher to summarize existing state strategies for monitoring breeding oystercatchers (plovers, colonial birds, etc.)
- Group will move forward with strategies for coordinating breeding season surveys via listserve.

#### Banding

- Feedback and discussion on DE pilot study using flags needs to continue amongst banders so that consensus is reached about moving forward (or not) collectively with using the flags.
- Brad Winn will initiate contact with international shorebird folks about using current state colors with flags. Banders will summarize ideas about changes to the banding protocol in early 2011 via list serve.

#### Executive Committee

- Stephen Brown will circulate a proposal on how to initiate development of executive/steering committee

#### Meeting 2011

- Florida 'nominated'. Need confirmation.

#### Website

- Send Tracy Borneman updates for website
- Updates to banding/resighting data on the website. Shiloh will let us know where the gaps are. Banding projects can update information at will.