

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Quarter: (circle one) 2018__1st 2018__2nd 2018__3rd 2018_X_4th

Grant Program, Number and Title: RCN 2017-03 GSA 00029

Contractor: Terwilliger Consulting, Inc.

Project Leader: Karen Terwilliger

Abstract:

Objective 1: identify and review and update of priority invertebrate RSGCN

The invertebrate steering committee was engaged to determine scope and priority order of next taxa to be addressed. The priority taxa groups to address were: Stoneflies (63 species), Bees (solitary, many types) (132 species).

Since October 1 we have:

- engaged the key state experts for the bee and stonefly taxa invertebrate groups
- coordinated WebExs with the expert teams to finalize rankings
- coordinated and recorded the work of these 2 teams, compile teams' input and finalize lists
- participate on NEFWDTC and SWAP coordinator WebExs and conference calls and annual fall meeting to communicate progress; compile and coordinate Committee input; respond to committee questions about RSGCN, provide updates, seek guidance on RSGCN selection and tracking

Objective 2: Complete population of regional Wildlife Action Plan database; provide on-going technical support, training, deployment, and evaluation of use. Since October 1 we have:

- worked with three states (MA, NJ, WV) to access their data, and complete uploading with quality assurance/quality control of remaining Wildlife Action Plan data. For both MA and WV, we created edit tools and forms for efficient data input. For MA we reviewed their SWAP and extracted the actions to link to threats for habitats. We sent them to MA staff for their review and verification, and they sent us an official approval. For WV, we reviewed their SWAP and extracted actions to link to their threats, habitats and species. These were sent to state staff for review and verification. We were informed that they are updating their database again, and on December 9th we received their updated database and incorporated the new WV data with location-based actions. We received and incorporated NJ database newest version.
- surveyed and solicited users regarding the regional SWAP database in addressing other program priorities and actions. We incorporated the results of 2 surveys: 1 to state Fish and wildlife agencies staff, and another to key partners -i.e. USFWS and other federal partners. We presented a summary report to accompany survey results which we provided to the NEFWDTC and SWAP coordinators on their monthly calls, as well as at the NEFWDTC annual meeting.

We implemented survey suggestions:

- refined database and queries (in consultation with states) to better identify themes of urgency, actionability, opportunity, etc., to more fully inform future high-priority regional conservation needs and tasks and address regional data analyses for partners. We will also:

Provided technical services and training for database users:

- requested the most effective ways to promote the database to partners
- Worked with the NEFWDTC to explore the most effective ways to provide technical support to targeted groups
- Perform database maintenance to ensure consistency with base platforms and servers- ongoing
- Developed 2 Webex training sessions, presented to 20+ users,
- Provided the updated database to NEAFWA Website

Were planned goals/objectives achieved last quarter? Yes

Progress Achieved: To meet the objective of expanding the RSGCN list to include additional Invertebrate taxa, we worked with the steering committee and recruited native bee and stonefly experts. We facilitated their review resulting in the first draft of RSGCN lists for these taxa. In the final quarter we finalized these lists. The draft list of RSGCN Bees and stoneflies was approved at the NEAFWA directors meeting in November. We have updated the RSGCN list and distributed it to states and their partners.

To meet the objective of updating the NE SWAP Database to include additional information from MA and NJ, we added over 15,000 new or revised threats and actions that we were able to link with the other SWAP elements. Priorities did not change, but numbers were significantly increased with these additions.

To meet the objective of understanding the use of the NE SWAP Database, we implemented the suggestions from two surveys, one for states and one for partners. These surveys asked users to explain what kind of information they were seeking, whether they were able to find it, how it could be made easier to use, and what additional information it should contain. The responses to the survey have been summarized in a draft report and incorporated in the updated database provided and posted on the NEAFWA website.

During 2018, additional data from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and West Virginia were added to the Northeast Region SWAP Database. TCI updated Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and West Virginia data by using the information from these states' respective Wildlife Action Plans. Data to link actions for addressing habitat threats in Massachusetts were extracted from chapter four of their plan. Statewide action data for New Hampshire were extracted from appendix five of their plan. For West Virginia, threats and actions for their Conservation Focus Areas were extracted from chapter six. In December 2018, West Virginia submitted additional threat and action data in a Microsoft Access database (SWAPMASTER - 9-14-18.accdb). New Jersey data was extracted from a Microsoft Access database (NJ_SWAP_V85_to_region.accdb) they provided. New Jersey threat data were extracted from the database at IUCN level 3 and a threat score greater than zero. New Jersey action data were extracted at TRACS level 3.

Most of the data that was updated concerned the threats and actions that states had specified in their planning processes. There were also minor changes to New Jersey's and West Virginia's SGCN lists based on a review of their published Wildlife Action Plans. From the New Jersey Wildlife Action Plan, habitat information for all 656 of their SGCN was extracted. A summary of what data were updated is presented in the table below.

Summary of changes to the Northeast Region SWAP Database

	Identified Threats Added	Identified Actions Added	Assigned Threats Added	Assigned Actions Added	Associated Actions Added	SGCN List Updates
Massachusetts	0	0	0	5,371	0	No
New Hampshire	0	119	0	0	119	No
New Jersey	125	67	7,282	0	4,527	Yes
West Virginia	94	88	132	89	87	Yes

Identified Threat – A descriptive phrase that identifies a threat that can be assigned to one or more species, taxa, habitat, location, or statewide.

Identified Action – A descriptive phrase that identifies an action that can be assigned to one or more threats.

Assigned Threat – An Identified Threat assigned to a species, taxa, habitat, location, or statewide.

Assigned Action – An Identified Action assigned to an Assigned Threat.

Associated Action – An Identified Action recommended for a species, taxa group, habitat, location, or statewide, but is not assigned to a specific threat. The 4,527 Associated Actions added by New Jersey and the 5,371 Assigned Actions added by Massachusetts significantly increased the number of Assigned and Associated Actions in the database. Prior to their addition, there were 15,604 Assigned or Associated Actions in the database. Now, including the 295 additions by New Hampshire and West Virginia, there are 25,720 Assigned or Associated Actions in the database, an increase of 65 percent. Likewise, including the 132 additions by West Virginia, the 7,282 Assigned Threats added by New Jersey increased the number of Assigned Threats in the regional database from 13,414 to 20,582, an increase of 53 percent.

These large increases of threat and action data supplied by New Jersey and Massachusetts are not indicative of a wide disparity of issues affecting wildlife among states in the region. They are just a reflection of the degree of specificity in which these states chose to record their data. The tables below show the percent contribution each IUCN threat category and each TRACS action category had on Assigned Threats and Assigned Actions prior to and after the database was updated. Pollution remained the number one threat category in the database and accounted for 18.3% of all Assigned Threats. Data Collection and Analysis remained the number one action category and accounted for 27.5% of all Assigned and Associated Actions.

IUCN Category of Assigned Threats	Prior to Updates	After Updates	Change
Administrative Needs	0.9%	2.2%	1.3%
Agriculture and Aquaculture	3.1%	4.5%	1.4%
Biological Resource Use	7.7%	8.0%	0.4%
Climate Change and Severe Weather	10.7%	10.3%	-0.4%
Education/Outreach Needs	0.4%	1.3%	1.0%
Energy Production and Mining	4.4%	5.0%	0.6%
Geological Events	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Human Intrusions and Disturbance	5.8%	6.5%	0.7%
Invasive and Other Problematic Species, Genes and Diseases	11.5%	11.9%	0.4%
Natural Systems Modifications	11.8%	12.7%	0.9%
Pollution	17.6%	18.3%	0.7%